Lewisham Local Plan

Regulation 18 consultation statement

Appendix 2 – Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Written Responses Split Part 3

September 2022

Organisation (if relevant)	Part	Section, policy or paragraph	Comment	Council officer response	Action
Blackheath Society no 2	3		Many site allocations already approved/underway, but no summary to show this	Noted. Site allocations with planning consents are noted in the plan. The Local Plan will be updated to provide further information on the status of site allocations and timescales for delivery.	Local Plan amended to provide updated indicative timeframe fro the delivery of site allocations Local Plan amended to include an up-to-date Housing Trajectory and five year housing land supply.
Blackheath Society no 2	3		**General** Concern: how to deal with issues on/near the boundary between areas, whether these Plan areas, or wards, or CAs, or boroughs e.g. Greenwich for Blackheath	The Local Plan must be read as a whole.	No change.
South East London Labour for a Green New Deal	3		Despite the presence of significant areas of out-of-town retail and industrial estates in the south of the borough, often close to railway stations, not all of these seem to be targeted for high density site allocations as per London Plan co-location policies. This lack of balance in site allocations is cause of significant concerns.	The Local Plan does allocate the existing out-of-town retail parks for mixed-use, high-density redevelopment. It also identifies a number of industrial areas which could be intensified or suitable for co-location. However, the plan is also concerned with protecting and growing local jobs. Our employment land review recognised that lots of our employment areas are well occupied and demand for floorspace is considerable. In order to ensure we protect and enhance jobs within the borough areas of Industrial land are protected by the Local Plan and in the case of Strategic Industrial Land (SIL) by the London Plan.	No change.
Telegraph Hill Society	3		We have previously pointed out that the character area and neighbourhood shown for Telegraph Hill in **figure 13.1** is incorrect. The Telegraph Hill Conservation Area, and the former Haberdashers' Estate of which it forms part, stretches to the A2 and New Cross Gate Station. It does not stop half-way down Jerningham Road nor exclude Musgrove, Troutbeck and the northern end of Pepys Road as the figure purports to show. We appreciate that the outlines on the map are not meant to be more than indicative but there is a considerable danger that that they might be used to justify inappropriate development. Where any such figures are clearly incorrect, as they are in this case, they must be amended.	The character areas and neighbourhoods within the Local Plan were defined by the Characterisation Study in 2019. As part of this process a collaborative exercise involving a number of community groups across the borough discussed and ultimately agreed these broad boundaries. Whilst we appreciate that not everyone may agree on the exact boundaries this was consensus lead and also derived by peoples understanding of the character and geographical boundaries of places.	No change
Telegraph Hill Society	3		Furthermore **figure 13.1** fundamentally mis-represents the catchment area of New Cross Gate. As we note below, most of the residents of Telegraph Hill up to the Vesta Road/Kitto Road line look principally towards New Cross Gate and the A2 for their transport needs; whilst south of that line there is a greater use of Brockley or Nunhead. For shopping the whole of area generally looks towards New Cross Gate for supermarkets and to Nunhead for small specialist shops rather than to Brockley.	The character areas and neighbourhoods within the Local Plan were defined by the Characterisation Study in 2019. As part of this process a collaborative exercise involving a number of community groups across the borough discussed and ultimately agreed these broad boundaries. Whilst we appreciate that not everyone may agree on the exact boundaries this was consensus lead and also derived by peoples understanding of the character and geographical boundaries of places.	No change.
Telegraph Hill Society	3		We have objected before, and continue to object to, the split of the Borough in the way it is set out in this Part of the Plan. The Area map (**figure 13.2**) splits the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area into two parts. The majority of Telegraph Hill is included in the West Area and is therefore separated from Hatcham Park and the part of the Telegraph Hill Conservation area between Pepys Road and Jerningham Road in the North Area.	The character areas and neighbourhoods within the Local Plan were defined by the Characterisation Study in 2019. As part of this process a collaborative exercise involving a number of community groups across the borough discussed and ultimately agreed these broad boundaries. Whilst we appreciate that not everyone may agree on the exact boundaries this was consensus lead and also derived by peoples	No change

				understanding of the character and geographical boundaries of places.	
Telegraph Hill Society	3		We imagine this is to scope part of the Conservation Area into the North Area for the purposes of considering the effect on proposals relating to the New Cross Road on the area and, if this is the case, then this is a welcome improvement over the previous split which ran along the New Cross Road.	Noted	No change
Telegraph Hill Society	3		A much larger part of the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area is however affected by what happens on the A2 New Cross Road and in New Cross and New Cross Gate than implied on these maps. It looks to New Cross and New Cross Gate as its local shopping centre and not to Brockley. The New Cross Gate railway station is the major station for the majority of Telegraph Hill residents (a minority using Brockley or Nunhead) and developments which impact on the capacity of that station to service the area impact significantly on these local residents.	We acknowledge that the northern section of the western sub area is impacted by the A2 New Cross Road.	No change.
Telegraph Hill Society	3		Hatcham Park and Telegraph Hill on either side of the A2 were developed together by the Haberdashers' Livery Company, with a homogeneity of design that resulted in them both becoming Conservation Areas in 1990. Even the map on page 470 shows Telegraph Hill as overlapping more with the lower part of New Cross than with Brockley. It makes no sense therefore to have the split where this Plan places it.	The character areas and neighbourhoods within the Local Plan were defined by the Characterisation Study in 2019. As part of this process a collaborative exercise involving a number of community groups across the borough discussed and ultimately agreed these broad boundaries. Whilst we appreciate that not everyone may agree on the exact boundaries this was consensus lead and also derived by peoples understanding of the character and geographical boundaries of places.	No change
Telegraph Hill Society	3		Two further and specifically example of these issues: • The Besson Street triangle is in the North Area, but the changes to the traffic flows around that area with the recent remodelling of traffic flows in Besson Street and New Cross Gate have had a considerable impact on the residents of the west side of the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area • The Goldsmiths A2/A21 gyratory system is in the North Area, but changes to the traffic flows in that area, including recent temporary changes whilst gas works were carried out, have increased the traffic across the east side of the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area.	The sub area boundaries do not have a significant bearing on the assessment of individual applications and any impacts of development whether traffic or otherwise will be assessed against the policies within Part 2 of the plan. We acknowledge that not everyone may agree on the exact boundaries of the sub areas however this will not impact on the robustness of our assessment at planning application stage.	No change.
Telegraph Hill Society	3		We accept that Telegraph Hill does not have much in common with the "true" more -industrial northern parts of the Borough or with Deptford. However, in terms of site typography and the built environment, Hatcham Park also has more in common with Telegraph Hill than with North Deptford. We would propose therefore that the Hatcham Park area should be included in the West Area so that New Cross Gate, Hatcham Park and Telegraph Hill can be considered holistically.	Disagree	No change.
Telegraph Hill Society	3		There is little in these sections about the Conservation Areas, and it is noticeable that the West Area section of this Plan does not mention Telegraph Hill or the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area at all.	Noted. The draft Local Plan Part 2 on Heritage provides further details on the historic environment including Conservation Areas. The plan must be read as a whole.	No change.
TIDE CONSTRUCTION LTD	3	General LCA SA 09	Dear Sir/Madam, REPRESENTATIONS TO THE LEWISHAM LOCAL PLAN REGULATION 18 MAIN ISSUES ANDPREFERRED APPROACHES DOCUMENT, ON BEHALF OF TIDE CONSTRUCTION LTD. On behalf of our client, Tide	Noted. Responses to further detailed representations set out elsewhere in this Consultation Statement.	No change.

			Construction Ltd., we are pleased to submit representations to the current consultation on the Lewisham Local Plan Regulation 18 stage “Main Issues and Preferred Approaches” document. Tide Construction is a development and construction company which designs, builds and delivers purpose-built student accommodation across London. Tide secured planning permission for 67affordable dwellings and 758 student flats with commercial uses on the former Carpetright Site at Loampit Vale, Lewisham, in October 2019 (LPA ref. DC/19/110610).		
TIDE CONSTRUCTION LTD	3	General LCA SA 09	SUMMARY We trust our representations on behalf of Tide Construction Ltd. will be taken into consideration in the preparation of the next stage of the Lewisham Local Plan. If you have any questions about the content of this representation please do not hesitate to contact us	Noted. Responses to further detailed representations set out elsewhere in this Consultation Statement.	No change.
The St John’s Society	3	General	Many site allocations already approved/underway before key transport improvements have been built.	Noted. Decisions on previous planning applications are outside the scope of the Local Plan.	No change.
	3	LCA	My husband and I have lived in Catford for just over 20 years. Our friends are local to the area, and we have even persuaded a few of them to move over from North and East London. We eat and shop locally, and would love to stay. Right now, some of the proposals in the Local Plan document have us considering that perhaps our future doesn't lie here after all. I'd love to be proved long and that local planners really do take into consideration the well being of people and future-proofing the character of the area.	Noted. The Local Plan sets out the strategic framework to support the comprehensive regeneration and revitalisation of Catford town centre. More generally, the Local Plan seeks to improve the character, quality and liveability of neighbourhoods within the borough.	No change.
	3	LCA	I’d like to comment on the Local Plan’s content and presentation, and my concerns over the current suggestions for the centre of Catford. I think Catford can go two ways: Follow the example of Lewisham which has created dense high rise small flats with no sense of community and no apparent easing of the local housing shortage Or take the opportunity to create an interesting town centre with a defined agreed and monitored social housing targets and which respects the local architecture particularly the low rise surrounding Victorian and Edwardian houses.. I am so hoping that you start to take the second option. In detail: **Existing residents** The web site shows an overview after consultations with local residents. However there appears to be a disconnect with the draft Plan which frankly is no better than a Lego land of buildings – with an almost complete disregards for what had been told you alas. This is a real chance to take on interesting building and learn from the French intensive housing set back from streets rising to a maximum of eight	The Local Plan recognises the important role of Catford major centre in the town centre hierarchy. It sets out the strategic framework to support its comprehensive regeneration and revitalisation. Further details are set out in the Catford Town Centre Framework, which the Council has prepared to help support implementation of the Local Plan. The public consultation has been carried out in accordance with the Council’s adopted Statement of Community Involvement. For the Catford area, there have been additional opportunities and engagement, such as through the Catford Conversation and the Catford Town Centre Framework. Catford is located within a London Plan Opportunity Area – these are areas throughout London and Lewisham which have the potential to accommodate growth and regeneration; this includes for more homes but also commercial space, community facilities and public open space. The Part 2 policies of the Local Plan set out further details on housing design standards and housing mix to meet local needs, including for family homes. The Local Plan makes clear that Catford town centre has a distinctive character and identify, along with a unique role in the town centre hierarchy as the	No change.

			storeys. This is of importance to the context as Catford lies in a low valley. Without visible benefits there is no way to carry local opinion which you will know from the heated opposition to the Catford Green proposed 19th storey remains strong – and I for one would strongly support this. **Why such small flats now? And in such numbers?** We know that the traffic plans for Lewisham were acknowledged to be out of date once set in tarmac – this plan needs to be more adaptable and clearly set out in phases to encourage lessons learnt again something that has been recognised from the Lewisham experiment. Forty years!! There is a clear argument for family sized houses or apartments if we are to make Catford a destination and not a transient camp. Also giving London is losing residents – either back to Europe for example or the moves to the country, the latest count being upwards of 700,000. Where is the commitment to reducing) Lewisham's local housing shortage? And all of Lewisham's planning for years has emphasised the need for family house, and for houses not to be divided up. How is Catford going to compete with Lewisham and Bromley on retail? No one can deny that Catford Centre looks miserable – and made worse recently by the permanent closure of such stays of a high street as Boots With Tesco, Lidl, Aldi, B&M, Dunelm, Wickes, Halfords and other large shops all under threat this is a concern. All are well used locally and given the relative poverty of many Catford residents small trips to budget or very reasonable shops is a higher priority than small, albeit interesting boutiques.. **The programme is how long?** I have been the programme manager for major national programme for seven years – and that was difficult to deliver. This simply is too much in the future and will result in planning blight where no one invest or start a business up here. **Those tall towers of Lewisham** What happened? Why was the housing shortage not addressed? Because LBL sold off plan aboard for starters and it was all driven by developers. Without a change of approach I can see no comforts for Catford monitoring.	Borough's main civic and commercial hub. Whilst it will continue to serve an important commercial and service role, the plan seeks to ensure its long-term vitality and viability by allowing for a wider mix of uses. The Local Plan seeks to ensure Catford complements and does not compete with other centres like Lewisham and Bromley. The London Plan is clear that tall buildings will have a role in helping to meet London's housing needs. The Local Plan Part design policies set parameters for building heights. The Local Plan must cover a minimum 15 year period, in line with national planning policy. Part 2 of the Local Plan on Green infrastructure sets out approaches to protect and enhance green spaces, including by addressing identified areas of deficiency. Part 4 of the Local Plan sets out a monitoring framework, which includes Local Performance Indicators – these are metrics against which performance in delivery will be reviewed.	

			CSF Critical Success Factors – where are they? Green spaces - we all want to enjoy but this is a very limited vision – before we've even started" Pleased plan in decent green spaces. This is our chance. You border on Catford South which is one of the most deprived areas in London for public green space.		
	3	LCA	Local plan improvements needed SE6 4UR: Please improve the following on Ravensbourne Road / Sunnyside, Blythe Hill / the parade of shops on Stanstead road on which The Blythe Tavern / Post Office / Moon Lane Books are part of. - more trees on Ravensbourne Road / Sunnyside and the local parade - traffic calming measures / ban lorries with height and or weight restrictions on the rat run from Catford Bridge Station via Montacute road, Polstesd Road, Ravensbourne Park Crescent and Ravensbourne Park to stop HGVs driving through these incredibly tight streets and (more often than not) getting immobilised on the corner of Sunnyside Blythe Hill and Ravensbourne Road. - help us to attract new , more diverse businesses to the parade. - spruce up shop fascias (as they plan to do on Brockley Rise) - repave the rest of ravensbourne road as the repaying was cut short I necessarily and has left elderly, disable and young children residents with reckless paving to navigate outside their homes. Only last week I tripped over a paving slab on Ravensbourne road with my 6 month old daughter strapped to my chest in the sling. She was forward facing and hit the pavement with me on top of her. I had to take her to A&E for cuts and bruises to her face. This is a direct result of Lewisham short-sightedness and cost cutting when repaving only the smallest of stretches of this road, despite it being a well used pedestrian thoroughfare to Blythe Hill Fields. Please do not leave our parade of shops and our streets neglected as you focus attentions on Brockley Rise. The old book keepers here would make an excellent coffee shop servicing families of children at Rathfern and Kilmorie schools and those visiting Moon Lane Books.	Noted. The Local Plan aims to transform the South Circular into a Healthy Street to address poor air quality, improve local amenity and make movement by walking and cycling safer and easier. There are a number of measures to support this including tree planting. The Local Plan includes policies which address the need to protect and enhance shopping parades, and this would include the parade at Stanstead Road. It is recognised however that new Permitted Development rights provide greater flexibility between changes of use within the new Class E of the Use Classes Order. The Local Plan recognises the important role of the employment area at Standsted Road. It designates this as a Locally Significant Industrial Site, and extends this to include the businesses at 118 Stansted Road, which form part of the new Forest Hill Cultural Quarter. 'Rat runs' are outside the scope of the Local Plan however your comments will be forwarded to our Transport Team.	No change.
	3	LCA	I'd like to submit a few comments on the Local Plan's content and presentation, specifically in relation to the proposals relating to Catford in the Central Area part of the plan.	The Local Plan sets out the long-term strategic development and investment framework for Lewisham. It is focussed on delivering Good Growth, in line with the London Plan – this is growth that is socially and economically inclusive and	Additional evidence base documents will be prepared and inform the next stages of plan production, taking into account the latest baseline information. This includes a new Retail and Town Centres Study, Strategic Housing Market Assessment and updated GLA population projections.

			There are no tangible benefits to existing residents The website contains several well-structured research documents on local attitudes and desires. However, these do not appear to be reflected in the draft Local Plan, which is little more than a Building Plan. I had expected something more visionary, something that would be a roadmap to making Lewisham/Catford a more attractive place to live, not only for new young people but for existing residents. At the moment all that seems to be promised is an intention to make life for car drivers more difficult. Without some clearly stated benefits, I fear there will be little buy-in from residents to the Plan and, on the evidence of the proposal for a 19-storey tower in Catford Green, a strong likelihood of public resistance. **There's no awareness of demographic changes** This plan is covering a 40 year period. It is therefore very surprising that it is so fixed and rigid, assuming that the needs and requirements of 2035 will be the same as those in 2021. The housing target, which seems to be the driver of the Plan, was set before Brexit was implemented and before the pandemic. Of course, we can't predict the effect of these two phenomena but to make no reference to them at all, and to even suggest some flexibility, seems a serious omission. London's population is in decline at the moment. This trend may not be reversed in which case the demand for new homes may be reduced. There's no commitment to solving (at least partially) Lewisham's local housing shortage Part of the justification for the plan is the shortage of housing in Lewisham. I have not been able to find an analysis but it seems that a significant part of the problem is overcrowding. The Plan should demonstrate how the new developments will reduce this. Left to developers, most of the new buildings will be composed of small flats: this will not necessarily help reduce the local shortage. There's no hint of a plan to encourage shops to come back to Catford We've just seen Boots, Peacock and Argos close up. The developments in Catford will remove Tesco, Lidl, Aldi, B&M, Dunelm, Wickes, Halfords and other large shops. The budget supermarkets in particular are essential to a large proportion of Catford's demographic. Unless the Council acts proactively, these shops may not return, people will have no reason to come into the centre of Catford to shop and we just become a dormitory. The programme is incomplete The Plan has boxes identifying when each site will be developed but they're not filled in. It looks very much as if Catford will be a building site for 40 years: this is not an attractive proposition for residents or businesses. A timetable, however tentative, would be, if not reassuring, at least honest.	environmentally sustainable. Part 3 of the Local Plan sets out key spatial objectives for the 'central area' – which make clear the Council's aspirations and priorities for improving specific neighbourhoods for the benefit of local residents and others. The Local Plan covers a 20-year period. The draft Local Plan was largely prepared before the peak of the Covd-19 pandemic. Additional evidence will be prepared following the Regulation 18 consultation taking account the latest information on the impact of Covid-19, Brexit and related issues The Council is required to review its adopted Local Plan every 5 years and consider the scope for changes informed by monitoring and new evidence. The review process will allow for consideration of the longer term impacts of Covid-19 and Brexit. The Local Plan recognises the important role of Catford major centre in the town centre hierarchy. It sets out the strategic framework to support its comprehensive regeneration and revitalisation. Further details are set out in the Catford Town Centre Framework, which the Council has prepared to help support implementation of the Local Plan. Part 4 of the Local Plan sets out a monitoring framework, which includes Local Performance Indicators – these are metrics against which performance in delivery will be reviewed. Part 2 of the Local Plan on Green infrastructure sets out approaches to protect and enhance green spaces, including by addressing identified areas of deficiency. Disagree that the plan is ageist. The Local Plan includes policies which address the wide range needs of people in the Borough, including older people. This includes design policies to ensure inclusive buildings and environments, along with accommodation for older people. The Local Plan supports the London Plan target for 90% of journeys in inner London to be made by walking, cycling and public transport.	

			There's no acknowledgement of any lessons learnt from the towers of Lewisham Lewisham Council needs to rebuilt its credibility in managing development projects. This is not just because of the development in Lewisham but also other planning controversies, such as Millwall and the missing footbridge at Catford Green/Doggett Road. Everyone I have spoken to about the new towers in Lewisham thinks it is terrible. This may not be your view, but either way there must be some lessons (what went well, what didn't go well) you've learned that will inform how you will manage future developments. Simply ignoring what has happened in central Lewisham gives a strong impression that this is not a reflective organisation and we should not pay much attention to the Council's promises. There are no actual aspirations beyond unit targets The plan gives a number of units and area for retail for each site, but this does not portray the ambition. It should state how many units of each size, amount of green space (or distance to), the number and type of retail units the Council will hope to attract. Ultimately, these things will be determined by a developer but the Council needs to set its expectations. (It might be helpful too if the Council was more realistic about parking and car-ownership There are no success criteria. At the moment, there seems to be a single success criteria — a building target. If it is achieved it will be a hollow achievement if it results in no change in Lewisham's homelessness, or the flats are unoccupied investments, or the lack of green spaces and crowded transport means that the area is home only to the most economically disadvantaged. Targets could include reduction in homelessness, distance from green spaces, longevity of residency, etc. The 'green' elements are disingenuous No one disagrees with the benefits of more green space, but including a tree map and saying that there are parks within walking distance does not constitute a green vision. A few hanging baskets? Who is going to maintain them? **The plan is ageist** The walking plan, the emphasis on cycling and the anti-car attitude are all clear signals that the Catford of the future is not a place for older people. The only seating area is right next to the A205 and there is not a single mature person in any of the illustrations and no provision for toilets.		
	3	LCA	I would like to add the site in St Asaph road (by the station) and the one in Drakefell road too. They are a bit further away from where I live but I believe the few random "brown land" in our residential area contribute to the HGVs problem.	The Council invited to the public to submit additional sites for consideration as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. However it has been decided that additional sites will not be considered for inclusion as site allocations. This is because the public would not have an opportunity to appropriately comment on the proposals for those sites at the Regulation 19	No change.

				stage. Also, that the Council considers that the existing site portfolio is sufficient to meet identified needs, including for housing and business space. The site submissions will be considered in any subsequent Local Plan review, which the NPPF requires to be undertaken every 5 years.	
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LCA	**Key spatial objective 1** claims that delivery of the Bakerloo line extension and Lewisham interchange upgrade will 'help to unlock the development potential' of the Opportunity Area. This same expression is used seven times in the Plan in connection with the BLE, but there is no explanation of why development potential would remain 'locked' without the BLE, and what would happen if it is not delivered.	Some examples of how the BLE can unlock the development potential of sites and areas include: incentivise landowners to assemble and bring forward sites for redevelopment and help to ensure the optimal use of land, including higher density development in highly accessible areas. Additional details will be included in the policy supporting text.	Commentary on the BLE has been amended throughout the plan, including explanation about how it can unlock the development potential of sites.
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LCA	While we support the objective of renewal of Lewisham major centre as outlined in **Key spatial objective 2**, we think the ambition of making it into a metropolitan centre and the proposed scale of the new Lewisham Shopping Centre as outlined in Site allocation 2 are too ambitious. They suggest a degree of intensification (height, density, footfall, traffic) that is too great for the constrained central area surrounded by low-rise traditional residential streets and railway lines and bisected by a network of busy arterial corridors (A20/A21, etc.). It is also too dependent on the arrival of the BLE in Lewisham by 2030 (unlikely) and by there being no slowdown in local population growth or housing, retail and other economic demand following Brexit and covid. Despite major residential/mixed developments and road/river infrastructure changes over the past 5-10 years, traffic congestion remains a major problem throughout central Lewisham and through to Catford along the A21 corridor, as well as in adjoining neighbourhoods (including Blackheath), while much existing, refurbished and new retail space in Lewisham town centre remains unlet. The same fate potentially awaits Catford, which has similar problems and constraints, if it is remodelled and redeveloped in the same way and on broadly the same scale as Lewisham (as Site allocations 19-22 imply), without any of the lessons of Lewisham's recent redevelopment being learnt. This includes the adverse impact on place, skylines and adjoining neighbourhoods and communities of extremely tall towers located very close together, close to busy transport corridors and with inadequate public realm in terms of space, noise, air quality and greenery. There can be no realistic expectation either that local infrastructure can be funded, expanded and upgraded sufficiently and quickly enough to support the planned expansion of residential, retail and commercial activity.	The Local Plan has to demonstrate where it will accommodate growth to meet its annual target set by the London Plan of 1,667 new homes per annum. Our approach, which is outlined in the spatial strategy is to accommodate this growth in opportunity areas and town centres. We believe that this is a sensible and sustainable approach which directs development in those areas which are highly accessible in terms of public transport, jobs and local services whilst protecting our lower-density residential and conservation areas. The ambition of making Lewisham a metropolitan centre by attracting investment and increasing viable town centre uses is one which has broad support and was established in the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan. The vision and Framework for Catford Town Centre was endorsed by Mayor and Cabinet and can be found on the Councils website.	No change.
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LCA	**Key spatial objective 3: secure the re-routing of the South Circular (A205) at Catford.** This is a good aspiration in itself, regardless of its role in regeneration, if it eases and speeds up traffic flow through Catford.	Support noted	No change.

Blackheath Society no 2	3	LCA	**Key spatial objective 4: transform A21 corridor into a 'healthy street'.** We agree that this busy corridor is in need of improvement. It has a number of bottlenecks, which have recently been made worse (especially near Ladywell) by road layout changes designed to improve bus and cycle lanes. However, for both roads, it is mainly the nature of the route, their intersections, and the weight of traffic they carry that is the problem. Since these roads are controlled by TfL, whose priority is to keep traffic moving, it is very difficult for Lewisham to secure improvements for other users, but all too easy for it to make things worse. The 're-development of out-of-centre retail parks and buildings for a wider mix of uses' (Objective 4) and 'the comprehensive regeneration of Catford major centre' (Objective 2) both sound likely to intensify use and exacerbate existing traffic problems and lead to anything but 'heathy streets'. These are observations rather than criticisms, but point to a dangerous clash of unresolved priorities that the Plan not does acknowledge, explain or justify in terms of key policy objectives.	The Local Plan supports the London Plans target of significantly reducing vehicular traffic within the capital. We recognise that some streets will still function as roads for carrying significant volumes of traffic such as the A21. However we also believe that these streets can still be significantly improved to make walking and cycling more attractive. TFL/GLA have detailed guidance on how this can be achieved We will continue to work with TFL and lobby for improvements along routes that are controlled by TFL.	No change.
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LCA	**Site allocation 6: land at Conington Road and Lewisham Road (Tesco)**.We support the redevelopment of this site to complement the redevelopment of Site allocation 5 Conington Road, where construction began recently (March 2021). In particular, it offers the prospect of generating the matching funding required to upgrade the river corridor and public realm. However, we have serious concerns about the proposed scale of and development requirements/guidelines for the site, which appears to propose development of both residential units [70% land use] and non-residential floorspace [30% land use]) at least as intense as the adjoining approved Conington Road development [mainly residential]. The indicative development capacities and similar Development requirements and guidelines for both sites imply similar heights and density, despite the requirement that the design of the Site allocation 5 development should respond positively to the low-rise residential properties and historic Eagle House at the site's eastern side and to the existing historic fabric towards the southern end of the site. We strongly opposed dense development and an extremely tall tower for Site 5 Conington Road, along with many residents in the local neighbourhood. This led to a highly contested application that eventually went to appeal. Site allocation 6 is even nearer to traditional low-rise residential housing on Lewisham Road and to Blackheath and St Stephen's Conservation Areas just beyond it. The indicative development capacity represents a major intensification of the combined site. Pedestrian access from this car-free site to the town centre and to Lewisham station and transport hub looks likely to remain severely constrained, especially in the absence of a fully funded commitment to a northern entrance to Lewisham station. The impact of potentially more very tall towers (Site allocation 5 includes a tower of 125m/35 storeys) on the immediate neighbourhood and the on	The methodology for indicative site capacities within the Local Plan is explained within a separate topic paper available on the Council's website. In this instance the indicative site capacity was informed by the London SHLAA methodology. This methodology derived by the GLA was used to assess the capacities for all sites across London contributing to each boroughs housing targets. We appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character of the borough. However the council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital.	No change.

			skyline of the Greenwich World Heritage Buffer Zone on Blackheath would be very significant. We believe that there should be height restrictions imposed on Site allocation 6 to require it to step down sensitively from Site allocation 5 to neighbouring low-rise residential areas, and that indicative site capacity should be reduced to reflect this and poor pedestrian access to town centre and interchange.		
Culverley Green Residents Association	3	LCA TR 01	The plan also makes no mention of the bottleneck caused by the railway bridge at Catford or the restricted pavements on the bridge over the Hayes line. The south circular at this point is pretty much a permanent car park and traffic jam which adds to an awful environment and terrible air quality. Unless active steps are taken to replace the bridge and widen the road under it and provide better wider pavements under it and over the Hayes line bridge and totally review all the junctions, I fail to see how the Wickes sites can be redeveloped for high density housing. Traffic out of the site from the exit nearest the bridge regularly ignores the left turn only requirements and blocks traffic by turning right. The plan should be making clear proposals as to what solutions are available. Likewise, we fail to understand how any proposals are going to come forward during the life of the Plan to realign the South Circular. TfL have failed for the last umpteen years although I am aware they have not allowed the Council to remove the proposals from the plan. Perhaps the council should indicate a plan B and give a time limit on the period for the life of the realignment.	Noted. The Local Plan aims to transform the South Circular using the Healthy Streets Approach to address poor air quality, improve local amenity and the public realm, particularly to make movement by walking and cycling safer and easier. The Local Plan provides the policy basis for the reconfiguration (re-routing) of the South Circular at Catford Town Centre, and the Council will continue work with Transport for London and other stakeholders to secure the delivery of this project. Development proposals on the Halford and Wickes sites will need to be car-free or car-lite, in line with the London Plan. Any future planning application will need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and strategy addressing parking, access and servicing.	No change.
Culverley Green Residents Association	3	LCA EC 10 EC 11	**There's no hint of a plan to encourage shops to come back to Catford** We've just seen Boots, Peacock and Argos close up. The developments in Catford will remove Tesco, Lidl, Aldi, B&M, Dunelm, Wickes, Halfords and other large shops. The budget supermarkets in particular are essential to a large proportion of Catford's demographic A variety of shops brings life to a town these plans seem destined to discourage any form of "vibrant shop life". Unless the Council acts proactively, these shops may not return, people will have no reason to come into the centre of Catford to shop and we just become a dormitory.	Disagree. The Local Plan recognises the important role of Catford major centre in the town centre hierarchy. It sets out the strategic framework to support its comprehensive regeneration and revitalisation. Further details are set out in the Catford Town Centre Framework, which the Council has prepared to help support implementation of the Local Plan. It is recognised however that new Permitted Development rights provide greater flexibility for changes of use within Class E category of the Use Classes Order. This limits to scope for the Local Plan to protect shops.	No change.
Environment Agency	3	LCA Site allocations	**Central Lewisham** This area of Lewisham has a high number of environmental constraints such as high risk flood zones, groundwater source protection zones, waste management sites and main rivers. This requires early pre application discussions to ensure development is informed by the latest evidence and guidance. For sites with one or more environmental constraints we recommend early pre application discussions with the Environment Agency. We have assessed the proposed site allocations against Flood Zones, proximity to rivers and flood defences and groundwater source protection zones. The priority sites for early pre application engagement with the Environment Agency are highlighted in bold below.	The site allocations have undergone assessment relating to flood zones through the SFRA and have also been through the Sequential and Exception tests (where relevant). These evidence base documents will be published on the council's website. Throughout the Local Plan process we have liaised with the Environmental Agency to verify these assessments and to gather comments on the plan. Environment Agency acted as critical friend for the Local Plan SFRA.	Some amendments to sites allocations have been made in line with the comments provided in the table of sites and through correspondence with the EA.

			LB Lewisham officer note: Table of sites with water management information included in original representation.		
Hither Green West Campaign Group	3	LCA	Parks and Green Spaces The Plan should focus significant attention on Mountsfield Park - at 32 acres it is one of the largest parks in Lewisham but has few facilities. Our park needs significant investment and new infrastructure to be provided. This includes cafes, public toilets, benches and other seating, picnic tables, outdoor gyms, tennis courts and other sports facilities, landscaping etc., if it is to meet its current population's needs in addition to the planned growth in population. For example, our park has far fewer of all such facilities than the East sides Manor House Gardens despite being four times the size. Why? The plan should state clearly how new leisure and green spaces will be created in Hither Green West and new formal and informal play spaces provided, which address the needs of people of different ages and abilities.	Mountsfield Park is recognised as a strategic open space in the plan and has also been recommended to be designated as MOL. The Local Plan is a strategic policy document but is underpinned by the Parks and Open space strategy. This strategy outlines improvements required for the park.	Local Plan amended by designating Mountsfield Pasrk as a MOL and Startegic Open Space.
Hither Green West Campaign Group	3	LCA	A style guide should be developed for street furniture and public facilities, which enhance the local character and reflect the location's heritage. For example, the predominantly Victorian character of Hither Green West should be reinforced by re-introducing appropriate heritage lampposts, benches, shelters and other seating; post-boxes; wayfinding signage and other street furniture. Residents and visitors enjoy historic high streets and shopping parades. Our street should also be de-cluttered, including removing phone boxes from Hither Green as they are unsympathetic to the largely Victorian setting, and are currently used mainly for outdoor advertisements. The boxes are also poorly maintained and are frequently used for drug dealing and toileting.	The Local Plan is a strategic planning policy document, and the suggested design guidance is not considered to be proportionate to this. The Local Plan includes policies addressing public realm, however specific measures will need to be considered on a site by site basis. We will pass on your comments to our transport team.	No change.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LCA Key spatial objectives	Page 50 point 4 and also point 14.6 in the main document refer to "transform the A21 into a Healthy Street". This is also mentioned in the spatial objectives (page 478). We would suggest the wording of this is altered to "adopt the healthy streets approach along the A21 corridor" and encourage the planning team to follow TfL guidance on this which is clear and unequivocal. This should also form part of the strategic planning document for the whole corridor, and form conditions of planning along the corridor, including CIL contributions to part fund improvements.	Noted. It is not considered that this change in terminology will alter the overall intent for the key spatial objectives. However, it is acknowledged that the detailed policies should be amended for consistency with the London Plan. Planning conditions or other legal agreements will be considered on a case-by-case basis, with reference to the Development Plan policies.	Local Plan amended to refer to the 'Healthy Streets Approach' or Healthy Streets Corridor, where appropriate, in line with the terminology used in the London Plan and the A21 Development Framework.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LCA Key spatial objectives	Page 50 point 8 (page 478, spatial objectives) refers to "Deliver a connected network of high quality walking and cycle routes that link these spaces". Lewisham Cyclists welcome this, but would highlight this would also need to follow London Cycle Design Standards and contributions from developers would need to take this into account in order to avoid a repeat of what happened at the Catford Green Development and bridge to Doggett Road.	Support noted. At its meeting on 16th September 2020 Mayor & Cabinet agreed the transfer of S106 funding originally proposed for the delivery of a footbridge between Doggett Road and the Barratt's development on the former Catford Greyhound Stadium site to be used to deliver a programme of public realm and accessibility improvements to Catford Station areas. This includes looking at options to provide step free access at Catford Station. See M&C report for further details.	Local Plan amended to make clear that the development proposals will be required to meet the London Cycle Design standards, where appropriate.

Lewisham Cyclists	3	LCA Figure 14.2	Page 51 , the map shown has a number of errors, including incorrect alignment for the A21 Healthy Streets corridor. This should be amended.		Additional diagram added to each sub area indicating key links and green routes
Transport for London	3	LCA	The existing bus stand at Thurston Road is the identified site for a BLE station box. The layout of the new station precludes a bus stand on the site. We recommend that the local plan identifies and commits to potential alternative site(s) which could accommodate future bus standing and driver facilities within the locality of: the existing stand, the new BLE station, the existing NR/DLR station and the town centre. Coordination between TfL BLE and bus teams will be crucial to identify and safeguard replacement site(s) to support the delivery of replacement bus standing and driver facilities, which is in close proximity to Lewisham town centre and the interchange facilities. The following site allocations and non-allocated sites have been identified as sites which could accommodate a bus stand in its entirety or split across neighbouring sites, which can share facilities. A number of these site allocations have large proportions of car parking, which could be removed completely or largely to accommodate a bus stand, and this aligns with Borough's climate emergency policy and sustainable transport policies. Site allocations • 1 Lewisham Gateway • 2 Lewisham Shopping Centre • 4 Land at Engate Street • 6 Land at Conington Road and Lewisham Road (Tesco) • 7 Molesworth Street Car Park Non-site allocated sites: • Station Road • Molesworth Street (Highway) TfL is seeking for provision to be made for adequate and appropriate bus standing and driver facilities within the Site Allocations (while continuing dialogue between the Borough and TfL as to the actual location).	The existing Thurston Road bus stand was given to TFL to facilitate the redevelopment of Lewisham Gateway. A key objective of the project was to remove bus standing from the heart of the town centre which was acting as a visual and physical barrier and blight in the centre. Whilst the Council accepts that the bus standing may have to be temporarily re-located along Molesworth street whilst Lewisham Station and the BLE is constructed we see no reason why this cannot then be located back to the original Thurston site. This may require some rationalisation of bus standing and we are happy to have discussions on this issue. All other sites suggested are in third party ownership and many are coming forward for re-development.	Additional site allocation added at Thurston Road to be safeguarded for station use and the continued use for bus standing. Local plan site allocation for Tesco amended to include the provision of bus stand facilities
Transport for London	3	LCA	Site Allocation 3 seems to be missing from the draft local plan.	Noted. This is a formatting error. Site 3 was a placeholder for a site allocation that was included in an early draft of the Local Plan, but not the Regulation 18 stage public consultation version.	Local Plan updated with formatting correction.
London Wildlife Trust	3	LCA 01	We support these principles, especially in respect of Parts F and H)d.	Support noted.	No change.
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LCA 01	Need vision for Blackheath (and for other neighbourhoods, to differentiate them) – see Annex 'Vision'	The Local Plan is a strategic policy document and whilst we have introduced a more granular approach with the sub areas we are unable to have separate visions for all neighbourhoods in the borough. This level of detail may be taken forward through the Neighbourhood Planning process.	No change.
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LCA 01	Need more emphasis on local importance and relationship to World Heritage site and its buffer zone	The importance of the World Heritage Site and its buffer zone is emphasised throughout the plan.	Local Plan amended by making additional references to the World Heritage Site.

Blackheath Society no 2	3	LCA 01	Need for better specification and protection of views across the Heath in many directions	The protection of views is covered in Policy QD5 View Management.	No change.
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LCA 01	Need for a Blackheath Neighbourhood SPD that stitches together policies for Village, Heath and Residential across the full range of Plan policies to 'Reinforce' the neighbourhood's unique character	The Council does not have the budget or the resources to undertake SPDs for all neighbourhoods in the borough. Furthermore Blackheath does not have any significant sites for redevelopment and would therefore not be a priority for an SPD. This level of detail may be taken forward through the Neighbourhood Planning process.	No change.
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LCA 01 HE 02	Need for more reference to Article 4 directions for specific streets and areas within the Conservation Area and need to review conditions and consider enhancing/developing, especially in the face of proposed downgrading of protection against permitted development in Conservation Areas generally	Proactive conservation work will be picked up through the Heritage strategy and action plan	No change.
Hither Green West Campaign Group	3	LCA 01	Given the limited scope for new housing development in Hither Green West (and its location between the two major centres of Catford and Lewisham), we were concerned at the lack of references to Hither Green in all 900 pages of the draft plan. The Plan notes the primarily residential nature of Hither Green. Still, it is silent on how its residential and historical character can be reinforced, preserved, promoted and elevated into a genuinely healthy neighbourhood. The Plan also does not explore the potential for creating new leisure, cultural and community facilities to support the residents, generate employment and bring in additional visitors. Hither Green West is the very definition of a '15-minute neighbourhood' but needs significant investment in public realm enhancements and infrastructure, and a strong vision and Plan, to realise this. The Plan also does not reassure us or explain how Hither Green West will not be left behind. It should be explicit in how Hither Green West will secure significant public realm improvements after decades of under-investment. For example, new or enhanced footpaths or cycleways; road improvements; new street crossings and other safety measures; cycle parking; heritage-sympathetic street lighting and street furniture; new landscaping; tree-planting and other green infrastructure such as pocket parks and squares, play areas and new wayfinding signage etc.	Noted. As the Local Plan is a strategic policy document and whilst we have introduced a more granular approach with the sub areas we are unable to have separate visions for all neighbourhoods in the borough. We have recognised the need to include additional policies on Hither Green, including for the area west of the railway. There are opportunities for the community to provide further non-strategic policies through the Neighbourhood Planning process.	Local Plan amended to include new spatial objectives and policies for Hither Green, including area west of railway. Local Plan amended to designate Hither Green Lane as a local centre.
Quaggy Waterway Action Group	3	LCA 01	**LCA1 Central Area place principles** F **The river valley network is a defining feature of the Central Area which development proposals should respond positively** to by: a. Ensuring that development is **designed to improve the ecological quality of the Ravensbourne and Quaggy rivers, including by naturalising the rivers, wherever opportunities arise**; b. Ensuring the **layout and design of development gives prominence to the rivers and the river valley, and enhances their amenity value, including by better revealing them**; and	The plan is supported by River Corridor Improvement Plan SPD which provides this level of detail.	Local Plan amended to refer to the River Corridor Improvement Plan SPD within the text for site allocations with riverfront access

			c. Facilitating the **provision of new and enhanced connections to and along the rivers and river valleys, including by extending and improving the Waterlink Way**. Walking and cycling links to the river from the town centres of Lewisham and Catford, and the A21 corridor, will be strongly supported G Development proposals for tall buildings in the Central Area will only be acceptable in those locations identified as being appropriate for tall buildings, having regard to the requirements of Policy QD4 (Building heights). H The Council has prepared evidence base documents and planning guidance to assist with understanding of the distinctive characteristics of the neighbourhoods and places within the Central Area, and to help ensure coordination in the delivery of new investment. Development proposals should refer to and positively engage with these documents, including: a. Lewisham Characterisation Study (2019); b. Catford Town Centre Masterplan (Forthcoming); c. A21 Design Guidance SPD (Forthcoming); and d. River Corridor Improvement Plan SPD (2015). **QWAG comments:** How will the ecological quality of the rivers and their corridors be assessed to inform decisions? The Plan should be clear about the tools and methods to be used as standard to inform good decisions making on ecological function and restoration. The Plan should also be clear about where restoration potential exists even where this is not in keeping with a development schemes coming forward. Too much reliance has been place on the chance that river restoration might occur when and if a developer takes an interest in a parcel of land. The Plan needs to be more proactive in restoring the ecological condition and natural function of rivers and waterbodies irrespective of whether a development opportunity arises.		
London Wildlife Trust	3	LCA 02	We support this policy in respect of Part F.	Support noted.	No change.
	3	LCA 02	We have been very disappointed by the very poor quality of design of Lewisham Gateway. The replacement of the previous roundabout with a new set of junctions seems to have led to worse traffic jams than before, buses stacked up trying to get through, a terrible pedestrian experience with desire lines ignored, awful wind tunnel effects on occasions and a complete failure to improve the rivers running through the scheme which remain immured in concrete and barely visible and contributing nothing to improving the opportunities for wildlife and biodiversity, never mind there being no green space just some paving and a few random planters. If this is the standard of what is to come in Catford then we will be objecting vigorously.	Noted. Development for which planning consent has been granted and/or built is outside the scope of the Local Plan. The Local Plan introduces a refreshed suite of policies on urban design, and requires that all new development is character-led and delivered through a 'design-led' approach. The Local Plan sets out the strategic framework to support its comprehensive regeneration and revitalisation of Catford major centre. Further details are set out in the Catford Town Centre Framework, which the Council has prepared to help support implementation of the Local Plan.	No change.
Quaggy Waterway Action Group	3	LCA 02	**LCA2 Lewisham major centre and surrounds** Page 483	The plan is supported by water management policies, and River Corridor Improvement Plan SPD which provides this level of detail. River corridor	Local Plan amended by making reference to the River Corridor Improvement Plan SPD.

			A Continued investment in Lewisham major centre to enable its transition to a metropolitan centre of sub-regional significance in London, and a gateway to the south east, is a strategic priority. To realise this objective and secure the centre's long-term vitality and viability, development proposals must contribute to a coordinated process of **transformational improvement to the town centre environment**. They should also deliver a complementary mix of uses, including new housing, whilst ensuring that the centre's predominant commercial role is maintained and enhanced. F **Development proposals will be expected to maximise opportunities to improve the ecological quality and amenity value of the river environment. This includes improved access to the River Ravensbourne by extending and enhancing Waterlink Way that traverses the wider town centre area, and the River Quaggy at Lee High Road. Proposals should make provision for attractive and robust embankments as a central design feature, particularly along the River Ravensbourne to enhance connections from Silk Mills Path to Lewisham transport interchange and the Lewisham Gateway site, leading to the town centre and the Primary Shopping Area.** **QWAG Comments:** What counts as 'attractive and robust embankments as a central design feature' and how does that advance ecological quality and potential? How will this policy ensure that development in central Lewisham, especially regarding the rivers, have both ecological function and design and amenity value? This clarity is needed especially in relation to the section on **LCA1 Central Area place principles** (see above) i.e.,: F **The river valley network is a defining feature of the Central Area which development proposals should respond positively** to by: a. Ensuring that development is **designed to improve the ecological quality of the Ravensbourne and Quaggy rivers, including by naturalising the rivers, wherever opportunities arise**; b. Ensuring the **layout and design of development gives prominence to the rivers and the river valley, and enhances their amenity value, including by better revealing them**; and… How will assessments of 'maximised opportunities' be made? The Plan should be clear on the ecological tools that will be used as the norm to inform an open and transparent assessment of the opportunities to inform decisions.	improvements will be considered on a case-by-case basis through the development management process.	
Quaggy Waterway Action Group	3	LCA 02	**LCA3 Catford major centre and surrounds** H **Development proposals will be expected to maximise opportunities to improve the ecological quality and amenity value of the river environment**. This includes measures to **deculvert and naturalise the River Ravensbourne near Catford and Catford Bridge Stations, and to improve public access to the Waterlink Way by repairing the existing break in the path and extending the route to join with the River Pool Linear Park**. Proposals	The plan is supported by water management policies, and River Corridor Improvement Plan SPD which provides this level of detail. River corridor improvements will be considered on a case-by-case basis through the development management process.	Local Plan amended by making reference to the River Corridor Improvement Plan SPD.

			should make provision for **attractive and robust embankments** as a central design feature to enhance connections to town centre's western gateway, Ladywell Fields and the train stations. **QWAG Comments:** 'Attractive and robust embankments' needs defining as it could mean the river being canalised and kept in concrete or other hard surfacing. The policy needs to be explicit about restoring the river to a naturalised condition which allows it to perform a proper ecological function, not merely be landscaped in ways which allow public access but without ecological merit and opportunities for engagement with and understanding of the river and its role.		
TIDE CONSTRUCTION LTD	3	LCA 02	**Policy LCA2 – Lewisham Major Centre and Surrounds** Part B of draft Policy LCA2 states: *Development proposals will be expected to help facilitate the delivery of strategic transport infrastructure necessary to ensure the centre can effectively serve, and benefit from, a wider sub-regional catchment and to support Opportunity Area objectives. This includes the Bakerloo line extension, Lewisham station interchange, land required for bus services and walking and cycle routes. Detailed site-specific requirements are set out in the site allocation policies for the Central Area.* The wording of this draft policy is not sufficiently clear as to how development proposals will be expected to help facilitate the delivery of strategic transport infrastructure, and at what stage in the development process this will be required. It is ambiguous and could suggest that this is a blanket requirement which will apply to all development proposals, regardless of their scale and whether there is an infrastructure requirement as a direct result of the development. Instead, site-specific requirements or planning obligations should be established through site allocations (as referred to in the policy), or through the development management process as part of the determination of planning applications.	Disagree. The text indicates that in this area the Council will look to new developments to help facilitate strategic transport infrastructure – it does not impose a blanket requirement on all sites. Furthermore the text specifies that detailed site specific requirements are set out in the site allocation policies for the Central Area. For other windfall sites coming forward, planning obligations will be determined on a site by site basis in the usual way.	No change.
London Wildlife Trust	3	LCA 03	We support this policy in respect of Part H.	Support noted.	No change.
	3	LCA 03	The Lewisham Local Plan has been rejected by seven residents of Brokdale Road, Bradgate Road, Scrooby Street and Wildfell Road. A plan like this should never ever have crossed your mind of yourself and the councillors of Rushey Green. This is our abode, where we live, raise our children grandchildren. So do other useful things. We are disappointed by the council, the local MP and Councillors.	Objection noted.	No change.
Theatres Trust	3	LCA 03	Policy LCA3: Catford major centre and surrounds	Support noted	No change.

			Part F.a of this policy supports the retention of the Broadway Theatre as “integral local landmark and cultural destination”, with new development and public realm improvements to maintain its prominence. Such emphasis on the Broadway is welcomed and beneficial in supporting the wider function and vitality of the town centre. As consumer habits continue to evolve, in particular resulting in challenge to retail, the value and importance of cultural facilities such as the Broadway as an anchor to bring people into the centre is likely to increase.		
London Wildlife Trust	3	LCA 04	We support this policy in respect of Part B)d.	Support noted.	No change.
London Wildlife Trust	3	LCA 05	We support this policy in respect of Parts B and C.	Support noted.	No change.
	3	LCA 05	We have been very disappointed by the very poor quality of design of Lewisham Gateway. The replacement of the previous roundabout with a new set of junctions seems to have led to worsen traffic jams than before, buses stacked up trying to get through, a terrible pedestrian experience with desire lines ignored, awful wind tunnel effects on occasions and a complete failure to improve the rivers running through the scheme which remain immured in concrete and barely visible and contributing nothing to improving the opportunities for wildlife and biodiversity, never mind there being no green space just some paving and a few random planters. If this is the standard of what is to come in Catford then we will be objecting vigorously.	Whilst we note your view this is not the perception of all. Whilst we recognise that the roads around Lewisham Gateway are congested the existing roundabout with bus standing in the middle was a significant barrier and blight on the town centre. The new arrangement, whilst we accept is still busy is a much more rational and legible experience for pedestrians. It should also be noted that when the Lewisham Gateway work is complete there will be a central pedestrian route, which links Lewisham Station to the Shopping centre. The intension is to continue this route through the redevelopment of the shopping centre.	No change.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LCA SA 01	**Lewisham Gateway**; the current site allocation opportunities (14.20) fails to take into account that the junction does not meet current London Cycle Design Standards, and scores poorly on Healthy Streets scoring matrix. Any future development should note in the development requirements (14.21) should involve the junction being designed to meet London Cycle Design Standards and also follow the council’s own transport strategy, detailing a strategic cycle route along the A21 and connecting to Brookmill Road via the A20. The junction should also be redesigned to enable more people to walk and cycle from Lewisham High Street to access new development, a major transport interchange and existing business. Lewisham Cyclists want this to be listed explicitly in the Development guidelines.	We are currently discussing with TFL, who control the road options to improve walking and cycling through Lewisham Town Centre. Further work will be outside the remit of the Local Plan.	Lewisham Gateway site allocation amended to include continued improvements to walking and cycling. Local Plan amended to refer to London Cycle Design standards.
Quaggy Waterway Action Group	3	LCA SA 01	• High quality public realm must be fully integrated into the site area. Particular attention should be given to key pedestrian locations, including the connections between the station interchange and High Street to the south, linking Lewisham Gateway to the heart of the town centre. Proposals should also be designed having regard to their relationship with adjoining strategic sites, including those at Loampit Vale to the east and Connington Road to the north. • The Rivers **Quaggy and Ravensbourne pass through the site but are culverted and canalised. Proposals will be expected to investigate and maximise opportunities to reinstate the rivers and their corridors as a prominent**	A feasibility study was undertaken to look at re-naturalising the river in front of the church and Lewisham Station. This unfortunately determined that it was not possible.	No change.

			feature in the development, along with facilitating improvements to Waterlink Way. This should be supported by delivery of a **new coherent public open space which focuses on the confluence of the rivers.** • Development must respond positively to the St Stephen's and Belmont Conservation Areas, and the St Stephen's Church (Grade II). **Clear visual links to the church, situated to the east of the site boundary, should be established and maintained**. **QWAG Comments:** This is dated although the potential remains to remove the River Quaggy from concrete in front of St Stephen's Church and Lewisham Police Station as should have been done during the Gateway scheme and with S106 funds dedicated to the purpose. That would be consistent with keeping open visual links to the church and creation on quality open space.		
Transport for London	3	LCA SA 01	This site is in PTAL 6b and the existing planning consent allows for the provision of 500 car parking spaces. There is no mention of cycle parking in this phased development. Since there are various phases of this development, to comply with the London Plan policies, we highly encourage any future changes and planning permissions are geared toward car-free development for both residential and non-residential uses (London Plan compliant disabled persons' parking is always permitted). A reduction in car parking provision will achieve better air quality in this air quality focus area, as well as make better use of land and reduce costs. Dedicated cycle lanes should be considered where appropriate to improve safety and encourage people to cycle.	As stated this site has an existing permission and any reserved matters that come forward will be in accordance with the approved permission. Whilst we cannot insist on a reduction in parking and increasing cycle parking it is something that we regularly discuss in pre-app discussions with developers through the reserved matter stages and will continue to do so.	No change.
Transport for London	3	LCA SA 01	14.22 - We appreciate coordination with TfL and Network Rail to 'make appropriate provision for transport infrastructure'. Based on ongoing discussions and the text in 14.22 (quoted below), the draft Plan is unclear about the future of Thurston Road bus stand. It is recognised that as a result of the BLE station, replacement bus standing and associated driver facilities will be required. In the event that the site is needed for NR station improvements, bus standing capacity and associated facilities must be suitably relocated. Arrangements to do this (whether temporary or permanent) must be agreed with TfL as owner and operator of the site. A reference to these site allocations in this paragraph 14.22 and specific clarity on re-provision of existing transportation infrastructure would be helpful. 'Transport for London proposals for the extension of the Bakerloo line provide for the possibility of infrastructure requirements at this site, including a new 'station box', being located partly on the existing bus ~~**layover site**~~ **stand and below adjacent sites** at Thurston Road. Applicants must consult Transport for London and Network Rail to ensure development makes appropriate provision for transport infrastructure **and services'**.	The bus stand will be relocated back to Thurston Road once the station work is complete.	Thurston Road Bus Station site allocation has been added to the Plan to provide clarity.

Lewisham Cyclists	3	LCA SA 04	**Endgate street**; This site needs to recognise the council transport strategy to deliver the A21 Healthy Streets corridor in making sure any development does not result in a reduction in existing footway or carriageway space. This should be detailed in the Development requirements as part of the public realm strategy.	Agreed.	Land at Engate Street site allocation amended by refering to Healthy Streets corridor and no reduction of footway and carriageway.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LCA SA 05 LCA SA 06	**Conington Road & Land at Conington Road and Tesco**; Both sites need to provide enough space on Silk Mills path for high quality public realm to link the proposed new public square. Building lines need to take this into account in the development guidance.	Agreed.	Conington Road site allocation and Land at Conington Road and Lewisham Road (Tesco) site allocations amended to allow sufficient space along the Silk Mills Path.
Quaggy Waterway Action Group	3	LCA SA 06	Site allocation 14.36 Comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment with compatible main town centre, commercial and residential uses. **Public realm and environmental enhancements including new public open space, improved walking and cycle routes, and river restoration**. Opportunities 14.37 This site occupies an important transitional position from the surrounding residential area leading into the heart of Lewisham major centre from the north. The River Ravensbourne runs along its western edge. The site is currently occupied by a large format retail building and car park. Comprehensive redevelopment and site intensification, along with the introduction of a wider range of uses, will provide a more optimal use of land to support the long-term vitality and viability of the town centre. **Redevelopment will also enable river restoration works along with other public realm and environmental improvements, better connecting the site to its immediate surrounds and the interchange.** 14.38 Development requirements • The site must be re-integrated with the surrounding street network to improve access and permeability into and through the town centre, with enhanced walking and cycle connections to residential areas and public spaces. This will require a hierarchy of routes with clearly articulated east-west and north-south corridors, centred on an improved Silk Mills Path. • Positive frontage with active ground floor frontages along key routes. • Delivery of new and improved public realm in accordance with a site-wide public realm strategy, including: • A new public square linked to Silk Mills Path; • **River restoration and a riverside walk** • **Development must be designed to improve to the ecological quality and amenity value of the River Ravensbourne, including a riverside walk incorporating the existing bridges with an attractive and robust embankment.** 14.39 Development guidelines • Development should provide for a complementary mix of uses which support but do not detract from the vitality and viability of Lewisham town centre, particularly the Primary Shopping Area. • The site should function as a transitional site, both in terms of land use and visual amenity, from the surrounding	The intention is to re-naturalise the river subject to EA approval. The council has secured substantial S106 funding from Connington Road who also prepared design proposals as part of the submission. The intention is for this to come forward when the Tesco site is developed. The Local Plan is underpinned by our River Corridor Improvement Plan SPD which provides further guidance.	Conington Road and Lewisham Road (Tesco) site allocations amended to make reference to the River Corridor Improvement Plan SPD.

			neighbourhoods into the transport interchange, Lewisham Gateway and the heart of the town centre. The design of development must respond positively to the residential properties at the site's eastern side, at Conington Road and beyond. • New development should provide high quality urban spaces with generous, functional and formal landscaped areas forming the central part of an improved Silk Mills Path and the river corridor. **Dissecting Silk Mills Path should be access from Lewisham Road and Conington Road, linking to the river and Lewisham interchange**. **• Development should respond positively in scale, bulk and massing to the River Ravensbourne, taking advantage of the natural slope of the site. The river embankment should be visually and physically accessible from Conington Road and improve access to Lewisham transport interchange, Lewisham Gateway and the wider town centre environs.** • Development should respond positively to the scale and grain of the existing historic fabric towards the southern end of the site, at Silk Mills Path and Lewisham Road. • Car parking provision should be the minimum required, reflecting the high level of public transport accessibility of the site. • Development should respond positively to Eagle House, which sits on the site's eastern edge fronting Lewisham Road. This building was constructed in approximately 1870 and is one of the original Anchor Brewery Buildings. It is of architectural and local significance. **QWAG Comments:** It is not at all clear what is meant by 'river restoration'. The Council may be using the term because it has been used by the developer Meyer Homes but it is far from clear that the development will restore the river. Does the site policy as presented here now mean that the river will be removed from concrete at this location and the river allowed to flow with a natural bed and banks? Clarity is required as QWAG has sought to find out what the developer means by 'river restoration' because the term was being used quite loosely by the developer and their agents and it remains unclear whether the actual intention was to restore the river. Meyer Homes eventually revealed that having used the term 'river restoration' liberally in its promotional material and public consultations, the river would not be restored in any true use of the term because the river would remain in concrete and the focus of the development would be on landscaping and hard surfacing to provide some public access but separated from the river and keeping the river in concrete. The policy here seems to continue that approach with terms such as 'robust embankment'. The proper potential to restore the river in keeping with ecological need should be adopted instead of another major riparian development opportunity being missed.		

Royal Borough of Greenwich	3	LCA SA 06	Land at Connington Road/Lewisham Road (Tesco): While we support the development of this site, we are aware that previous proposals have included tall elements, and the allocation should be clearer about appropriate building heights, given that a tall building on this site would have a direct impact on neighbourhoods within Royal Greenwich.	Noted. Following the Regulation 18 consultation the council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study. This has informed the revised local plan approach on building heights.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LCA SA 07	**Molesworth Street Car Park;** This site needs to recognise the council transport strategy to deliver the A21 Healthy Streets corridor in making sure any development does not result in a reduction in existing footway or carriageway space. This should be detailed in the development requirements as part of the public realm strategy.	Noted but this site needs to remain undeveloped as it is required for flood storage.	Molesworth Street Car Park site allocation has been removed from the Plan
	3	LCA SA 08	I am very concerned about the re-development of Lewisham Retail Park, Loampit Vale into a mixed use residential and commercial area.	Lewisham Retail Park has an existing approved planning application.	No change.
	3 - General	LCA SA 08	In addition to two major retailers, Sports Direct and Matalan currently onsite, Lewisham Retail Park, Loampit Vale is the home of SET Lewisham, a community artist-led studio and project space, and Lewisham Wing Chun, a full time school, part of the WCUK organisation, led by Sifu Paul Thompson, that teaches adults and children self-defense. Both spaces – SET Lewisham and Lewisham Wing Chun – have significantly benefited the community, cultural values and well-being of Lewisham and its residents since they started at this former Mothercare retail space spanning 12,000 sq ft in January 2019. While I will speak more about the value of SET Lewisham, some testimonials from the Lewisham Wing Chun have described the following: - I started training with Sifu 8 months ago and I can honestly say that I look forward to every session! He gives the school a unique family feel, a welcoming and fun environment, where I feel safe and confident training. With a perfect balance between wise and lively, he's very approachable and provides gentle correction. I definitely feel more confident in day-to-day life, and I look forward to many more lessons! - As a total beginner to martial arts, Sifu Paul made me feel at ease and went at my pace while still keeping it dynamic and allowing the class of mixed ability to progress together and challenging everyone. Highly recommend to anyone looking for a fun and exciting way to get fit and learn a new skill. - Sifu Paul's classes are fun and lively. The content is accessible from improving fitness to developing a technique and applying it to a given situation. There's also an element of fun and laughter within classes. Time spent with Sifu is always looked forward to.	Lewisham Retail Park has an existing approved planning application.	No change.
	3	LCA SA 08	To "re-develop" Lewisham Retail Park, Loampit Vale would mean the absolute destruction of two community spaces which have actually helped Lewisham thrive and grow as a community and bring its residents together, especially in a time of global uncertainty. While the pandemic has	Lewisham Retail Park has an existing approved planning application.	No change.

			brought its challenges to everyone, I fear that Lewisham Retail Park, Loampit Vale is vulnerable to being "re-developed" and completely compromising this vision and values that the Local Plan is proposing.		
	3 -	LCA SA 08 General	SET Lewisham, in particular, where I am an artist and share a studio space, has completely transformed in the two years I have been there. As artists and a community in South East London, we are resourceful, creative and have been able to meaningfully use this space to create independent artist studios, where was nothing. Part of the wider SET network of studios across London with a membership of over 500 individuals, SET Lewisham has been a cultural hub for young and emerging artists, especially individuals finishing degrees in fine art, design and film at some of the most prestigious universities in the U.K. and internationally including Central Saint Martins, the Royal Academy of Arts, the Royal College of Art, and Goldsmiths, University of London. It has become a safe space to think, make, create, and exchange ideas. SET Lewisham has always been welcoming and inclusive of all individuals and backgrounds, especially from the LGBTQ+ community, people of colour, and low income households, and consistently provides a high quality and affordable studio space to ensure its inclusivity. The ability to have an affordable studio space is especially important for younger individuals who are struggling with money and being able to afford an artist studio and somewhere to live. I am fortunate to have been able to afford and use a studio for the past two years and I can see with such clarity how invaluable the SET Lewisham space has been for myself and the fellow artists who have a studio here, not just to make work, but a place to safely keep their work overnight, grow and develop ideas and their professional practice. The building is ideal for various artistic practices because it has lots of natural light, hardwood floors, and high ceilings, primarily based on ground level for easy access and transport; these features are truly incredible and impossible to find in London. There is also a regular team of cleaners who ensure it is looked after and maintained. It is also very useful and convenient that SET Lewisham is within 20-30 minutes of walking or bicycling from home for most artists and has subsequently connected the artists and studio more closely to the local businesses and community of Lewisham. As part of the building, there is a project space which has also been fruitful for artists to make new and ambitious work, as well as present free exhibitions of contemporary art, injecting new energy and vitality into the community of Lewisham and individuals from the art community, who can easily access the space within 15 minutes of public transport. This project space has also become increasingly collaborative and interdisciplinary, hosting performance	Lewisham Retail Park has an existing approved planning application. The Local Plan does however seek to protect cultural, community and employment uses within the borough and we will work with the developer to understand how this space can be relocated. The Councils Economic Development department also play a role in looking for suitable alternative space and we will pass on your comments.	No change.

			art, dance, music, screenings, poetry readings, creative and educational workshops, a guest curated residency programme and other free, live events for the community of Lewisham and aligned with Lewisham's greater vision as it prepares to host the London Borough of Culture 2022. There is a constant fear among artists in metropolitan cities such as London that their studio building will close down only after a few years or even months after opening and made into residential housing or mixed use. This fear not only inhibits the creative spirit but diminishes the capacity for an individual to authentically pursue a creative practice and professional career.		
	3	LCA SA 08	The reality is this fear is true and the proposed Local Plan is a stark reminder and call to action that spaces like SET Lewisham, despite how obviously valuable they are to the community of Lewisham and the greater art community, are vulnerable and can not be taken for granted; we must secure this space and work our hardest as a community to ensure it is not destroyed and lost forever.	Lewisham Retail Park has an existing approved planning application. The Local Plan does however seek to protect cultural, community and employment uses within the borough and we will work with the developer to understand how this space can be relocated. The Councils Economic Development department also play a role in looking for suitable alternative space and we will pass on your comments.	No change.
	3	LCA SA 08	I am writing to you to express my concerns about the redevelopment of Lewisham Retail Park, Loampit Vale into a mixed use residential and commercial area.	Lewisham Retail park has an existing approved planning application.	No change.
	3 -	LCA SA 08 General	In addition to two major retailers, Sports Direct and Matalan currently onsite, Lewisham Retail Park Loampit Vale is also the home of SET Lewisham, a community artist-led studio and project space, and Lewisham Wing Chun, a full time self defence school for adults and children, part of the WCUK organisation led by Sifu Paul Thompson. Both spaces – SET Lewisham and Lewisham Wing Chun – have significantly benefited the community, cultural values and well-being of Lewisham and its residents since they started at this former Mothercare retail space spanning 12,000 sq ft in January 2019.	Lewisham Retail Park has an existing approved planning application. The Local Plan does however seek to protect cultural, community and employment uses within the borough and we will work with the developer to understand how this space can be relocated. The Councils Economic Development department also play a role in looking for suitable alternative space and we will pass on your comments.	No change.
	3	LCA SA 08	To "re-develop" Lewisham Retail Park, Loampit Vale, would mean the absolute destruction of two community spaces which have actually helped Lewisham thrive and grow as a community and bring its residents together, especially in a time of global uncertainty. While the pandemic has brought its challenges to everyone, I fear that Lewisham Retail Park, Loampit Vale is vulnerable to being "re-developed" and completely compromising this vision and values that the Local Plan is proposing.	Lewisham Retail Park has an existing approved planning application. The Local Plan does however seek to protect cultural, community and employment uses within the borough and we will work with the developer to understand how this space can be relocated. The Councils Economic Development department also play a role in looking for suitable alternative space and we will pass on your comments.	No change
	3 -	LCA SA 08 General	SET Lewisham, in particular, where I am an artist and share a studio space, has completely transformed in the time I have been there. As artists and a community in South East London, we are resourceful, creative and have been able to meaningfully use this space to create independent artist studios, where there was nothing.	Lewisham Retail Park has an existing approved planning application. The Local Plan does however seek to protect cultural, community and employment uses within the borough	No change.

			Part of the wider SET network of studios across London with a membership of over 500 individuals, SET Lewisham has been a cultural hub for young and emerging artists, especially individuals finishing degrees in fine art, design, fashion and film at some of the most prestigious universities in the U.K. and internationally including Central Saint Martins, the Royal Academy of Arts, the Royal College of Art, Goldsmiths, University of London and the Ruskin School of Art, Oxford University. It has become a safe space to think, make, create, and exchange ideas. SET Lewisham has always been welcoming and inclusive of all individuals and backgrounds, especially from the LGBTQ+ community, people of colour, and low income households, and consistently provides a high quality and affordable studio space to ensure its inclusivity. The ability to have an affordable studio space is especially important for younger individuals who are struggling with money and being able to afford an artist studio and somewhere to live. I am fortunate to have been able to afford and use a studio at SET for the past year and I can see with such clarity how invaluable the SET Lewisham space has been for myself and the fellow artists who have a studio here, not just to make work, but a place to grow and develop ideas and their professional practice. The building is ideal for various artistic practices because it has lots of natural light, hardwood floors, and high ceilings, primarily based on ground level for easy access and transport; these features are truly incredible and impossible to find in London. There is also a regular team of cleaners who ensure it is looked after and maintained. It is also very useful and convenient that SET Lewisham is within 20-30 minutes of walking or bicycling from home for most artists and has subsequently connected the artists and studio more closely to the local businesses and community of Lewisham. As part of the building, there is a project space which has also been fruitful for artists to make new and ambitious work, as well as present free exhibitions of contemporary art, injecting new energy and vitality into the community of Lewisham and individuals from the art community, who can easily access the space within 15 minutes of public transport. This project space has also become increasingly collaborative and interdisciplinary, hosting performance art, dance, music, screenings, poetry readings, creative and educational workshops, a guest curated residency programme and other free, live events for the community of Lewisham and aligned with Lewisham's greater vision as it prepares to host the London Borough of Culture 2022. There is a constant fear among artists in metropolitan cities such as London that their studio building will close down only after a few years or even months after opening and made into residential housing or mixed use. This fear not only inhibits the creative spirit but diminishes the	and we will work with the developer to understand how this space can be relocated. The Councils Economic Development department also play a role in looking for suitable alternative space and we will pass on your comments.	

			capacity for an individual to authentically pursue a creative practice and professional career.		
	3	LCA SA 08	The reality is this fear is true and the proposed Local Plan is a stark reminder that spaces like SET Lewisham, despite how obviously valuable they are to the community of Lewisham and the greater art community, are vulnerable and cannot be taken for granted. I feel passionately that we must secure this space and work our hardest as a community to ensure it is not destroyed and lost forever.	Lewisham Retail Park has an existing approved planning application. The Local Plan does however seek to protect cultural, community and employment uses within the borough and we will work with the developer to understand how this space can be relocated. The Councils Economic Development department also play a role in looking for suitable alternative space and we will pass on your comments.	No change.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LCA SA 08 LCA SA 09	**Lewisham Retail Park, Loampit Vale & Land at Loampit Vale/Thurston Road (CarpetRight);** Both sites need to recognise the council transport strategy to deliver the Healthy Streets corridor between Lewisham and Deptford, (either along Jerrard Street once converted to two operation or along Thurston Road) in making sure any development does not result in a reduction in existing footway, cycle lane or carriageway space. This should be detailed in the development requirements as part of the public realm strategy for this site, station redevelopment and connectivity to Lewisham Town Centre.	Agree that Healthy Streets should be acknowledged in relation to Lewisham Retail Park. Development at the Carpetright site has now been completed.	Lewisham Retail Park site allocation amended by refering to Healthy Streets corridor and no reduction of footway and carriageway. Land at Loampit Vale and Thurston Road (Carpetright) site allocation has been removed from the Plan
TIDE CONSTRUCTION LTD	3	LCA SA 09	**Site Allocation 9 Land at Loampit Vale and Thurston Road (Carpetright)** The table on page 515, and the 'existing planning consent' referred to on page 516 require updating to reflect the most recent planning consent on the site. Tide secured outline planning permission (ref. DC19/110610) on 18 October 2019 for the following: *The demolition of the existing building and the construction of two buildings of 20 storeys and 35 storeys in height plus basement comprising: 838.2 sqm non-residential floorspace, comprising (A1) Shops, (A2) Financial & Professional Services, (A3) Restaurants & Cafes, (B1) Business, (D1) Non-residential Institutions and (D2) Assembly & Leisure uses; 67 (C3) self-contained housing units with private and communal amenity space; 758 (Sui Generis) student housing bedspaces with communal amenity space; associated ancillary space, including refuse stores and cycle parking; and landscaping and public realm works.* The table refers to the previous planning permission which was granted on the site in February 2018 prior to Tide purchasing the site, but was not implemented. The indicative development capacity therefore needs to be updated to reflect the most recent planning consent. The development is due to be delivered by Tide by Summer 2021, prior to the start of academic year 2021/22. We suggest that following details in the site allocation are amended for accuracy, to reflect the planning consent	Agreed. Development at the Carpetright site has now been completed.	Land at Loampit Vale and Thurston Road (Carpetright) site allocation has been removed from the Plan

			which has been implemented on the site (ref. DC19/110610): • Planning status This should be updated to state that full application DC/17/102049 was originally granted in February 2018 and a subsequent full application DC19/110610 was granted in October 2019 and has now been implemented. • Timeframe for delivery The timeframe for delivery should state that the site is coming forward in the period 2020/21 – 2024/25. • Indicative development capacity This should be updated to state 319 net residential units (67 residential units and 758 student bed spaces which are equivalent to 252 residential units). • Existing planning consent This should be substituted to refer to planning permission DC19/110610.		
Quaggy Waterway Action Group	3	LCA SA 10	**Silver Road and Axion House - River Ravensbourne** Page 518-519 Site allocation 14.54 Employment-led mixed-use redevelopment comprising compatible commercial and residential uses. Public realm enhancements including **public access and landscaping along the River Ravensbourne.** Opportunities 14.55 The site comprises non-designated employment land located within a predominantly residential area in Lewisham major centre, next to the River Ravensbourne. There are several older commercial units on the site, including a large two-storey warehouse building. Redevelopment and site intensification, along with the introduction of a wider range of uses, will provide a more optimal use of land to support the long-term vitality and viability of the town centre, including provision of modern workspace. **Redevelopment will also enable public realm enhancements that maximise the amenity provided by the River Ravensbourne**. 14.56 Development requirements • The maximum viable amount of employment floorspace must be re-provided, in line with Policy EC7 (Non-designated employment sites). • Delivery of new and improved public realm in accordance with a site-wide public realm strategy, **including public access to and landscaping along the river**. 14.57 Development guidelines • **Development should respond positively to the River Ravensbourne and be designed to enhance its amenity value, with walking connections and views through the site to the river, and landscaped public realm alongside it.** • Development should maximise employment floorspace provision, including through reconfiguration of the existing buildings and spaces, and **improve the overall**	The developer, encouraged by the Council did look at extensive options to improve the interface with the river. Unfortunately the options were not supported by the Environment Agency and could not be persued.	No change.

			environmental quality of the site. Proposals will be required to justify any net loss of the existing non-designated employment floorspace. • An element of affordable workspace should be delivered on-site. • The site is situated within a predominantly residential area and consideration will need to be given to the amenity of neighbouring and surrounding properties, including for daylight and sunlight. **QWAG Comments:** This is a **major missed opportunity** based on landscaping and public access but without any restoration of the river to address ecological improvement. That would be another example of the only opportunity to carry out river restoration when significant development occurs being squandered. The Local Plan should be clearer about how quality river restoration will be a pre-requite, not an optional extra.		
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LCA SA 11	**PLACE/Ladywell (Former Ladywell Leisure Centre);**This site needs to recognise the council transport strategy to deliver the A21 Healthy Streets corridor in making sure any development does not result in a reduction in existing footway or carriageway space. This should be detailed in the development requirements as part of the public realm strategy.	Agreed	PLACE/Ladywell site allocation amended by referencing the A21 Healthy Streets corridor and no reduction in footway or carriageway.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LCA SA 13	**Driving Test Centre, Nightingale Grove;** This site needs to recognise the council transport strategy to deliver Healthy Neighbourhoods in order to enable more people to choose to walk and/or cycle. Any development on site should not result in a reduction in existing footway or carriageway space and should seek to reduce overall motor traffic volumes in the area. This should be detailed in the development requirements as part of the public realm strategy and appropriate CIL contributions should be made by developers to facilitate this.	Agreed but there is no need to reference CIL contributions in this site allocation as it is dealt with in part 4 of the plan. The Plan should be read as a whole.	Driving Test Centre site allocation amended by referencing no reduction in footway or carriageway.
Lewisham Liberal Democrats	3	LCA SA 14	• From a conversation with the owner of the MOT garage at **35 Nightingale Grove**/**Maythorne cottages** it was discovered that he is unaware that Lewisham Local plan's site allocation affects his business. Does the Council not personally inform local business owners of relevant plans, however long term they may be? It is regrettable that they are ignorant of consultations taking place.	The Regulation 18 consultation was carried out in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. To raise awareness about the consultation, the council wrote to all landowners of site allocations (identifying owners through planning records and Land Registry searches) and put up site notices around proposed site allocations. This was in addition to other promotional activity.	No change.
Hither Green West Campaign Group	3	LCA SA 14	The relative lack of leisure, cultural and community facilities or employment spaces in Hither Green West mean residents often have to travel (linked to Transport section below). The area immediately adjacent to main west-side entrance to Hither Green Train Station (Maythorne Cottages and Nightingale Grove) is a prime development location. Its value is wasted by low rise, low intensity, low quality buildings and an industrial yard. New leisure, cultural, community and visitor venues can be developed at this prime location on the west side. The west entrance to the station should include a new public plaza and a wider, more attractive pedestrian railway underpass to balance the sense of arrival at each side of	The Local Plan is underpinned by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out the necessary infrastructure to support future growth. We have worked with our infrastructure providers both internal and external to understand the requirement. The draft Local Plan includes several site allocations for Hither Green west of the station (around Maythorne Cottages) and sets out objectives to improve the station approach. Hither Green Lane will be re-designated as a Local Centre and it is hoped that this can support its long-	Hither Green Lane re-designated as a new local centre.

			the station. The development of the Library Resource Centre (near to the station, on Hither Green Lane) and the low-rise industrial buildings to its rear on Duncrievie Road could present a further opportunity to develop a cultural and leisure 'quarter' and community facilities here.	term vitality and viability, with support for a wide range of business, community and cultural uses.	
	3	LCA SA 18	Proposed redevelopment of 134 Bromley Road SE6 2QU Having recently been informed of the Lewisham Council's proposal to redevelop the above stated site, I would like to register my rejection to the proposal for the following reasons:- 1. There are already far too many flats in the Lewisham / Catford area. 2. People will eventually require to be re-housed out of flats and into houses to raise families. 3. Flats encourage anonymity and as well as the residents, usually renters, not having as much pride in the upkeep of their dwelling and surrounding area. This is evidenced by social history. 4. Flat owners/ renters are there usually for a given period of time and then move on elsewhere, and therefore are not inclined to set roots in the area and wish to maintain the area as best as could be. 5. There has been much flat construction, and still is ongoing, along the A21 route stretching from Bromley through to Lewisham centre and Loampit Hill. This has caused great concentration of residents along that route. I can understand the benefit to the council of allowing flats to be built as this raises a lot of additional income in the form of Council tax from a given land area, but does little if nothing to increase the quality of life for the residents.	Noted. The allocation of this site has been informed by the London Plan, which directs boroughs to take opportunities enable the redevelopment of out-of-centre retail parks. The Council considers a more optimal use of land could be made at the site, particularly to meet acute needs for housing in the Borough and support the vitality and viability of Lewisham's network of town centres. The London Plan sets a challenging housing target for Lewisham, which the Local Plan must deliver on. The location is considered appropriate for sensitively integrated and higher density development, which is likely to include flats. The site allocation sets out land use principles and development guidelines to help ensure that any future proposal responds positively to the local context.	No change.
	3	LCA SA 18	Lewisham Central Area Re No 18 - Ravensbourne Retail park. It would be fantastic to have access to the waterways behind this site and to be able to walk along it for its entirety. However, much more needs to be done to improve pedestrian access to this retail site. Also to improve the A21 junction at this site which was made worse a few years ago by removing the pedestrian island to cater for large lorries.	Noted. The site allocation makes clear that development proposals will need to deliver public realm enhancements to improve the amenity of and access to the river, along with public realm enhancements along the A21 and other site access points, particularly for walking and cycling.	Ravensbourne Retail Park site allocation amended to reference the River Corridor Improvement Plan SPD.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LCA SA 18	**Ravensbourne Retail Park;** This site needs to recognise the council transport strategy to deliver the A21 Healthy Streets corridor in making sure any development does not result in a reduction in existing footway or carriageway space. This should be detailed in the development requirements as part of the public realm strategy.	Agreed.	Ravensbourne Retail Park site allocation amended to reference the A21 Healthy Streets corridor and no reduction in footway or carriageway.
Quaggy Waterway Action Group	3	LCA SA 18	**Ravensbourne Retail park** Pages 535-537 Site allocation 14.92 Comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment of existing out-of-centre retail park comprising compatible residential, main town centre and commercial uses. Public	Comments are noted. The development requirements already mentions the ecological and amenity value of the river.	Ravensbourne Retail Park site allocation amended by referencing the differing roles of the River Corridor improvement Plan

			realm and environmental enhancements including new public open space and river restoration. Opportunities 14.93 The site is located on Bromley Road which forms part of the A21 corridor. It is currently occupied by an out-of-centre retail park consisting of large format retail buildings and car parking. The River Ravenbourne runs along the site's western boundary. Comprehensive redevelopment and site intensification, along with the introduction of a wider range of uses, will provide a more optimal use of land. Rationalising of the retail offer will support the long-term vitality and viability of Catford major town centre, which is located nearby. Re-development will also enable public realm enhancements, including river restoration works and improved access to the River Ravensbourne. 14.94 Development requirements • Development proposals must be delivered in accordance with the A21 Corridor Intensification and Development SPD. • The site must be re-integrated with the surrounding street network to improve access and permeability into and through the site. This will require a hierarchy of routes with clearly articulated east-west and north-south corridors, with direct walking and cycle access to a riverside amenity space. • Positive frontages along Bromley Road and Aitken Road. **• Development must be designed to improve the ecological quality and amenity value of the River Ravensbourne.** • Delivery of new and improved public realm in accordance with a site-wide public realm strategy, including: **• Provision of new public open and/or green space must be integrated into the site, linking to Aitken Road.** **• Public open space along the river** **• Public realm enhancements along Bromley Road to improve the walking and cycle environment.** 14.95 Development guidelines • Development should clearly define the edge of the A21 corridor with a well-integrated building line, including by extending the established building line to the north. • A positive frontage should be established along the south side of Aitken Road to create a 'two sided' street which relates sympathetically to the properties to the north. • Development should be designed so that primary vehicular access is from the A21 and Aitken Road. Opportunities should be explored to align the street network with Barmeston Road to create a contiguous layout, where this would help to improve circulation and not adversely impact on local amenity. • Taller buildings that help with way finding along the A21 corridor may be acceptable, with development stepping up from Bromley Road. Taller elements should be positioned towards the centre of the site to manage and mitigate impacts on amenity, including overshadowing, on the surrounding residential areas.		

			• Part of the site falls within the Culverley Green Conservation Area, which development must respond positively to. • Buffers between the adjoining employment sites will need to be introduced, and where they are existing, enhanced. **These should include elements of green infrastructure wherever feasible.** • Commercial uses that are compatible with existing and new residential properties will be supported in principle. All such provision should complement existing uses at the Bromley Road SIL to reinforce the local node of employment generating activity. • Where main town centre uses are incorporated these should not adversely impact on the town centre network. Development will be expected to achieve a significant reduction in the current amount of retail floorspace, with replacement retail provision focussed on servicing the site and its immediate surrounds. **QWAG Comments:** Improving the ecological quality and amenity value of the River Ravensbourne should be a requirement as stated, not a guideline. It is notable that the reference to the A21 study underplay the important opportunity to refashion the culverted river to play a full role in ecological function, carbon storage, reduced flood risk, improved public amenity, health and other objectives. The next version of the Local Plan should reflect that full potential.		
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LCA SA 20	**Plassy Road Island;** This site needs to recognise the council transport strategy to deliver Healthy Neighbourhoods in order to enable more people to choose to walk and/or cycle. Any development on site should not result in a reduction in existing footway or carriageway space and should seek to reduce overall motor traffic volumes in the area and enable people to choose to walk and cycle between Sangley Road, the Corbett Estate and Catford Town Centre. This should be detailed in the development requirements as part of the public realm strategy and appropriate CIL contributions should be made by developers to facilitate this.	Agreed	Catford Island site allocation amended by referencing the A21 Healthy Streets corridor, improving active travel modes and no reduction in footway and carriageway.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LCA SA 21	**Laurence House and Civic Centre;** This site needs to recognise the council transport strategy to deliver the A21 Healthy Streets corridor and also East West links along A205 Catford Road in making sure any development does not result in a reduction in existing footway or carriageway space. This should be detailed in the development requirements as part of the public realm strategy.	Agreed	Laurence House and Civic Centre sie allocation amended by referencing the A21 Healthy Streets corridor and no reduction in footway and carriageway.
Theatres Trust	3	LCA SA 21	Site Allocation 12: Laurence House and Civic Centre This site allocation seeks retention and enhancement of the Albany, which is welcomed. It also includes new residential use. In principle this could be supported, but there is a need to protect the theatre (and ensure suitable living conditions for occupants) by protecting from future conflict with new residents. We recommend the addition of text highlighting the need to consider the Agent of Change principle. This includes for the theatre's access and servicing needs which may be the bigger risk; it can be	Agreed.	Laurence House and Civic Centre site allocation amended to include reference to the agent of change.

			necessary to transfer equipment and sets in and out of theatres and other performance venues at night and early in the morning due to the requirements of touring shows.		
Theatres Trust	3	LCA SA 21	Site Allocation 21: Laurence House and Civic Centre This site allocation includes the Broadway Theatre. Although there is no suggestion the theatre is at threat and indeed other policies within the plan protect such uses, we would recommend revision of the second bullet point of paragraph 14.107 to make this clear and state: "Provision of a mix of main town centre uses, incorporating civic and cultural uses and retain the Broadway Theatre as a performance facility." Additionally, as per our comments for Site Allocation 12, we suggest there is merit in referencing the Agent of Change principle to protect the operations of the theatre.	Agreed.	Laurence House and Civic Centre site allocation amended by preserving or enhancing the threatre as a performance facility and referring to the agent of change principle.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LCA SA 22	**Wickes and Halfords, Catford Road;** This site needs to recognise the council transport strategy to deliver the Greenwich to Kent House Cycleway (along the Waterlink way), detailed in the Transport for London Cycling Action Plan , in making sure any development does not result in a reduction in existing footway or shared path space. This should be detailed in the development requirements as part of the public realm strategy for this site, making clear that walking and cycling routes should be clear, direct and wide enough to meet future demands. We refer the council to our Consultation response to the Catford Town Centre Framework.	Agreed	Wickes and Halfords site allocation amended by referencing the Greenwich to Kent House Cycleway and no reduction is footway or carriageway.
Quaggy Waterway Action Group	3	LCA SA 22	**Catford Road, Wickes – Halfords site** Pages 546-7: Opportunities 14.110 Redevelopment will also enable public realm and environmental improvements to be delivered, with key opportunities to **reinstate the River Ravensbourne**. 14.111 Development requirements (include): - Provision of **new public open or green space around the River Ravensbourne, linking to Stansted Road**. - Development proposals must **conserve and seek to enhance green infrastructure**. **QWAG Comments:** There should be a proper assessment of the ecological potential to restore the river and surrounding land rather than viewing this as yet another place to put in bland amenity planting and space of little or no ecological value. QWAG has raised this with Team Catford for some time, but it remains unclear how this has been addressed because artists' impressions of bland green space continue to be used in public engagement exercises without any sense of how these arise from proper ecological assessments. If ecological assessment has been conducted this would be showing up in the design ideas, plans and public communications by now.	The Local Plan is a high level policy document. The Catford Town Centre Framework provides additional level of detail. As the sites come forward the Council will work with developer to ensure the river is re-instated.	No change.

			Current green infrastructure in the area, such as it is, is of low ecological value but it could be transformed to play a significant role in restoration of conditions for nature including of the river corridor, and for public engagement with their local environment and the health, learning and other benefits this can bring. That would require a very different approach than the kind taken with the Catford Green development where it has taken two or more years to get even basic, low biodiversity planting in place and where the minimum has been done to boost nature and to engage the public in what the place would be like. There may also be potential for flood storage and mitigation and both should be explored.		
	3	LCA SA 23	1. Housing: I'd like to register my opposition to the Site Allocation proposal 23: Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi), on page 549 of the Lewisham Local Plan document. Even though I understand this is not a planning application, I am concerned about the precedent that approving the guidelines outlined in the document would set. Bradgate Road is predominantly a residential street, with 2-storey Victorian houses. I live at number 3, and along with my neighbours at that end of Bradgate Road, would be severely impacted by a high rise being built at the Aldi site. Concerns include lack of light caused by a high rise opposite my home, noise and traffic. Above all, allowing for the construction of high rises in and around the Rushey Green area will negatively change the character of the neighbourhood, bringing it closer to what Lewisham has been transformed to since the aggressive construction drive: a soulless, cheap-looking, impersonal and extremely noise area that is seen as a place pass through and not a destination area. The proposal to build flats above a shop (Aldi or otherwise) also doesn't encourage long-term residents and add to the 'this will do' image that Lewisham has developed over the past few years: people will move here for a few years and live in rental accommodation just long enough until they have enough cash to move out to a more desirable area. Instead, what we long-term Catford residents who live in and love the area would like to see is a neighbourhood that attracts people who want, like us, to invest their lives and bring their families to live here, build business and local connections.	Where there has been no advanced pre-application discussions the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. This has taken into account the complexities of the site including the existing residential character surrounding the site. The indicative capacity has also been tested through the A21 Development Framework that has been endorsed by the council. Based on these considerations, the residential units have been amended. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach. Tthe Local Plan acknowledges the potential for this site to accommodate higher density development given the site's high Public Transport Access Level, location within a major centre and London Plan Opportunity Area. Following the Regulation 18 public consultation, additional work will be undertaken on the Lewisham Tall Buildings Study which will inform amendments to the Part 2 Policy QD4 Building Heights. Part 2 of the Local Plan on High Quality Design includes policies to ensure the protection and management of amenity. The site allocation must be read in conjunction with these polices.	Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi) site allocation amended to remove reference to Rosenthal House as a wayfinding precedent and to make reference to protecting the amenity of surrounding properties. Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi) site allocation amended by reducing residential to 88 units.
	3	LCA SA 23	3. Green infrastructure: very worried about how many sites have been earmarked for new housing in detriment of green spaces. referring to point 1 of my email, what about converting the Aldi site into green space (a square, community gardens, allotments)? The housing stock	The Local Plan must be demonstrably deliverable. The land is privately owned and unlikely to come forward exclusively for green space. However, new major development would need to provide on-site greening	No change.

			around the south circular is a health hazard for residents who have no option but living there. In addition to your well thought pedestrian and cycling plans, what about increasing green spaces and reducing traffic around that area?	measures and make adequate provision for amenity space and public realm. The Local Plan supports the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and public transport. This will also help to address local issues of poor air quality. The Local Plan sets out details around how this will be delivered in Catford major centre.	
	3	LCA SA 23	Proposed Development at SE6 4JD: I am writing to you to voice my disgust for the development of 119 residential units in what currently is Aldi's car park in Catford. I have lived on Bradgate Road for over 16 years, the area has become congested with shops closing late and a huge increase of vehicles both cars and large goods lorries. The Lewisham Borough is overpopulated already and what used to be a quiet residential street has become a racing car cut through which has increased my daughter's Asthma immensely. I see arguments and physical fights on this road on a weekly basis, my car has been scratched 6 times in the last year from cars squeezing past because they can't be bothered to wait. And now Lewisham Council wants to build 119 flats! Why does Lewisham council have no regard for Lewisham residents and are only interested in making money. The impact of this proposal seems absolutely crazy, I am forced to pay £130 residential parking permit fee of which I can't even park outside my home and now you want to increase traffic by building on a car park that is 100% occupied throughout the day for the Aldi customers. So where does Lewisham council expect people to park? Not only will it increase fuel emissions but will heightened the tension of road users on Bradgate Road. I am deeply hurt by the disregard of Lewisham Council and the fact that nearby residents have not been informed sooner of this proposal. I await your response!	Noted. The Local Plan supports the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and public transport. This will also help to address local issues of poor air quality. Given the site's high Public Transport Access Level (PTAL), it would be expected that development of the site is 'car-free' or 'car-lite' in line with the London Plan parking standards. Local Plan Policy TR5 (Deliveries, servicing and construction) provides that any future development proposal would need to be informed by a satisfactory Delivery and Servicing Plan and/or Construction and Logistics Plan for the commercial and residential elements. Where there has been no advanced pre-application discussions the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. This has taken into account the complexities of the site including the existing residential character surrounding the site. The indicative capacity has also been tested through the A21 Development Framework that has been endorsed by the council. Based on these considerations, the residential units have been amended. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach. The Local Plan acknowledges the potential for this site to accommodate higher density development given the site's high Public Transport Access Level, location within a major centre and London Plan Opportunity Area. The public consultation has been carried out in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.	Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi) site allocation amended by reducing residential to 88 units.

	3	LCA SA 23	I'm writing to make my concerns on the specifics of the "Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi)" site allocation. As a local resident at 13 Bradgate Road, myself and other local residents are directly affected by any such development on the site. 1. Scale and heights I am concerned about the allocation allowing for 119 residential units (I understand is from a calculated formula) based on the size of the whole area of ~ 0.5hectares. If there is a continuation of a supermarket (e.g. Aldi) at the base of a new development, and with a continuation of accompanying car-parking and space for the supermarket customers, I can only envisage that the 119 units could be accommodated vertically above the supermarket? It would be more useful to an average person like myself, to know specifically what the Site Allocation allows in terms on planning applications e.g. an approx. tower of 8, 12, 20 stories? Given your experience of recent local tower block buildings, please can you provide indicative numbers of building scales, sizes and heights? It would be very helpful as a local resident to know, rather than waiting until planning applications come in, as I'm sure you will have a good example either to send me; or use as an indication of possible proposals for scales and heights. Thank you for that. 2. Perspective, overlooking, shadowing Given a lack of clarity above, it is difficult to ascertain the impact of any overlooking or shadowing, but any such development would have a major impact on local Bradgate Road residents. Can you give assurances that there will no negative impact from overlooking and shadows cast from any new development? 3. Precedent concerns I am concerned by the passage on page 550 "Rosenthal House, opposite on the eastern side of Rushey Green, establishes a wayfinding precedent at this end of the town centre, which this site may work in conjunction with to enhance townscape and legibility" Can you explain more by what is meant by this sentence and by "wayfinding precedent" in particular? If I've understood correctly, I think the current Aldi supermarket is already a wayfinding precedent in some respects; but I think this passage points to an assumption of a tower block on the scale of Rosenthal House; and as such reveals what would already be an acceptable proposal to be granted planning permission. I think this is of real concern, that the document indicates the sort of planning applications that would be expected for the allocated site. Can you confirm what is meant by the term wayfinding precedent, and if you can allay my fears of an equal or greater tower to face Rosenthal House on the opposite side? 4. Traffic	Where there has been no advanced pre-application discussions the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. This has taken into account the complexities of the site including the existing residential character surrounding the site. The indicative capacity has also been tested through the A21 Development Framework that has been endorsed by the council. Based on these considerations, the residential units have been amended. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach. The Local Plan acknowledges the potential for this site to accommodate higher density development given the site's high Public Transport Access Level, location within a major centre and London Plan Opportunity Area. Following the Regulation 18 public consultation, additional work will be undertaken on the Lewisham Tall Buildings Study which will inform amendments to the Part 2 Policy QD4 Building Heights. It is agreed that reference to Rosenthal House as a wayfinding precedent should be removed. Part 2 of the Local Plan on High Quality Design includes policies to ensure the protection and management of amenity. The site allocation must be read in conjunction with these polices. The Local Plan supports the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and public transport. This will also help to address local issues of poor air quality. Given the site's high Public Transport Access Level (PTAL), it would be expected that development of the site is 'car-free' or 'car-lite' in line with the London Plan parking standards. Local Plan Policy TR5 (Deliveries, servicing and construction) provides that any future development proposal would need to be informed by a satisfactory Delivery and Servicing Plan and/or Construction and Logistics Plan for the commercial and residential elements.	Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi) site allocation amended to remove reference to Rosenthal House as a wayfinding precedent and to make reference to protecting the amenity of surrounding properties. Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi) site allocation amended by reducing residential to 88 units.

			Another element/concern for 119 units in an already busy residential street is the number of extra cars and predicted road traffic that such a development would bring. As a resident of Bradgate Road for over 7 years, I have witnessed consistent traffic issues on our street, particularly at weekends with the numbers of people accessing the supermarket or parking locally for the supermarket, shops, churches and other local facilities. The stand-offs, confrontations and fighting, with resulting road blockages, and then increased speeds of traffic when access in one direction becomes free - not taking into account the consistent damage and dents to locally parked cars (I estimate my car must have been damaged 10-15 times) - would only become more focussed in the resulting extra traffic. Given that Bradgate Road is essentially housed by quiet respectable local residents, to increase these external factors on our street is a major concern.		
	3	LCA SA 23	Our response to the notional proposal of the current Aldi site being re-purposed with a possible “tower” being built opposite Rosenthal House with one of the reasons being that it is viewed as being a visual marker for Catford town centre is concerning. We live at No 6 Bradgate Road and already have to cope with the ingress and egress of Aldi customers as our house backs on to the car park. We have to tolerate a lot of traffic going up and down the road, rubbish and general disturbance. This impacts on the quality of life and has done for a number of years. It seems because Rosenthal House sits on Rushey Green that the council takes the view that it sets a precedent for a “twin” tower build on the opposite side of the road on top of Aldi for 119 residential units. We do not want to be overlooked by a tower as it will take away our privacy. There is potential for light to be blocked and shade to be cast across residents’ gardens as the sun moves from east to west. The description of where Aldi sits on Rushey Green meeting the Public Realm seems to indicate that it needs to be “opened up”. What does this mean exactly? Is this a way in to build other commercial units or is it where the residents of the 119 units will enter the building and if they have vehicles where will they be parked? With Aldi we have for several years experienced an impact on our quality of life and if there is a tower built above Aldi we believe that our quality of life will be further eroded. This site does not have any further capacity without negatively impacting on the residents who already live here. Amenities are already strained, for example, the Novum NHS surgery. At the moment residential flats are being built across Rushey Green where the DSS offices were near to Tesco Express. This is increasing the density of residents, so to add another 119 units, which presumably will not be 119 individuals but possibly minimum 2 per unit is pushing the amenities even further beyond the limit. The consultation description identifies Bradgate Road as being part of the Catford town centre area there appears	Following the Regulation 18 public consultation, additional work will be undertaken on the Lewisham Tall Buildings Study which will inform amendments to the Part 2 Policy QD4 Building Heights. It is agreed that reference to Rosenthal House as a wayfinding precedent should be removed. Given the site’s high Public Transport Access Level (PTAL), it would be expected that development of the site is ‘car-free’ or ‘car-lite’ in line with the London Plan parking standards. Local Plan Policy TR5 (Deliveries, servicing and construction) provides that any future development proposal would need to be informed by a satisfactory Delivery and Servicing Plan and/or Construction and Logistics Plan for the commercial and residential elements. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has been prepared alongside the Local Plan. This sets out infrastructure required to support the growth planned in the borough. Part 4 of the Local Plan sets out how new development must contribute to securing the delivery of infrastructure. The site is located within the town centre boundary within the adopted Local Plan, and this boundary will be carried forward in the new plan. The site allocation development guidelines state that development proposals must respond to the residential scale and character of properties on Bradgate Road.	Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi) site allocation amended to remove reference to Rosenthal House as a wayfinding precedent and to make reference to protecting the amenity of surrounding properties. Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi) site allocation amended to recognise the established residential area surrounding the site.

			to be no recognition that Bradgate Road and the surrounding roads is an established residential area. The current shopping centre is not adjacent to us but 10 minutes' walk so we reject the notion that Bradgate Road is on the north boundary of the town centre area.		
	3	LCA SA 23	4. I am incredibly concerned about the idea of a high rise building on the site of the Aldi car park, just off Bradgate Road. I simply cannot see how this is possible and why it has even been put forward as a tentative idea as this stage. The current site is the location of a car park that is currently well used by residents of a supermarket. A high rise development in this location would also change the fabric of this area and impact adversely on a densely populated, but low rise area.	Where there has been no advanced pre-application discussions the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. This has taken into account the complexities of the site including the existing residential character surrounding the site. The indicative capacity has also been tested through the A21 Development Framework that has been endorsed by the council. ~~.~~Based on these considerations, the residential units have been amended. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach. The Local Plan acknowledges the potential for this site to accommodate higher density development given the site's high Public Transport Access Level, location within a major centre and London Plan Opportunity Area. Following the Regulation 18 public consultation, additional work will be undertaken on the Lewisham Tall Buildings Study which will inform amendments to the Part 2 Policy QD4 Building Heights. Part 2 of the Local Plan on High Quality Design includes policies to ensure the protection and management of amenity. The site allocation must be read in conjunction with these polices.	Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi) site allocation amended by reducing residential to 88 units.
	3	LCA SA 23	As a resident of Bradgate Road backing onto Catford Aldi, I am deeply concerned about the Lewisham local plan to potentially allow high density housing on the site of Aldi carpark. The would cause a significant, material impact to myself and other residents, due to the concerns below: Loss of Privacy (both bedroom and kitchen face directly onto the site in question) Loss of day light (the site is directly to the south of my kitchen and bedroom). Any 'high rise' development would completely block the natural light. Traffic (Bradgate Road is already a rat run for drivers to avoid the South circular - the building of high density housing immediately to the south would only make this worse.	Noted. Part 2 of the Local Plan on High Quality Design includes policies to ensure the protection and management of amenity. The site allocation must be read in conjunction with these polices. Given the site's high Public Transport Access Level (PTAL), it would be expected that development of the site is 'car-free' or 'car-lite' in line with the London Plan parking standards. Local Plan Policy TR5 (Deliveries, servicing and construction) provides that any future development proposal would need to be informed by a satisfactory Delivery and Servicing Plan and/or Construction and Logistics Plan for the commercial and residential elements. However it is recognised that some	Local Plan amended with additional policy on 'considerate construction' to help protect local amenity.

			Construction disturbance - as the site backs directly onto the gardens of Bradgate Road there will be significant noise and disruption caused by large scale building works.	additional support for the use of the 'consideration construction' scheme could be included in the plan.	
	3	LCA SA 23	I am emailing to formally record my strong objection to the local plan's site allocation for land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road. The potential development of 119 residential units is massively disproportionate to the size of the land available, would be a very high building surrounded by small Victorian terraced houses so completely out of scale to the surrounds, greatly increase traffic along Bradgate Road and put massive strain on local services which are already oversubscribed (for example it is very difficult to get an appointment at the local doctor's surgery Rushey Green Group Practice). This planning documents seem to suggest this is a town centre area - it is not. It is a very residential area and I strongly reject the idea of using Rosendale House which is set back on Rosental Road as a wayfinding template. A high rise development would have a hugely adverse affect on our home in terms of shade, noise, potential for being overlooked (we live at 5 Bradgate Road) as well as on the wider local, residential area. Already having Aldi car park entrance on Bradgate road which is a residential street and the recent closure of surrounding roads to incoming traffic has already had a terrible affect on levels of traffic on Bradgate Road which is used by many, many children and families attending Holbeach School. Litter is another persistent problem which would be likely to increase with this proposal. Any future residential development at the site should be restricted to 2-storey in line with the vast majority of the surrounding residential buildings and clearly residential location. The car entrance to Aldi should be relocated on the main Rushey Green Road, and/or the first section of Bradgate Road should be closed to traffic beyond the car park entrance.	Where there has been no advanced pre-application discussions the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. This has taken into account the complexities of the site including the existing residential character surrounding the site. The indicative capacity has also been tested through the A21 Development Framework that has been endorsed by the council. ~~.~~Based on these considerations, the residential units have been amended. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach. The Local Plan acknowledges the potential for this site to accommodate higher density development given the site's high Public Transport Access Level, location within a major centre and London Plan Opportunity Area. Following the Regulation 18 public consultation, additional work will be undertaken on the Lewisham Tall Buildings Study which will inform amendments to the Part 2 Policy QD4 Building Heights. Part 2 of the Local Plan on High Quality Design includes policies to ensure the protection and management of amenity. The site allocation must be read in conjunction with these polices. Entrance to the site will be assessed through the pre-application process and within the required Transport Assessment when the scheme comes forward.	Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi) site allocation amended by reducing residential to 88 units.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LCA SA 23	**Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi)**; This site needs to recognise the council transport strategy to deliver the A21 Healthy Streets corridor in making sure any development does not result in a reduction in existing footway or carriageway space. This site also needs to recognise the council transport strategy to deliver Healthy Neighbourhoods in order to enable more people to choose to walk and/or cycle. This should be detailed in the development requirements as part of the public realm strategy.	Agreed.	Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi) site allocation amended by referring to the A21 Healthy Streets corridor and no reduction in footway or carriageway.
Wildfell Road Residents Association	3	LCA SA 23	On reviewing your publication, Lewisham Local Plan 'An Open Lewisham as part of an Open London: Regulation 18 stage "Main Issues and Preferred Approaches" document	Where there has been no advanced pre-application discussions the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more	Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi) site allocation amended to refer to the concentration of uses, including for night-time economic activities

			January 2021 our association would like to comment on behalf of our residents. While the great majority of the medium / long term plan for Lewisham has been welcomed positively by our local community there is one particular area of concern in the document mentioned above that has been brought to our attention. This is namely item 23 “Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi)” located on page 547 – 548, LCA, Part 3 of the document. For clarity we have attached a pdf copy to this email. *Officer note: Site allocation LCA Site 23 included as attachment.* Our concerns can be summarised in three points. · The size / capacity of the proposed redevelopment. · Mention of a ‘night-time economy hub’. · The lack of account for properties bordering the site from Wildfell road. <u>Redevelopment capacity</u> While we collectively understand the need to use space more effectively and efficiently across the borough, residents are concerned by the proposed redevelopment of this site. As stated in your document the ‘indicative development capacity’ is recommended to include 119 residential units in addition to 4,100 meters squared of main town centre space. The southerly most section of this site backs onto the gardens of house numbers 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, and 20 on Wildfell road. Residents living in these properties and in the wider immediate area are worried about how redevelopment of this site could affect the outlook from the back of their homes and increase noise pollution in the area. This anxiety is based on the large number of units you propose to allocate to a site of this modest size leading many to assume that any development will need to be multi storey. Currently the land is used as a low level car park so we are asking for your assurances that any further development on this site will be limited so as to not affect the right to privacy or light currently enjoyed at the aforementioned properties in any way. <u>Mention of a ‘night-time economy hub’</u> In the ‘planning designations and site considerations section’ of your document the site is labelled as a ‘night-time economy hub’. Several late night take-away’s, bars, restaurants and other late night businesses already populate the immediate area around Rushey Green. Residents already consider the noise and disruption caused at unsociable hours by these places to be a nuisance. Therefore it is the overwhelming view of residents that there is no need for any additional participants in what is already regarded as a saturated sector. Can you commit to	details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. This has taken into account the complexities of the site including the existing residential character surrounding the site. The indicative capacity has also been tested through the A21 Development Framework that has been endorsed by the council. ~~.~~Based on these considerations, the residential units have been amended. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach. The Local Plan acknowledges the potential for this site to accommodate higher density development given the site’s high Public Transport Access Level, location within a major centre and London Plan Opportunity Area. Following the Regulation 18 public consultation, additional work will be undertaken on the Lewisham Tall Buildings Study which will inform amendments to the Part 2 Policy QD4 Building Heights. Given the site’s high Public Transport Access Level (PTAL), it would be expected that development of the site is ‘car-free’ or ‘car-lite’ in line with the London Plan parking standards. The Local Plan sets out priority locations for night-time economic activities, recognising the role they play in supporting local economy and cultural activities. However, it is recognised that further clarity is required to ensure controls for concentration of certain types of uses and need for protection of amenity. Part 2 of the Local Plan on High Quality Design includes policies to ensure the protection and management of amenity. The site allocation must be read in conjunction with these polices. However it is acknowledged that the Wildfell Road properties should be referred in the development guidelines.	Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi) site allocation amended to refer that development must protect surrounding amenity including the properties on Wildfell Road. Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi) site allocation allocation amended by reducing residential to 88 units.

			controls that will limit noise and operating hours of any new businesses in this proposed development so as to ensure that there is no further disruption to residents? <u>The lack of account for properties bordering the site from Wildfell road.</u> We notice that in your development guidelines that properties located on both Patrol Place and Bradgate Road are taken into account. There is no mention of Wildfell Road which, as mentioned above, also borders the site. Residents on Wildfell Road who might be affected by this development would also like to be taken into account specifically. Many thanks in advance for reading our concerns, we recognise that this is not a planning application but a consultation and look forward to any feedback you can give us. In addition we look forward to working with you in the shared endeavour of making Catford a better place for residents and those who visit.		
	3	LCA SA 23	We wanted to get in touch to highlight some concerns we have regarding the proposed Lewisham Local Plan - specifically the below site allocation in the Central Area: 23 - Land at Rushey Green / Bradgate Rd We are residents of number 1 Bradgate Road, Catford and live directly opposite the site in question and the current entrance to Aldi. Our feedback/concerns with the proposal are as detailed below: 1. Traffic Traffic, parking and air pollution on Bradgate Rd is already a big issue. To implement the plan as suggested, it is assumed a large section of the existing Supermarket car park will be lost, resulting in customers looking for parking opportunities on overly populated residential streets close by. In addition, Bradgate Road and surrounding streets will also need to absorb parking for up to 119 additional car owners. Space for supermarket deliveries to take place within the allocated plot of land should be a consideration. I can testify that they are early, frequent and loud so for quality of life for residents (existing and new) I would flag that these should not occur any closer to residential premises than they already do (1-6 Bradgate Rd to Aldi Load-In Shutters). 2. Precedent of Rosenthal House / High Rise Buildings Rosenthal House as a precedent is concerning for a number of reasons - whilst I appreciate the proposal is not to replicate, this building stands out locally for being high-rise and is run down, dilapidated and an eye sore. I question the quality of the housing for the people who live in this block and the whole site attracts fly tipping and sub-standard community space. If this is being touted as the	Noted. The Local Plan supports the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and public transport. This will also help to address local issues of poor air quality. Local Plan Policy TR5 (Deliveries, servicing and construction) provides that any future development proposal would need to be informed by a satisfactory Delivery and Servicing Plan and/or Construction and Logistics Plan for the commercial and residential elements. This will help to ensure protection of amenity. However it is recognised that some additional support for the use of the 'consideration construction' scheme could be included in the plan. Given the site's high Public Transport Access Level (PTAL), it would be expected that development is 'car-free' or 'car-lite' in line with the London Plan parking standards. Following the Regulation 18 public consultation, additional work will be undertaken on the Lewisham Tall Buildings Study which will inform amendments to the Part 2 policy QD4 Building Heights. It is agreed that reference to Rosenthal House as a wayfinding precedent should be removed. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has been prepared alongside the Local Plan. This sets out infrastructure required to support the growth planned in the borough. Part 4 of the Local Plan sets out how new development must contribute to securing the delivery of infrastructure.	Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi) site allocation amended to remove reference to Rosenthal House as a wayfinding precedent and to make to reference the amenity of surrounding properties. Local Plan amended with additional policy on 'considerate construction' to help protect local amenity

			'welcome and way finding' point as you enter Catford I would hope that funds for development are being prioritised into making this a site for quality housing and establishing a positive commercial/community presence on Rushey Green. Reconfigured, this site could produce a fantastic opportunity for regeneration, producing a greater volume of better quality of housing as you enter Catford. In conjunction, a lower-rise configuration (2-3 storeys) could be considered on the opposite Rushey Green / Bradgate Rd site to compliment this gateway to Catford. I don't feel Rosenthal House's height and location alone justifies a replica on the corner of Bradgate Rd and Rushey Green. 3. Impact of building on site Living so close to the proposed development site raises the obvious personal concerns for us and our neighbours - years of loud, noisy and dusty construction work will inevitably have an impact on our day to day quality of life and the value and desirability of our properties should we wish to move on during the construction period. Personally, we receive very little sunlight in the garden due to office block we sit next to, so we have undergone building work to open up our house to maximise sun from the front of our property. If a high rise block exceeding the height of existing buildings on the street is developed, we will lose light into our home which is of great concern. 4. Additional residents Additional residential units need to be reflected by local amenities and reflect the ever-growing number of people living in that community to make the area an enjoyable and practical place to live. I'm sure this is key in your planning, but since we moved here 5 years ago, we have attended a doctors surgery in Ladywell/Brockley since the Rushey Green Group Practice that backs onto our house is oversubscribed and getting an appointment was challenging to say the least. Additionally, we have applied for a bicycle rack spot in on both Medusa Rd and Brookdale Rd in this past year, as well as applying (as part of the street) for a dedicated Bradgate Rd bike storage unit of which we have heard nothing. With 119 additional homes, this requirement grows again. When the council and local services seem to be struggling with current resident requirements, it's hard to not be concerned about further stretching resources. As much as we support new homes, it has to be in the right areas where residents already feel supported by their councils and quality of life and resources can be maintained for residents old and new. We are supportive of and understand the plans to refocus the entrance to the commercial premises on this land to be Rushey Green facing.		
	3	LCA SA 23	I understand and acknowledge the clear opportunity to intensify this site, and bring much needed housing. I am also very concerned that there isn't a stronger statement and underlying commitment to enforce	Noted. Where there has been no advanced pre-application discussions the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper	Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi) site allocation amended to refer to Policy QD10 and to make reference to protecting the amenity of the surrounding properties.

			proposed policy QD11 Infill and backland sites, back gardens and amenity areas specifically: *"Do not result in harmful overshadowing or overlooking, or otherwise adversely impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, including their rear gardens, or the occupiers of the development, having regard to other Local Plan policies"* There is a poor precedent from 17 Scrooby street in allowing this to occur and more needs to be done to balance the clear opportunity to improve and better utilise the Aldi site, with protecting the amenity and privacy of the existing homes and gardens. This is a really good opportunity to get something right, but could go horribly wrong if mis-handled. There is also a real need to improve traffic flow on Bradgate Road, which is currently dangerous due to two-way aggression and mishaps (everyone has dents in their cars) and used as a rat run to avoid the Catford Town Centre, which will get much worse during any regen and relocation of the south circular. This will bring the illegally bad air quality from the A21 into a deeply residential area, and make it more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclist, especially important given the location of the Holbeach primary school on this road. Children and parents should be able to walk and cycle safely to school every day, free from aggressive speeding drivers and the pollution they bring. I would strongly urge consideration of how to use the Aldi site corner development to not only sensitively create density without infringing on the amenity of existing residents, but also to improve the traffic situation, ideally closing the road to entry from the A21 and making it one way (west only). This could be done by redesigning the access to the Aldi to be direct off the A21 rather than imposing large lorries on what is otherwise a small scale and heritage residential road. There is huge support locally for improving the road safety and pollution levels on Bradgate road and the surrounding area, particularly with reference to the school. This would be a really important opportunity to make an otherwise highly resisted and unpopular development much more acceptable to local people.	Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. This has taken into account the complexities of the site including the existing residential character surrounding the site. The indicative capacity has also been tested through the A21 Development Framework that has been endorsed by the council. ~~,~~Based on these considerations, the residential units have been amended. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach. Road closures are outside the scope of the Local Plan.	Land at Rushey Green and Bradgate Road (Aldi) site allocation amended by reducing residential to 88 units.
	3	LCA SA 24	Proposed Site - House on the Hill - Slaithwaite Rd - SE13 6DL We wish to refer to the Local Planning Application in respect of the above mentioned property at 47 Slaithwaite Road, Lewisham, SE13 6DL. We are local residents and have just been made aware of a proposal to redevelop the above site as part of the Lewisham Local Plan. The scheme does not appear to be	Noted. The public consultation has been carried out in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. The site is in a highly accessible area, within the borough's opportunity area and is suitable for redevelopment.	House on the Hill site allocation amended by increasing residential to 52 units.

			listed on the Authority's official webpages ending – commonplace or local plan consultation – but as displayed on a rather weather beaten single sided A4 sized notice, attached to a lamppost on the pavement at the tradesmen's side of the property. This means that hardly any local residents will be aware of this submission. Covid lockdown will have also prevented a wider discussion. The consultation period mentioned on this single A4 sheet appears to have begun on the 15th January of this year and is stated to end on the 11th April. The document proposes that 36 residential units should be built on this site. We request that the present purpose built centre be retained, refurbished and direct discussions immediately started, with all neighbouring residents, for the future use of the site. Our suggestions for a detailed consultation are based upon the following;- 1. Consideration be given to the present building being used by the local community or perhaps adapted for a national charity/ refugee accommodation. 2. Proposed change to 36 residential units would alter present single storey building, surrounded by trees and garden, into a multi storey concrete infilled site. This will add to population density and impact upon a local environment and associated services, already under stress caused by littering and illegal dumping of household waste. 3. There would be an increase in road traffic up and down Slaithwaite and Lingards Roads, and added pressure in respect of public parking space at the Library car park. This would be in addition to the recent construction of a 127 room Travel Lodge hotel at the Slaithwaite Rd- A21 Lewisham/Catford Rd junction where there is no extra car parking provision. It should be noted that the residents along both Slaithwaite, Lingards, Clarendon Rise and Limes Grove roads have not enjoyed the benefits of a quieter traffic or pollution free life during Covid lockdown, as a result of the recent Council LTN/ GLC traffic reduction policies – all these roads have clear and unhindered access. More residential units in this area of Lewisham will mean added traffic noise and pollution, generated by both private cars and commercial delivery vehicles. 4. Will this project lead to the provision of much needed additional medical, educational and social services? Will the sanctioning of the scheme add to the basket cases of empty unaffordable properties littering this area? Is the redevelopment going to impinge upon stretched utility services in the area? The interrelationship of these questions, and any meaningful answers, come under scrutiny when observing the relentless construction of high rise flats, clustered as empty forbidding megaliths in the town centre, serving as sad monuments to the cult of profit, regardless of a green and spacious low rise environment which could be welcoming to us all.	Where there has been no advanced pre-application discussions the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper. Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. The indicative capacity has been tested through the A21 Development Framework that has been endorsed by the council. Based on these considerations, the residential units have been amended. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach. The development will be car-free or car-lite in accordance with London Plan policies.	
	3	LCA SA 24	Proposed house on the hill at Slaithewaite Road I was very disappointed to see this proposed development. This is already a high density neighbourhood (I live in Limes	Objections noted. However the site is in a highly accessible area, within the borough's opportunity area and is suitable for redevelopment.	House on the Hill site allocation amended by increasing residential to 52 units.

			Grove) and there is a hotel being built at the bottom of Slaithewaite Road. In other areas of policy, Lewisham is trying to reduce traffic to roads like this but both of these development will have the opposite effect and increase traffic and air pollution. There must be alternative uses for the existing building or how about a new public space!!!. This is a fairly quiet area close to the centre of Lewisham. I would prefer to see it stay that way rather than fill up every possible square inch with new building.	Where there has been no advanced pre-application discussions the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper. Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. The indicative capacity has been tested through the A21 Development Framework that has been endorsed by the council. Based on these considerations, the residential units have been amended. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach.	
	3	LCA SA 24	47 Slaithwaite Road I am against the proposal to build 36 residential units on the site of 47 Slaithwaite Road. I do not think it is a suitable use of this space. It would mean the loss of a purpose built institutional building that was planned for community use. It would also change the character and environment of the area which is currently low rise with many mature trees. The additional pressure on parking, and local provision of doctors etc. will have a detrimental impact on quality of people's lives in our community and will see an increase in traffic and pollution. It's really not the right place for such a development, especially given the new hotel being built at the other end of that road. Given lockdown I have only just seen this proposal on the small notice on the nearby lamppost, so I think it might be a good idea if you also extend the consultation period so that the community is given a fair chance at their say about this.	Objections noted. However the site is in a highly accessible area, within the borough's opportunity area and is suitable for redevelopment. Where there has been no advanced pre-application discussions the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper. Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. The indicative capacity has been tested through the A21 Development Framework that has been endorsed by the council. Based on these considerations, the residential units have been amended. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach. The consultation was carried out in accordance with our Statement of Community Involvement.	House on the Hill site allocation amended by increasing residential to 52 units.
	3	LCA SA 24	I am writing regarding the proposed development at No.47, Slaithwaite Road, Lewisham. I understand there is a proposal to develop 36 residential units on the site, which seems poorly considered. This is a purpose built building that is supposed to be for COMMUNITY USE. Something that the area could massively benefit from and now more than ever, this should be an integral part of rebuilding Lewisham. I feel very proud to be a part of lewisham's community and at a time the government is failing to offer the financial support we need to really thrive and reducing funding to the borough, we must protect the few spaces that do matter. There is so much that could be done with the space and if there is a way for me to get involved in doing so, please	Noted. The site is in current use as a residential institution (supported accommodation). The site allocation development requirements make clear that any future development would need to ensure appropriate re-provision of this type of housing, in line with other Local Plan policies.	No change.

			could you advise me how to do so? I currently volunteer for a community garden in Peckham and we have just secured a £10,000 grant from the Mayor of London's Make London fund, which is one of many things that could be done to get this space off the ground too. Aside from destroying a genuine community space, I also don't think due consideration has been given to more practical issues. Parking, access to GPs, schools, increased traffic etc. What price point would said units go on the market at? Would the price align with the average income for the area, making them affordable to locals and young people who wish to remain in the borough and serve it with their skills? I feel that this is being considered purely from a financial perspective and not with the community in mind and hope that you will consider alternatives for what could be a real asset to the community, given the right investment and focus.		
	3	LCA SA 24	HOUSE ON THE HILL SITE PROPOSAL. We are pleased to have an opportunity to comment on the Local Plan for Lewisham, specifically on the proposed site allocation and possible development of the House On The Hill site - 47 Slaithwaite Road. Although we would support more affordable/social housing, most new developments in Lewisham currently **do not** eventually result in delivering this for a variety of reasons. The notice suggests that the site may be used for 36 mixed residential units. What does that mean? Are these all affordable? There is already high density housing in this area, with many apparent unregistered HMO'S, and numerous problems relating to very high air pollution, high levels of traffic and fly-tipping. The objections we have to this space being developed for housing include: 1) **Increased Air Pollution.** The area suffers from a **very high level of toxic air pollution**. This improved significantly when **local residents** campaigned for the gated closure where Clarendon Rise meets Bonfield Road. However, further efforts are required to improve this further, as a combination of inadequate signage and lack of enforcement means traffic still heavily uses the road, in an attempt to access the Lee High Road or find parking space. Introducing new housing to this area will add to this serious air pollution issue. In addition there will soon be a new Travel Lodge and Church at the bottom of the road, both of which have no apparent parking facilities. It is	Any new development for the site would be assessed against our affordable housing policy which seeks a 50% affordable strategic target across all sites. The site is in a highly accessible area, within the borough's opportunity area and is suitable for redevelopment. Where there has been no advanced pre-application discussions the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper. Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. The indicative capacity has been tested through the A21 Development Framework that has been endorsed by the council. ₋Based on these considerations, the residential units have been amended. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach. The development will be car-free or car-lite in accordance with London Plan policies. The Council is preparaing an Air Quality Action Plan for further details please see the Councils website. For further details on the Councils LTN shemes please see the Councils website. Lewisham like all London boroughs is tackling a housing crisis and needs to build more homes. At the	House on the Hill site allocation amended by increasing residential to 52 units.

			predicted that this will bring even more non residential traffic into this area, and exacerbate the traffic pollution issues. This area has a large diverse community. When nine-year-old Ella Kissi-Debrah, from this area of Lewisham, became the first person to have air pollution listed as a cause of death, it sent the stark message that people living in poorer urban. areas and minority groups are especially at risk of the dangers of increased carbon emissions. If **even more** cars and construction work are introduced to this area, this will clearly have a negative impact on air pollution levels. How will the Council monitor and act on any increase in the air pollution levels, or enforce any increased traffic reduction initiatives? Additionally better, clearer, signage is required, particularly on the right hand turning from Lingards Road onto Slaithwaite Road to reduce current levels of non residential traffic which impacts on the air quality of the area. Recent attempts to introduce LTN's in this area (Dermody Road) were very disappointing. Too often the local public support for the measures are overshadowed by a small group of more vocal opponents. It is noticeable in Lewisham that the location of the more child and family friendly parks with better amenities, and LTN's are disproportionately benefitting the wealthier postcodes. Traffic and the consequent pollution have been shifted onto displacement routes with less affluent communities. The inherent unfairness of this is highly divisive. Any possible development of the House on the Hill site should consider that this area is very central, ringed by major highly polluted roads carrying displaced traffic. The area has been sorely neglected in terms of air quality and environmental improvements in recent years. Rather than build on this area can the site be used to plant additional trees, to help improve air quality, as part of the Mayor of London's tree planting scheme? 2) **Need for more Green Space in Central Lewisham.** The House on the Hill has a lot of old and established trees and potentially is a rare green space in this central Lewisham area. Can it not be redeveloped as a community garden, park or allotments e.g. for AFRIL? The Mayor of London is committed to **preserving** and increasing our tree canopy. This site seems ideal to develop into a vibrant green space for local residents, in this highly polluted urban area.	same time we acknowledge the importance of open space and oue green infrastructure. The Local Plan and the policies that underpin our spatial strategy is trying to deal with these two issues. The Local Plan is accompanied by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan – also part of the consultation which sets out the necessary infrastructure such a school places, health care facilities etc to accommodate growth. Any proposal coming forward for planning will be accomopanied by a transport assessment and construction plan to minimise disruption during the construction stage. The consultation was carried out in accordance with our Statement of Community Involvement.	

			Green infrastructure is just as important to Lewisham as its grey infrastructure. Enabling multiple green spaces promotes healthier living, providing spaces for physical activity and improves mental health. Green spaces filter pollutants to improve air and water quality, they facilitate clean, comfortable and more attractive streets and encourage walking and cycling. All very much needed in this area. Every time a new development is proposed in central Lewisham it is accompanied by uplifting architectural pictures of additional green spaces for the residents. These have very rarely materialised. The Gateway development is a prime example of this. Social demand for urban green space is getting stronger, post pandemic, and any opportunity to retain/expand these sites needs to be grasped. 3) **Additional Services Required.** Already there is an inadequate provision of GP, Dentists, School services etc. in central Lewisham. If there is a further increase in residents, are these services set to expand? What actions/interventions are being/will be made to address this? 4) **Building work introducing more noise and pollution.** Construction activities are a large contributor to air pollution. The House on the Hill site is surrounded by housing on all sides, and the residents will be subjected to **even more** pollution than normal! The level of dust and noise generated during land clearance and demolition alone, will have a massive impact on local residents. As we are currently **already experiencing high levels of air pollution in this area from vehicle emissions**, additional pollution caused by building work and plant machinery would undoubtedly have health consequences for all of us living in this area. 5) **Notification of proposed work:** Lastly, the way this proposal was advertised is very concerning. One A4 notice attached to a lamppost is not the most effective way of communicating proposed works to the wider community. Most local people would not see this in the midst of a lockdown! Most residents are currently **unaware** of this proposal and its implications. If the assumption is that communication takes place online, the Council are excluding a lot of local		

			residents from the conversation, and a greater effort to be more inclusive should be made. In summary, we are incredibly disappointed to see the proposal to build housing on the footprint of the House On The Hill. During the pandemic local residents have come to really appreciate local green spaces, and in central Lewisham they are desperately needed to improve our poor air quality. Investing in urban public green spaces brings many health and social benefits. As residents we are already concerned about toxic air, and wonder what is being done about reducing it in this particular area? We hope to be given the opportunity to work with the Council, to shape and attempt to make a positive impact on our environment. Regrettably, at the moment the excessive levels of pollution in this area are already very worrying, and any further building and lack of initiatives to reduce traffic emissions, leave us feeling very anxious about the potentially lethal health impacts on residents. This proposal does not appear to have the best interests of our community in mind.		
	3	LCA SA 24	We would like to raise concerns regarding the inclusion of 47 Slaithwaite road i.e. the "House on the Hill" as a site for residential development. The Lewisham Local Plan suggests that this former community centre currently being used as an overnight respite centre will be developed into 36 residential flats (see pages 551-2 of the Plan). Introduction of 36 new flats will significantly increase the strain on local amenities in the area. At its most basic, issues such as parking and traffic will significantly increase on Slaithwaite and the adjoining roads, as well as broader services such as access to doctor surgeries, transport etc. Some of these amenities are already negatively impacted by the introduction of a new hotel at the end of the road without additional services to support those staying there. Further, the potential loss of the site as a community space including short-term residential stays could negatively impact the provision services for the most vulnerable in the Lewisham community. The Plan notes that development should be in accordance with Policy HO7 Supported Housing, but does not appear to describe how this Policy is met (and apologies if we have missed this detail). For example, it is not clear that the "existing provision is no longer required or that adequate 106 replacement provision will be secured" nor that "the existing facility is not suitable to support the intended occupants in its current condition or is incapable of being maintained at an acceptable modern standard". In our view, a better use of this site, would be to continue its use as a community building (refurbished or redesigned if necessary to accommodate a variety of community	Objection noted. However the site is in a highly accessible area, within the borough's opportunity area and is suitable for redevelopment. Where there has been no advanced pre-application discussions the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper. Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. The indicative capacity has been tested through the A21 Development Framework that has been endorsed by the council. ~~-~~Based on these considerations, the residential units have been amended. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach. The development will be car-free or car-lite in accordance with London Plan policies. The site is in current use as a residential institution (supported accommodation). The site allocation development requirements make clear that any future development would need to ensure appropriate re-provision of this type of housing, in line with other Local Plan policies.	House on the Hill site allocation amended by increasing residential to 52 units.

			purposes) and to continue the provision of short-term stays for vulnerable residents.		
	3	LCA SA 24	**Objection to proposal for House on the Hill 47 Slaithwaite Road** I am emailing you directly as it seems impossible to find the right place to register my objections on your commonplace website. I am extremely concerned at your proposal to develop the above site into "36 residential units" as I do not think this is at all a suitable use of the site. It currently consists of a single storey building surrounded by garden – mature trees, grass and flowers and was previously used as a community resource for disabled and vulnerable children. A community resource like this should not be mindlessly turned into yet more pokey little residential units of which Lewisham is currently overrun. There must be hundreds or possibly a thousand or more of these in the recent and continuing excessively high rise developments in the town centre. The Slaithwaite Road/Clarendon Rise corner is not a suitable place to put more of these inappropriate "units". More housing, especially of this densely packed type, would only lead to higher demand on already overstretched resources – parking and transport, doctors, dentists, schools and the hospital. I cannot imagine you are making any more provision for any of these services in your excessive rush to overdevelop Lewisham. There is already nearing completion a cheap 127-room hotel at the bottom of Slaithwaite Road with no extra parking provision. We do not want 36 more "residential units" at the top end as well. I would propose that a single or at most double storey community facility is a much better use of the site. In any case, you should absolutely not be forcing more change on the residents of the local area (LTN anybody?) without proper consultation of the residents affected, i.e. those in Clarendon Rise, Slaithwaite Road and Limes Grove. Putting up a tiny notice on a tree outside the site does not constitute meaningful consultation (why not a door drop of the area?) and as I said at the top, it's impossible to find the relevant section in your commonplace consultation. Stop trampling on and ignoring residents and do a proper consultation.	The site is in a highly accessible area, within the borough's opportunity area and is suitable for redevelopment. Where there has been no advanced pre-application discussions the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper. Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. The indicative capacity has been tested through the A21 Development Framework that has been endorsed by the council. ~~-~~Based on these considerations, the residential units have been amended. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach. The development will be car-free or car-lite in accordance with London Plan policies. Details on LTNs can be found on the Councils website.	House on the Hill site allocation amended by increasing residential to 52 units.
	3	LCA SA 24	My wife and I live at [redacted] and oppose the proposed development known as House on the Hill. For various reasons, including increased traffic, lack of additional amenities, destruction of community centre that could be repurposed.	Objection noted. However the site is in a highly accessible area, within the borough's opportunity area and is suitable for redevelopment.	No change.
	3	LCA SA24	Petition. 55 signatures The most prevalent comment was that people would prefer it is the existing building was renovated and used	The site is in a highly accessible area, within the borough's opportunity area and is suitable for redevelopment.	House on the Hill site allocation amended by increasing residential to 52 units.

			either in the way it was previously, to provide respite care for vulnerable children, or to provide some other valuable service to the wider community. If the site is turned over for development of 'residential units' then again they would favour some form of sheltered housing/ assisted living facility, but would strongly object to it being sold to private, commercial developers. A further prime concern is over the height and design of any new building and the potential loss of the many trees and shrubs on the site. A multi-storey block would obviously change the nature of, and be out of character with the area. There is a real concern as a result of seeing the many high-rise buildings that have sprung up in central Lewisham and the blocks built in Morley Road and Clipper Way. People also cite the multi-storey monstrosity (Travelodge Hotel) being built at the bottom of the hill as an indicator of what they might fear might happen. Whatever the nature of the development, residents would expect to be formally consulted and their views actually taken into account. The perception, rightly or wrongly, is that Lewisham just 'bulldozes' proposals through without regard for local resident's concerns/ This is one 'small' item in a massive project, but those of us who live here, it is very significant. Additional information found latterly on the Lewisham Local Plan Website (site allocation) indicates there are provisions which seem to meet most of these concerns. Had people even been aware of the proposal and if this information had been more easily accessible, they may not have been quite so concerned. Conducting such a low profile 'consultation' during the lockdown just added insult to injury. One issue which is apparently not addressed is the impact on residents' parking. This is already a concern as a result of the hotel development which has no additional parking provision.	Where there has been no advanced pre-application discussions the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper. Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. The indicative capacity has been tested through the A21 Development Framework that has been endorsed by the council. -Based on these considerations, the residential units have been amended. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach. The development will be car-free or car-lite in accordance with London Plan policies.	
	3	LCA SA 25	Lewisham Central Area No 25 A21 corridor and Industrial Park at Randlesdown Road. Again, it would be wonderful to access the water way. The shop frontages need major improvements as do those along Bromley Road between Daneby and Bellingham Road. Nothing will be improved here unless you address the long running issue of cars driving across the pavements to park outside the shops. Giving priority to pedestrians and encouraging cycling will be to no avail unless this issue is addressed first as a priority. I would like to know what is being done about this issue at the moment.	Noted. The Council is seeking to address concerns raised by the public about the existing poor quality of the public realm and townscape at this site and its wider context through the Local Plan. The Council is supportive of redeveloping the site for non-residential uses, appropriate to its SIL designation. Where new development is proposed, it will need to comply with the Local Plan policies.	Land at Randlesdown Road and Bromley Road site allocation has been removed from the Plan.

Lewisham Cyclists	3	LCA SA 25	**Land at Randlesdown Road and Bromley Road;** This site needs to recognise the council transport strategy to deliver the A21 Healthy Streets corridor in making sure any development does not result in a reduction in existing footway or carriageway space. This should be detailed in the development requirements as part of the public realm strategy.	The Council is supportive of redeveloping the site for non-residential uses, appropriate to its SIL designation. Where new development is proposed, it will need to comply with the Local Plan policies.	Land at Randlesdown Road and Bromley Road site allocation has been removed from the Plan.
	3	LEA	I am not clear on what the 'Strategic Area for Regeneration' means for Grove Park. There appears to be a site allocation but little further information.	The London Plan directs London Boroughs to identify regeneration areas within their Local Plan. A 'Strategic Area for Regeneration' is proposed to be designated in the Lewisham Local Plan – this is a land use designation and not a site allocation. Further information is set out in Policy LEA3 (Strategic Area for Regeneration) and the policy supporting text.	No change.
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	I have read the plans for Lee Green and surrounding area and would like to express my absolute objection to what is being proposed. My reasons are as follows. I totally disagree with the height of the buildings on the plans. Lee agreed is a small community area and should not become dominated by such huge buildings that will Have very densely populated accommodation. They are way too high and it would totally block out the sky line and make the area very overpowered by huge buildings. It totally unsuitable for such a small area. I understand the need for increased b b housing in London, but this has to be balanced with sensible developments that do not impact negatively on people's lives. The proposal stated 450 more housing units. How is the local area going to cope with such an increase? With not enough amenities to meet the needs of all the people who would then be living there. Where are the schools and doctor surgeries that Would be needed to accommodate all these new residents. Increase in through traffic to an already car heavy main road. This would be Unsustainable if you introduce more residence on that scale into the area. There has been no local consultation. People who live here were fully involved Last time when St. Modwen were proposing new buildings for the Lee gate space All local residents must be consulted, I live very close to the proposed site and this Will affect my life hugely.	Noted. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. With regard to the indicative capacity for the Lee Gate site allocation we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. With regard to consultation again this response is directed at proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Lee Gate site and not the Local Plan consultation. It should be noted that although the Council does encourage developers to carry out pre-application consultation with residents there is no statutory requirement and this is at the discretion of the developer. The Local Plan consultation has been carried out in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05	Leegate development Developers having field day around here. More high rise I expect. Sterile , have we learned nothing?..... Sent from my	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.

		Leegate			
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	I am writing to express my great concern at the dramatic increase in height and unit numbers of the buildings planned at Leegate. We all know the site needs to be improved and developed. That is not in debate. BUT the proposal for 15 storeys is ridiculous. There is a severe risk of daylight and sunlight being blocked at the junction and buildings at Tiger's Head junction. The site will be totally out of keeping for the area, an area many of which are in conservation areas with listed buildings inhabited by families who stay for many years. It will cause a significant change to the skyline of the area which will be severely detrimental and not an enhancement in any way. This is not an area that can be compared with developments at Lewisham roundabout or Kidbroke and therefore a similar plan of dense tall buildings is distinctly inappropriate for the area. The Lee green area cannot cope with the proposed increase in the number of housing units for a number of reasons: -Traffic already queues for lengthy periods at the junction, with queues half way up Lee Road at several times of the day including weekends causing increased pollution, and along Lee High Road to Sutcliffe Park. -Public transport is already at breaking limits with the trains pre-COVID resembling cattle trucks at the peak hours of the day. -Schools already have waiting lists. Until the plans include a primary school you cannot expect young families to be adequately served. In essence: Please make sure the height does not exceed those of the buildings currently in Leegate Include homes for elderly as well as young families Make sure the lead building is not at the north side blocking out light on the junction. The Sainsbury and BMW garage sites must be lower than that of the current low level buildings at Leegate. Improve the infrastructure available with more trains running through Blackheath and Lee. Include plans for an expansion of existing primary and secondary schools to accommodate more children without taking up more land. It is extremely upsetting to face the prospect of Lee Green looking like Lewisham roundabout. I cannot believe that Lewisham Council has not set out strict criteria already to stop wasting more time on this project, when so much should have been learnt from the St Modwen applications.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, roads and public transport etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. In terms of housing sales to particular groups, the Council exercises no planning control in this respect. However draft Local Plan policy HO1 set out that the Council will broadly support developers and agents in making a reasonable proportion of new residential units available to local residents, UK citizens and others with a strong connection to the Borough.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Local Plan amended by referring to the marketing of new houses to existing residents and people with a local connection before advertising more widely.

			Finally Galliard is well known for selling flats in Hong Kong and Asia to buyers at discount bulk prices who 'mothball' the flats. This in no way contributes to solving the lack of housing in Lewisham nor achieving the Mayor of London's housing targets. So I would also like an undertaking that all flats that are for sale should be sold in the UK via local agents to British residents.		
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	We are deeply concerned by suggestions that the Leegate is appropriate for development for up to 450 housing units and perhaps 15 stories. Such plans represent a grotesque over development of the site. Surrounding buildings are typically 3 or 4 stories and the highest building in Lee Green is only 10 stories. We cannot see how this site could rationally be seen as appropriate for this scale of development which is totally incongruous with its surroundings. Local amenities (e.g. doctor, dentists, schools, libraries) and infrastructure are inadequate to support this many new units. We are also concerned that including the development of Leegate as part of the local plan is means to largely circumvent consultation on the most controversial aspects (scale and density) of a new planning application for the site. We do not know anyone living in the area who would support a development of such a scale. The local plan should reflect the views and respect the wishes of people living in the area. We would like to see any redevelopment restricted to the height of the existing building or neighbouring buildings. Lee Green is predominately low rise and this should be preserved. We have similar misgivings about the suggestions for the Sainsbury's Lee Green site.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	The amount of housing which is proposed for that small area is ridiculous - it is all too high and the density will be awful for those who live in it especially after the lockdown people will what space not concrete jungles. Taking the Sainsbury's away is very unfair for local people making them travel further for their shopping Please reconsider this dreadful plan Liz Colburn	Noted. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, to assist in the identification of sites which may be suitable for development. As set out in draft Local Plan Table 13.1 the number of homes proposed for the East area in Lewisham is relatively limited when compared to the North, Central and South areas. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital.	Sainsbury's Lee Green site allocation amended to allow for re-provision of a supermarket
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	I am contacting you as I am concerned about the density of the Galliard proposal for so many as 630 homes in Leegate and the height of some of the buildings proposed. This will lead to pressure on resources locally, more pollution from cars and poor housing conditions for those living in high-rise dense area with no direct nor close access to green areas.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.

			However, having a new reasonable and sustainable development like the original proposal would be welcomed.		
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	I am responding to the plans which I have just seen My first comment is that the obvious low-key distribution of this consultation on this is worrying, previous plans have been widely publicised by the council but as there were so many objections maybe it was decided to try a less inclusive approach? The height of the proposed development is of concern, having grown up on a high-rise council estate I know the problems these can bring for residents so would suggest Lewisham has enough hi-rise problems in the pipeline without creating more. Surely 10 stories, as now, is enough, what is the improvement to quality of life in a higher build? It is of concern if the local infrastructure can cope with additional homes/residents. Recent attempts by the council to create TFZ given the high level of traffic have failed so why potentially increase traffic with residents needing to use cars, there is no provision for adequate pedestrian/cycling in the plans, it's all about cars (emissions) Regardless of the current covid crisis I am dismayed at the overall structure of this development, reflective of 1990's thinking not 2020's... Trusting my concerns will be considered,	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	As local resident, I would like to make known my objections to the proposals put forward by Galliard Homes for the development of Lee Gate. I agree the area is long overdue for development but certain aspects will I believe be detrimental to the environment and the Lee Green community. Height and density of buildings I understand that a height of 15 floors and 630 new homes is being proposed. This is much too high for the local area which comprises of a mix of styles of houses. No matter how well designed, it would be incongruous and an eyesore being a full 5 floors higher than the nearest tall building to it (Leybridge Court). Infrastructure Common sense dictates that the existing infrastructure - schools, GP services would not cope with the burden of accommodating the needs of the occupants of another 630 homes. Indeed, it is struggling to keep pace with the current population and I have seen the extension to capacity of local schools in my time here. There is also the issue of more traffic and car parking as some residents are likely to have cars.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			Lewisham Local Plan Bearing in mind the points I have made above. I feel strongly that a maximum height of 10 floors (that being the height of the existing flats at Leybridge Court) be the cap for any future developments and incorporated into Lewisham Plan for our area. Furthermore, that cap be taken into account should there be applications to build on other local sites in the future - namely Sainsbury's and the BMW Garage.		
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	As local resident, I would like to make known my objections to the proposals put forward by Galliard Homes for the development of Lee Gate. I agree the area is long overdue for development but certain aspects will I believe be detrimental to the environment and the Lee Green community. Height and density of buildings I understand that a height of 15 floors and 630 new homes is being proposed. This is much too high for the local area which comprises of a mix of styles of houses. No matter how well designed, it would be incongruous and an eyesore being a full 5 floors higher than the nearest tall building to it (Leybridge Court). Infrastructure Common sense dictates that the existing infrastructure - schools, GP services would not cope with the burden of accommodating the needs of the occupants of another 630 homes. Indeed, it is struggling to keep pace with the current population and I have seen the extension to capacity of local schools in my time here. There is also the issue of more traffic and car parking as some residents are likely to have cars. Lewisham Local Plan Bearing in mind the points I have made above. I feel strongly that a maximum height of 10 floors (that being the height of the existing flats at Leybridge Court) be the cap for any future developments and incorporated into Lewisham Plan for our area. Furthermore, that cap be taken into account should there be applications to build on other local sites in the future - namely Sainsbury's and the BMW Garage.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	As a local resident I am totally against this new development proposal. A tower block in the middle of Lee Road and next to the Lee conservation area would look dreadful. There is no provision in the plans for schools or GP clinics as far as I can tell but the implications of all these dwellings is that these will be very much needed. There is a right-of-way for pedestrians through this area which exists currently. A block of dwellings does not usually allow a right-of-way, I would therefore put to you	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.

			that this planning application contradicts your own stipulations of right-of-way through the area. This was the reason why the plan for the Asda superstore plan was turned down. I appreciate the need for new dwellings as our population expands but this is a very inappropriate place to put it then them.		
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	I am very concerned about the proposed height of the buildings for the development of the Leegate centre, the BMW garage and other sites at the Lee Green crossroads. The current maximum height of a small number of buildings in this area is 10 stories and this should not be exceeded on this local district site. The proposal to go to 15 stories will ruin the local district and surrounding areas. Proposed development of up to 630 homes is too high density for this area. There are insufficient schools, medical amenities, night time economic opportunities and rail capacity to accommodate this increased population in a small local area. I am also gravely concerned about the increased emissions likely with the increase density in an area already significantly above the acceptable pollutant levels. Lewisham town centre and Kidbrooke village are high rise and high density new development sites and these are sufficiently close to Lee Green not to require a further high rise and high density development on the leegate shopping centre site. This is a local area flanked by conservation areas and the proposed development will ruin Lee Green.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	I write to strongly object to the proposed plans under the above heading. The density is far too great. Plans of the size envisaged need a well thought out infrastructure - which seems to have been completely overlooked here. The proposed buildings are far too high and do not fit in with their surroundings at all. The maximum height of buildings are not mentioned and should be included. A height of a maximum 6-8 stories would fit in with the surrounding area. Plans should be cut right back to a minimum in order to fit in with the Lee Green area.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05	I am responding to the Local Plan in particular on the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. It is very important that the Centre is redeveloped into a good shopping and social meeting area with new housing as well but as a local resident I do have some major	Noted. The Local Plan is a strategic policy document and the Council needs to carefully consider the level of detail provided for each area within the site allocations. Further detailed guidance at a masterplanning level would normally be undertaken	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.

		Leegate	concerns about the current proposals being developed by Galliard Homes which I will outline below. I understand the Council is potentially looking at 3 sites to develop, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage Site and Sainsbury. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other and enhance the whole area. The Plan should state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. Please ensure that the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigall Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all – the work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee. However, I have major concerns about the height of the buildings now proposed for Leegate by the current developers, Galliard Homes, as it seems they intend one block to reach 15 storeys high which far exceeds the height of any other building in the area and is fifty percent higher than the other highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - which are 10 storeys high. I think the Local Plan should set a10 storey maximum height limit for any single building planned for the Lee Green area and also state an expectation that most new housing development should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys so that the public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings which would block out light from these areas. Very tall buildings would make the area unwelcoming and unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being planned for the site. There is an opportunity now to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. But to do this any development will need to respect the proportions of the local area and not create the highrise blocks of parts of Kidbrooke Village and Lewisham town centre. It is important to note that although the existing Leybridge flats are 10 storey blocks they are set well back from the road and are situated in large green spaces which is very different to the mass of high buildings bunched closely together that appear in Galliard Homes simulated pictures of their proposed Leegate development. I believe it is essential that the infrastructure should be developed so it can match the number of new residents with increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a good size community centre for people to use	as part of a Framework Document or Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The draft Local Plan part 2 policies on Green Infrastructure set out approaches to protecting and enhancing green and open spaces. The remainder of the response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsburys Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to Old Tigers Head Pub and/ or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			and sufficient parking facilities which will be especially needed by older people when shopping etc. The plan should state the importance of developing new green spaces and also improving existing ones for leisure use as more families come into the area. For example, the Edith Nesbit Gardens on Leyland Rd. provide a small but well landscaped area for people to walk and exercise dogs but the play area is in great need of refurbishment. As more young families move into the area they will need more play areas and safe green spaces for their children. The infrastructure improvements needed for Lee Green's development should be explicitly outlined in Lewisham's Local Plan.		
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	I am writing to you in reference to the proposed plans for the Lee Gate development. Having been a resident within the area for the past 7 years and following the various proposals that have been discussed throughout this time, I am really disappointed with what has now been proposed. My main concerns relate to the following: (1) Height of the proposed development- 15 stories (2) Volume of housing to be built (3) Parking considerations for all the additional housing and potential cars parked on neighbouring streets (4) No consideration for improvements for residents that live in the area- new cafes, sports venues, retail outlets, children activities. (5) No considerations and factoring requirements for additional public amenities- schools, GP surgeries, dental practices. (6) No consideration for increased need for public transport- buses, trains. I had really hoped that Lewisham council was planning to regenerate the Lee Gate centre and improve the social aspects associated with living in Lee Green. Original discussions had focused on facilitating cafés, sports, retail and place to socialise with children. The schools are already over subscribed in the area, to the point where we were allocated our 6th choice of school despite living 500m from our preferred choice. Obtaining a timely GP appointment was difficult pre-COVID without an additional 450 homes being built. Additionally, public transport preCOVID was so busy that I constantly had to wait for another bus or train before commencing my journey. The plans being proposed are only going to make living in Lee worse with the area being over populated with minimal places to congregate and placing even further pressure on public amenities.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04	We are concerned to have been given only a very few days to respond to the proposed development of Lee Green which would affect our neighbourhood greatly. We wonder if this is legal practice?	This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their	No change.

		LEA SA05 Leegate	The expanse and height of the buildings proposed is unacceptable in scale for Lee Green. These buildings would be taller than the surroundings and cause a significant change to the skyline which should only be built in places with transport links and other infra structure that can support them. Lee Green is excluded from the Tall Building opportunity area. The proportions of any higher than present buildings would be inappropriate and overbearing for Lee Green and its environment. The vast majority of buildings are two and three storey homes. The need for transport, parking, medical and educational services has not been addressed. Play areas, community facilities, additional parks, playgrounds and planting of trees is vital. We request appropriate low rise housing development that suits Lee Green in scale and design with supported infrastructure for an area that has been neglected for so long.	views on the scheme through the Development Management process. It should be noted that although the Council does encourage developers to carry out pre-application consultation with residents there is no statutory requirement and this is at the discretion of the developer.	
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	I strongly believe buildings of 15 storeys and over 600 homes will be excessive for the area and if the Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW garage sites are to be built upon to include more housing any buildings should not be higher than surrounding buildings and the design, mass, scale and detailed design (including materials) should be appropriate and in keeping with the area they are being built in. In addition, infrastructure will need to be improved to support any additional housing in the area to fully support the community - whether that be improved transport links, medical facilities and schools, the ability to support already congested roads, detailed plans on ensuring there is no increased, if anything, decreased pollution. The area also has nationally grade II listed buildings and, as such, the height and design of any additional buildings should be in keeping with those that currently exist and certainly no taller.	This response relates to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	No change.
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	I have been contacted regarding the above proposal which is apparently in advanced discussion with Lewisham officers. I have some very general observations which I set out below: 1 Galliard homes (GH) presumably have consultants working on the proposals: who are they? 2 The scheme illustrated is very dense in terms of future populations: what local infrastructure accompanies these proposals? What population density is proposed, and how does this compare with the existing? 3 Local high rise (Leybridge Court) is a group of 10 storey buildings in a landscaped setting without directional orientation. The proposal offered by GH seems to dominate the corner site by building three high buildings	Noted. This response relates to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			running from the corner through to Leyland Road. Firstly the buildings are too high and secondly there is no reason for the Leyland Road block to be as high as proposed. My opinion is that 10 stories is the maximum for any high rise on the site and that Leyland Road requires a lower form to follow the existing three storey houses in the road. 4 In a previous proposal St Modwen were urged to develop permeability to pedestrian flow at ground level. What is offered in the GH proposal? 5 My opinion is that the adjacent sites of Sainsburys and BMW are treated differently. Sainburys may have a maximum height of three storeys above the shop while BMW should allow access to the river frontage with two/three storey housing on the remainder of the site.		
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	I am writing to you to express my concerns over the proposed plans for Leegate and the effects they may have on the entire area of Lee Green and beyond. My first concern is that Galliard Homes' plans for Leegate will not be presented to local people prior to the deadline of Lewisham's Local Plan on the 11th April 2021. Surely, the residents that live within Lee Green should be able to voice their opinions on the proposed plans by Galliard before the consultation ends? This, I believe, shows a total disregard for the rights of Lee residents. Whilst I appreciate that a set amount of housing must be built in the area each year, it is crucial that the views of the residents of Lee Green are considered. I understand that Galliard Homes are proposing to construct a 15-storey tower on the Leegate site. This would exceed the current height limit of buildings in this area by 37%. The London Plan states that tall buildings should only be built in places where transport links and other infrastructure can support them. For any increase in the density of the population of the area we would need plans for improved public transport, new schools, revisions to the road network and GP practices to name just a few. I was under the impression that Lewisham had explicitly excluded Lee Green from its Tall Building opportunity in the draft Local Plan. Also, a high-rise building contravenes the wishes of the community as expressed in the Lee Neighbourhood Plan. With over 50% of Lee Green town centre's buildings being locally and nationally grade II listed buildings, any new developments should be sympathetic with the characteristics of the area. Buildings, in my opinion, should be limited to a maximum of 4 storeys, in line with the Grade II listed fire station.	Noted. This response relates to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. It should be noted that although the Council does encourage developers to carry out pre-application consultation with residents there is no statutory requirement and this is at the discretion of the developer. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. Whilst the Council is working with the Lee Neighbourhood Forum to support its preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan, the Plan has not undergone the necessary stages or been subject to a referendum to be considered when assessing planning applications at this stage.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			In summary, I would ask you to consider carefully the Lee Neighbourhood Plan and ensure that any proposed developments are only granted permission if they fall within the remit and outline of this plan.		
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	Regarding the proposed development by Galliard Homes on the Leegate site, as a local resident I would like to respond to the Lewisham consultation. 1. Height of the buildings. The proposed 15 storey high buildings is 5 storeys higher than the existing single 10 storey high building. This does not meet the expectations of the local neighbour plan. 15 stories would be too high. It would be better to reflect the Lee fire station building / Tigers head building in height (5 or 6 stories) so creating an attractive frontage with commercial properties on the ground floor echoing the historic Victorian frontage. 2. Density If the Leegate site and the Sainsbury site are both developed with possibly 15 storey high buildings there will not be the appropriate infrastructure to support that density of housing. The Sainsbury site should remain as a supermarket. The Leegate site should have lower level housing with open, preferably green spaces, room for a community centre and careful thought on car access in what is already a very busy and congested crossroads. I note that the aesthetic standard of the proposed development is extraordinarily low. I trust this will be looked at carefully.	Noted. This response relates to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, roads and public transport etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	I hope you are all well considering the circumstances. This is the first time I am writing to yourselves as I feel really distraught after hearing the news of new builders taking over the Leegate project near Eltham Road and changing the plans. I feel like in the last few months community was very scared by Lewisham's unconsulted plans for road closures which has caused extreme traffic. Having had to shield with my 3 year old disabled toddler it is awful to have all this smog and noise around the house and never be able to deliver the 6 year old to school in time, get to doctors in time, let alone emergency situations! Our family stress levels have been raised by at least 30% by those inconsiderate and family unfriendly actions. What Lewisham have as a plan now for Leegate, later for Sainsbury's and BMW shop is 100% worse! Overcrowding in terms of community, schools, food shops, parks and overall lack of green spaces. And the worst is traffic! I am really keen on positive changes and improvement in the area. But this needs to be addressed and explained to	Noted. Any planning application submitted on the sites outlined below will need to be accompanied with a Construction Management Plan, to be assessed at the planning application stage. The draft Local Plan encourages developers to register with the Considerate Construction Scheme. Residents will have the opportunity to comment on this and other aspects of the schemes through the Development Management process. The recent closure of roads in the Lee Green area was part of the Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTN) pilot scheme, which is outside the scope of the Local Plan. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan's ambitions and policies, particularly to improve air quality and protect local amenity, and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			us in detail. How will it be managed? How can we trust Lewisham again after those road closures? How should I protect my children as a mother? My boy 3 year old was born premature and has lung and heart problems. Smog caused by this overwhelming traffic with street closures in Lewisham are already affecting this health. The traffic was imposed in our neighbourhood and now we are expected to take even more. In addition, will Lewisham take into account and make sure that those buildings meet the current height regulations and not exceed 4 storeys? That is another huge concern as the only source of light are via front windows and if overshadowed we would never see any sun in the house. Other side of the house is barely touched by the sun in mid garden for a couple of hours in summer. How will we be protected from builders parking in our car park? Will you install an electric gate for us? My son needs to use the walker in the car park to exercise and it cannot be used by anyone else apart from our neighbourhood! This is already happening due to night club opening on weekends and parties until 2am, rubbish to be picked up in the car park, kids not being able to sleep due to laud music coming from the cars parked outside and the club itself. If these cars cannot be accommodated at the moment for small parties how will the builders be sorted to protect residents? Apologies for such a long winded email but I feel like our concerns should be raised and considered. We are the ones that will be affected mostly on the road. Again this is not directed at anyone personally we just need clarity. Many thanks for consideration and looking forward to hear from you soon ASAP. I am not looking for laws and regulations I am interested from the human family point of view.	set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	To whom it may concern, I object to the plan to build up to 630 new dwellings in Lee Green, particularly to the proposed height of 15 storeys. As a mum of 2 children who did not get any place in any local primary school, I find it unbelievable that someone would want to add to this local burden. The same goes for the local GP surgeries who, as it is, are unable to look after the local population. Furthermore, public transport already cannot cope with the local demand. Local parks and playgrounds can be over run, not only on warm and sunny days. On these grounds in terms of infrastructure, I very much object to the development as it is proposed. Furthermore, I would like to know if any of the flats would be affordable in the true sense of the word. And lastly, 15 storey tower blocks are not in keeping with the local architecture and would not only cast shadows over	Noted. This response relates to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.

			neighbouring housing but also most likely create wind channels.		
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	We have recently become aware of the new development plans for Leegate and am very disappointed by the environmental impact of these plans. There has been very little publicity about them and no public consultation. In recent years Lewisham town centre has been ruined by very tall blocks of flats close to each other being erected so that the whole centre has become dark and dismal. Now it seems the council wants to ruin Lee Green in a similar way. It not only has plans for Leegate but also wishes to develop 2 other sites in Lee Green. The focus is on high density housing with no additional facilities. Large increases in housing need accompanying increases in infrastructure. It is essential that the drains are expanded as there is frequent flooding of Eltham Road due to the drains being inadequate already. The education system also needs expanding as the schools in the so-called conservation area are currently oversubscribed and reluctant to accept children from the other side of Burnt Ash Road despite there currently being no other primary schools in the area. This in effect means that Lewisham is discriminating against less privileged families and that that the education of our children is being sadly neglected in these plans for the borough. In addition, there is only one secondary school funded by Lewisham within this area and that too is on the edge of the conservation area. The density of the housing plans will increase traffic and the recent traffic plans introduced by Lewisham have increased traffic on both Burnt Ash and Eltham roads, not to mention the South Circular, resulting in additional pollution on these roads and discrimination against those who happen to live on them compared with the privileged occupants of the conservation area. Lewisham needs to state what plans it has for infrastructure improvements in Leegate. We are also concerned about the height of the buildings being allowed in Lee Green.. They are totally out of proportion with other buildings in the area and will cause significant change to the skyline which is against the Mayor of London's planning policy. The proposal for 15 stories by Galliard Homes exceeds even the maximum height of the tallest existing buildings by 5 stories or 37% and will dwarf current Grade II listed buildings. A maximum height of the current tallest building should be specified in Lewisham's plans.	Noted. This response seems to relate to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The draft Local Plan sets out a vision, spatial objectives and planning policies for the East Area, including within Lee Green, to help ensure a coordinated approach to future development within the area. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, roads, public transport, utilities, etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05 Leegate	I have recently become aware of new plans for Leegate centre redevelopment. I understand it will be 15 stories high, and contain 630 new homes. I have to add my voice as a strenuous objector. The imposing nature of such a structure will be enormously overbearing on the local area, especially when it's adjacent to a conservation area. It should not be aiming to out-do	Noted. This response relates to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.

			the ugly tower blocks on Eltham Road, the redevelopment should be trying to tie into the lower level residential character of the area. In addition, the objections from before still carry. 630 new residents will need amenities, such as doctors, dentist, schools, etc. These services haven't changed in the interim, in fact council spending in the area is extremely low. Additionally, it will add hugely to the traffic in the area - an issue which has troubled the council recently. The addition of hundreds of new cars will exacerbate the existing problems, especially when building these homes on a busy junction, where air quality is already causing existing residents health concerns. The homes will be in a dead-zone regarding other commuting options, specifically, the trains. Furthermore, the plans seem to suggest enormous additions to the BMW garage site and the Sainsbury's site. I find these objectionable for the same reasons above.	With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital.	
	3	LEA LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	My comments on the Local Plan as follows: • Density - current level of housing can only increase in Lee Green if infrastructure such as schools, doctor surgeries, and transport (trains, buses, cycle lanes), green outdoor spaces has at least the same amount as it is to date per residential unit. I would want planned infrastructure improvements for Lee Green explicitly named in Lewisham's Local Plan. I am not happy for Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW garage to be built upon more intensively in order to include more housing. • The maximum height of any new buildings should be no taller than the current buildings on the sites of Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW garage. I would want this maximum height for Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW garage sites to be included in Lewisham's Local Plan. • I would want the Local Plan to explicitly state that any new development on the sites in Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW should not just be studio or 1/2 bedroom flats but would be a mix with family suitable homes (3 bedrooms). • I would want the Local Plan to state that there must be significant green and public spaces in any development of Lee Green, including Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW. • Urban design - I object to developments including Lee Green that do not meet a mixed use of outdoor and community spaces supporting social inclusion	Noted. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density and scale from the existing character. However the council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, roads and public transport etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA	Traffic Impact The vision (as all visions) sounds good but the problem with the proposals for Lee Green is that they do not take account of the impact of, for example, up to 630 housing units on the Leegate site. I note in the request for scoping that work has still to be undertaken on Impact Assessments for traffic, pollution levels, population etc. – but prima facie the present levels of traffic would argue for a much smaller development at Leegate. However much there is a hope that new residents will not use cars, and even if by 2035 cars will be electric, there will still be heavy	Noted. This response relates to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.

			traffic at the Cross Roads. Thus at the moment road and public transport infrastructure is inadequate to sustain the level of housing proposed at Lee Gate. Should there be further tower block housing above the Sainsbury's store and on the BMW sales then the traffic and public transport impact will be further worsened. That Visual Impact. I see the proposal includes a 15 floor tower block on the northern section of the Leegate Centre. No tower block should exceed the height of the Lethbridge Estate but if the new centre is to be in keeping with the current heritage of Lee Green then new buildings that line the streets should not exceed the height of the buildings round the Young Tigers Head. They should be in keeping, but in a good modern architectural style with the historic buildings of Lee Green. Population Impact. The scoping exercise needs also to assess the impact on local population numbers with the consequences for health care, education, communal facilities. I note that in the scoping letter the developer offers funding to assist with any impact on health care. That is not adequate if it is solely a lump sum and does not cover the on-going costs of additional medical services, including salaries. There is also a need to consider the potential needs for nursery, primary and secondary education for any families who may live in these affordable apartments. I will continue to keep a close watch on proposals as they develop. I use the shops in Lee Green several times a week.		
	3	LEA	The Local Plan has multiple references to intensification and this is a clear policy direction based on housing need. However, intensification will lead to greater numbers of residents and increased demand for community facilities and green spaces. Covid has highlighted the importance of green spaces and community facilities will be even more important in combating issues of isolation and mental health. In one of the recent consultation zoom meetings there appeared to be a reference to building on the Grove Park library site. Housing built above, or on, community land complicates and often inhibits community use, or future development of the land for community use. The community sites in Grove Park need to be maintained for community use and not for housing developments. The local plan could give greater clarity on the designation and intentions for the important community facilities in the Grove Park area including: Ringway Community Centre and Gardens Library and gardens Youth Club WG Grace Community Centre	Noted. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, roads and public transport etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. In addition, draft Local Plan policy CI1 Safeguarding and securing community infrastructure provides strong strategic protection for community facilities. The Grove Park Neighbourhood Plan is now 'made' and forms part of the Council's statutory Development Plan. This provides further detail protection of the community facilities outlined in this response.	No change.
	3	LEA	The old large plain trees in Grove Park are part of the history of the area and line the main roads. They are an	Noted. The Local Plan is a strategic document, and as such it is not considered proportionate to identify specific groups of trees in specific areas. However the	No change.

			essential part of the local character. Recently 6 of these trees were under threat and only intense lobbying saved them. It was clear that they did not have adequate protection. The local plan needs to set out the importance of these trees both in Grove Park and across the Borough, and give them enhanced protection as they are a valued and important local asset. They are important aesthetically and create an enhanced environment, particularly for pedestrians, shading walking routes and giving a feeling of protection from the road.	draft Local Plan recognises the importance of the Borough's trees and canopy cover and the role they plays in contributing to local character, the environment and tackling the climate emergency. Policy GR4 on Urban greening and trees provides strategic policy guidance on the retention of trees.	
	3	LEA	There is a clear and understandable emphasis on the historic character of areas such as Blackheath. There is less recognition of some of the historic or interesting architecture in areas such as Grove Park which also has housing and buildings of note. On the map of Non Designated Heritage Assets there appears to be very few assets listed for Grove Park. The row of Edwardian terraced houses on Coopers Lane in Grove Park are a good example of historic housing from the turn of the last century that remains true to the original built form. These are of note, reflect the history of the area, and add to local character and distinctiveness. (I must declare an interest as I live in one of these houses). The same can be said of the significant numbers of distinctive 1930s housing that could be designated as an Area of Special Local Character. Napier House should be locally listed.	Noted. The draft Local Plan seeks to preserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets and their setting, in line with national planning policy. The draft Local Plan Part 2 section on Heritage includes policies for both designated and non-designated heritage assets. It reflects the Council's current list of statutory listed and locally listed buildings. The local List was reviewed recently and a large number of properties added to this list. We will continue to review and update where appropriate.	No change.
	3	LEA	There does not appear to be a clear vision for the regeneration of the local centre of Grove Park as identified in the Neighbourhood Plan. The Plan could give greater clarity to the green linkages to the centre and a clear commitment to the creation of a district park.	Noted. The Local Plan is a strategic policy document and as such the Council has to balance the level of detail for each of its many centres. The key spatial objectives for the East area address the Grove Park local centre, and these are supported with site allocation policies within the centre itself. The Grove park neighbourhood plan is now 'made' and forms part of the Council's statutory Development Plan. It provides a further detailed vision for the area including the role of the centre and key green links. The Neighbourhood Plan will be used in conjunction with the Local Plan in the assessment of planning applications and regeneration decisions.	No change.
	3	LEA	There is recognition of some of the more formal green spaces in Grove Park but I cannot find reference to the green corridor which exists from the Willow Tree Stables site following the train line towards the local centre. It is important that this is recognised as such. The Plan needs to show more clearly in both maps and tables all of the green open spaces and green infrastructure in Grove Park and their designations and linkages.	Noted	East Area Key diagram amended to provide greater clarity.
	3	LEA	Nor can I see why the office block already standing along Burnt Ash Road has been mainly unused for years and has not been converted into social housing, unless it is due to changes in ownership of Leegate	Noted. This comment will be passed along to colleagues in the relevant service area within the Council.	No change.

	3	LEA LEA SA 03	Most local people agree that the Leegate Centre has been mismanaged and left to deteriorate, but a sensitive and viable development, taking account of the limited local infrastructure, need for shops, community facilities and job opportunities is what we need. The decision to significantly intensify the residential use of the Leegate Centre is in direct contradiction to your stated LEA1 East Area place principle A (a) to "secure the centre's long-term vitality and viability and to enhance its role as key focal point for community activity, in line with Policy LEA2 (Lee Green district centre and surrounds)". The over-development of the Leegate Centre site as an intensive residential area with buildings out of scale with the immediate surrounding neighbourhood does not contribute to the "vitality and viability" of the centre or its role as a "key focal point for community activity". There are few community focussed opportunities for local activities within the proposed site and the over-development of housing will lead to an imbalance in facilities in the local area. While the redevelopment of the Leegate Centre as an intensive residential site complies with your blanket Principle E ("The intensification of sites within the Lee Green district centre"), it clearly contradicts your LEA1 East Area place Principle A – "Development proposals must make the best use of land in helping to facilitate Good Growth". 'Good growth' (there is no definition in your draft Local Plan glossary) is not facilitated by intensive residential development at the expense of commercial and community infrastructure. Your LEA1 East Area place Principle F – "Development proposals should seek to address elements of the built environment that segregate neighbourhoods and places from one another" - is completely undermined by the proposed plan for the Leegate Centre. There is little ability to negotiate the tall, densely packed buildings in the plan proposed, extremely limited permeability, few opportunities for pedestrian facilities or community infrastructure. The new densely packed residential area will be in direct contrast to the more spacious residential areas and green sites bordering the development and linkages will be lost between community spaces. The proposed height, density and massive scale of the proposed building development at Leegate Centre are out of keeping with your LEA1 East Area place Principle F – "The sensitive intensification of established residential neighbourhoods will be supported where new development responds positively to their distinctive local character, including the landscape setting". There is no attempt at matching any of the local neighbourhood's characteristics in the development and no green space to match that of the Leybridge Court estate which is just across a minor road from the site.	Noted. Disagree with the position that the vitality of any town centre cannot be maintained by developing mixed-use schemes that incorporate residential as well as non-residential uses. Indeed, this is the policy direction of the London Plan to ensure there is a sufficient critical mass of residents within town centres to support their long term vitality and viability, for example, by sustaining local facilities and services. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density and scale from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land. The remaining points seem to relate to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Lee Gate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan glossary amended to include definition of Good Growth, in line with the London Plan. Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			The lack of human scale or public realm in the proposed development at the Leegate Shopping Centre is a huge concern. The proposed height and mass of the buildings increase the destructive environmental impact of the development on the construction process, change the nature of the current neighbourhood and take account of developer ambition rather than local regeneration needs. It appears that hitting Lewisham targets for the growth of residential units is taking precedence over the genuine needs of the local population of Lee Green. The draft Plan's principles should be honoured by your site allocations and planning decisions. The Council needs to ensure that it complies with its own expressed principles and objectives for local people. The Leegate Centre desperately needs to be tackled in an effective way to meet local requirements for good quality housing. Please ensure that you listen to residents and deal with this eyesore that we have been suffering for years without action by the council or the site's previous owners, but do not make it worse by insensitive and intensive development.		
	3	LEA	Note: In relation to Lee Green. The draft plan incorrectly identifies a shop occupancy rate of only 40% but it is clear that the shops in Lee Green outside the Leegate centre have the highest occupancy rate of any District Centre in the borough. The shop units within the Leegate Centre have been poorly managed for over twenty years with shopkeepers leaving because of rent increases despite extremely poor maintenance of the site.	Noted. The figure cited in the plan pertains to vacancy rates, which were considered as part of a town centre survey. The survey only considered shops within designated shopping frontages in town and local centres. Following the Regulation 18 consultation, a new Retail Impact Assessment and Town Centre Trends study has been prepared and information from this will be cited within the Regulation 19 document, as appropriate.	No change.
	3	LEA	Burnt Ash Hill was proposed for Streetscape at the same time as Manor Lane but was shelved for Cost reasons and also Utility Spaghetti issues. At present it is a Rubbish Dump. We wanted to put Planters where the Commercial Bins had been removed but were denied on the spurious grounds that they would be an impediment and lack maintenance. Hey 2020/21! What have we got under LTN at the top of Woodyates Road junction with South Circular? A Planter on the pavement restricting the width to under a half and a hazard to visually impaired and/or people with walking difficulty. The Planters which have a maintenance contract being paid for by the Council have NEVER been maintained and are receptacles for Passers-By's rubbish!!	Noted. This response pertains to schemes which are outside the scope of the Local Plan, for example, Low Traffic Neighbourhoods. However these comments will be passed on to colleagues in the relevant service areas of the Council.	No change.
	3	LEA	I very much support the idea of development of Lee Green as a greener, tidier and more economically developed place to live and agree with the majority of the proposals. In particular I lend my support to: - Retaining and improving Lee Green as a welcoming centre of economic and community activity - Improving the area around Lee Green station and the Chiltonian Industrial Estate	Support noted.	No change.

			- Protecting and enhancing our ability to engage with Lee's green spaces and the river Quaggy and taking advantage of Lee being on the Green Chain Walk		
	3	LEA	Having recently moved to the area, I am a huge supporter of the LTN and I hold strong concerns about the threats to safety, noise and air quality that frequent, heavy site traffic will create. I hope you will be able to ensure the ongoing safety of our local road network.	Noted. Low Traffic Neighbourhoods are outside the scope of the Local Plan. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes, and road safety, are central to the Local Plans ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies.	No change.
	3	LEA	I write as a resident of Lee Green. I understand that there are proposals to upgrade and improve Lee Green, including building high density high rise units. Whilst I agree in principal with providing much needed homes for people, I do not think that Lee Green can be like Lewisham in terms of supporting large numbers of homes for people. For example there is insufficient space to build homes; insufficient amenities, including GPs and schools, to support large numbers of new residents; and the roads are practically grid locked in rush hour. There is also no parking available and public transport is limited and slow in Lee Green. High rise buildings would spoil the area and are not what people want to live in. The current high rise buildings at Leegate are pretty ugly and do nothing for the skyline. More high rise units would totally change the character of the area and might not attract people to rent or buy them. Since Covid, people have reassessed how they want to live and the demand for more space has changed the demand from small gardenless flats to houses with gardens. With more people working from home, the demand will be for small friendly shops, community activities such as yoga and green spaces to walk dogs and children. Currently Lee Green looks tired and suffers noise and air pollution from heavy traffic, fly tipping and a glut of unhealthy fried chicken outlets. Shops like Sainsbury's (which is not too big), the new Blackheath store on the New Tiger's Head site and the small businesses near the dubious Wetherspoons have enhanced the area. Low rise dwellings and some additional green park space to complement these would be good for Lee Green Leegate. Lots of tree planting would help diffuse the road pollution, but I would suggest that new units should be set back from the main road so people do not suffer from noise and air pollution.	Noted. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, roads and public transport, etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density and scale from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The draft Local Plan includes a raft of measures which address the need to protect and enhance local amenity. This includes tree building design, tree planting, landscaping, and public realm.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04	In Lee Green, I would like to see the following:	Noted. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

		LEA SA 05	Building of no more than 8 stories high in the Leegate Centre. I would like this specified in Lewisham's Local Plan. No further housing to be building on top of Sainsburys and the BMW garage sites. I would like this specified in Lewisham's Local Plan. Adequate parking infrastructure for any new houses built New transport links and increased services to cope with any increased housing. I would like infrastructure improvements for Lee Green explicitly named in Lewisham's Local Plan. New schools, nurseries, GP surgeries to cope with any increased housing. New playgrounds, parks and other leisure facilities to cope with any increased housing New green areas and trees to counter any increased traffic In the Leegate centre, I would like to see more dining and retail options, particularly from local independent businesses and not from large chain stores. I would also like to see a gym and pool.	Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, roads and public transport etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. Site specific requirements for strategic infrastructure are set out in site allocation policies, where appropriate. The site allocations for Lee Green district centre provide for mixed-use redevelopment, and will provide for a wide range of uses to locate within the centre to support its long term vitality and viability. The site allocations will enable the reprovision of appropriate main town centre uses with residential above. This is in line with good urban design principles and current planning policy. The appropriate level of car parking provision within new developments will need to be considered having regard to the London Plan parking standards.	
	3	LEA	3. Welcome the intention to improve the environment along Lee High Rd and the South Circular but found little information in the plan of what exactly you were going to do	Noted. The Local Plan is a strategic policy document and sets the Council's ambition for managing growth and change. In general, the Healthy Streets Approach will be advocated for Lee High Road and the South Circular. Details of any future proposals will be developed in partnership with Transport for London.	No change.
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05	Dear Sirs, I have today been contacted by a better Leegreen describing the plans to build new homes in three locations including the Leegate Centre and Sainsbury's. Firstly, I really hope that we can keep the Sainsbury's. It is a good supermarket in a residential area. This means that unlike larger supermarkets in outdoor purpose-built malls, such as Greenwich Peninsula, local residents can easily walk or cycle to the local supermarket. This is a massive amenity for the area. The alternative would be more people driving further away. It also provides employment for many local people. Secondly, I hear that the plans for flats at the Leegate Centre would be a 15 storey building. This would be entirely out of keeping with the area as nothing else is that tall. I would be very concerned that this would set a precedent and then Lee Green would have more tall buildings too. Abetterleegreen says that Lee Green has been designated as an area that **should not** have such tall buildings.	Noted. The draft Local Plan site allocation for the Sainsbury's site, LEA SA04, makes provision for main town centre uses, which will enable the reprovision of a supermarket. The remaining points seem to relate to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, roads and public transport etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	No change.

			Where would the doctors surgeries, school places etc. be for all the new residents of such a huge block? It is already difficult to get local children into local schools, especially secondary schools. Please ensure that my views are taken into account in objecting to these two developments.		
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05	Dear Sirs, I am writing to you as a concerned resident of Lee, specifically in relation to the plans for Leegate. While I appreciate that there is a need to increase housing, I am concerned about the density and height of the housing proposed on each of the 3 sites - Leegate, Sainsbury's and the BMW garage. Density: I do not feel that it is necessary or appropriate to build 450 homes on the 3 proposed sites for the following reasons: - Transport: I have lived in the area for some 5 years and am already noticing that infrastructure to support the area is creaking at the seams. The trains from Blackheath, Hither Green and Lee are already full by the time they get to each of these respective stations and will undoubtedly become worse. While I appreciate that COVID may have an impact on WFH, this is not yet a known quantity and therefore to predict that the increase in housing will not have an impact on transportation is in my view, foolhardy and irresponsible, especially regards the individuals, who like me, already pay large amounts to commute to work. - Schooling: It is my understanding from local neighbourhood forums that schooling is insufficient to be able to accommodate the proposed increase in housing density. There has already been very large expansion of the Kidbrooke estate and the changes proposed for Leegate will also undoubtedly put pressure on local nursery's, primary and secondary schools. Children need good education and safe places to learn and I do not feel that this has been considered as part of the wider plan. - Other facilities such as local shops are also not adequate to support the proposed increase in housing density. The local Sainsbury's is a great resource and while I am not proposing that additional supermarkets are built, (in fact this would be disastrous for traffic and congestion, especially as many of the local routes have now been blocked,) more needs to be invested in the local surrounding area to support local businesses. It would also be important to encourage shops, restaurants, cafes and fitness spaces into the area by providing grants or additional financial incentives which I do not believe has been covered as part of the plan. - Open spaces: While there is the benefit of Manor Park, the density of the housing proposed will have a significant impact on local parks and outside spaces. With the after effects of a post COVID world unknown, the public parks	Noted. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density and scale from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available. The draft Local Plan site allocations for Lee Green centre will enable provision for a wide-range of main town centre uses at the ground floor level with residential above. They also require significant public realm enhancements to be delivered to support the centre's vitality and viability. Grant funding for business development is outside the scope of the Local Plan. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, roads and public transport etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. The remaining points seem to relate to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			and spaces will be vital to ensure that individuals are able to socialise and connect in an appropriate and socially distanced way. Height: - I am also extremely concerned about the proposed height of the housing stock and do not believe that this needs to be 15 storeys as proposed. The style of housing would be totally out of line with the housing stock of the area, Flats and tower blocks in my view would actually ruin the local area and should be restricted to a maximum height of 3 or 4 stories only (as is currently the case) . This is extremely important to me as a local resident who bought a property in the area for its housing stock and the lack of high rise. If this is the environment I wanted to live in, I would have purchased in Canary Wharf or Lewisham. I know that there will be many individuals who feel the same as me in this regard and this has not been taken into consideration, save for maximising the profits for the developers and also the council. - I would like to INSIST that the maximum height be restricted to 3 or 4 storeys and the maximum height for each site clearly written into Lewisham's local plan for certainty and to prohibit the developers now or in the future, from developing tower blocks in the area. I am aware that the Neighbourhood Plan states that buildings must NOT be higher than surrounding buildings (in this case 4 storeys) that design, mass, scale and detailed design (including materials) must be appropriate for the surrounding area. Again it is extremely important to me as a resident, that new housing stock is built in accordance with property already in the surrounding area. I would ask you to strongly consider the above and also the feedback from all of the local residents before you engage in any arrangements or approve plans submitted by the developers. The local area has historical significance which needs to be retained. It is the reason myself and other local residents bought in the area and continue to enjoy living in the area. Therefore, please do NOT ignore our comments or views.		
	3	LEA	Re Lee gate proposal and my objections 1. Tallest building In Lee 10 storeys. This should be the limit 2 opening of Quaggy river so why build on bmw land? 3. Lack of infrastructure for too Much sudden growth 4.planning should be in keeping with the style of the area. - heritage buildings and so on	The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, roads and public transport etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

				The site allocation for the BMW site seeks to facilitate the redevelopment of the site, whilst ensuring the site design improves the amenity value of the River Quaggy, including public access to it.	
	3	LEA	Hi, I understand that the deadline for the local plan consultation is 11th April. I haven't received a letter about this - is it not usual practice to leaflet local residents to make them aware? Also, it would've been easier to have an online form or survey to complete instead of email but I couldn't find that as an option. My comments on the Leegate plan: The plan to add a high number of new homes - what plans do you have to improve the local infrastructure for this? Public transport - rush hour trains from Lee station are very overcrowded so this would need to be provided for. As are many of the buses. Schools - all primary schools in the area are heavily oversubscribed. You need to build a new school or expand an existing school if you plan to build new homes. Current Leegate - there is a fantastic community currently operating there and many brilliant local businesses. I would like a commitment to keeping these on as they really do add to the area. We should be promoting and supporting independent retailers as much as possible. High rise buildings - I think the height of the buildings should be considered and keep in sync with the local area. Promoting cycling/walking - how will the plans support better options for cycling and walking in the area in order to reduce the high traffic levels? Many thanks for taking my response on board.	Noted. The Local Plan consultation was carried out in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which can be found on the Council website. It is not standard practice to send leaflets out to all local residents; however a notice was included in an issue of Lewisham Life which was distributed to all households in the Borough. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, roads and public transport etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies. In addition, the new policy on Lewisham Links will provide a more granular level of detail for the East area.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05	I am pleased to see that it looks as if development of Leegate may soon be going ahead. As a local resident I do have some concerns and would like to share these with you. I understand you are potentially looking at 3 sites to develop, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage Site and Sainsbury. Please ensure that the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigal Road playing Fields is opened	Noted. The draft Local Plan site allocation for the BMW site, LEA SA05, a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended so that the reference to enhanced access and amenity of the river has moved from Guidelines to a Requirement

			up with access for all – the work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee. I am not happy that the height of the buildings look as if they are going to be more that the Leybridge Estate. 10 stories should be the maximum for any of the planned buildings and the infrastructure should be supported so it can match the number of new residents – medical practices, schools, green space and play areas etc. Lewisham need planned infrastructure improvements for Lee Green named explicitly in Lewisham's Local Plan. I'm resident of Leybridge court. I've got two children and been living here for nearly 20 yrs. With all the tall building you're planning to build we won't see a sunlight anymore not to mention beautiful sunsets. Please, don't do that to us. We are already stuck in small flats.	requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The draft Local Plan includes policies to ensure protection of amenity, including design requirements dealing with outlook, daylight and sunlight.	
	3	LEA LEA SA03 LEA SA04 LEA SA05	Dear Sir / Madam I live in SE12 and frequent Leegate fairly often and thus would like to comment on the latest proposals for Leegate and the local plan. Density: I am concerned that much more housing is now proposed, including the Sainsbury's and BMW sites. I am not happy about this as the area is a traffic hotspot and there's only really bus transport. Agreed Lee,or Blackheath railway stations are within 15 minutes walk, but those services are overcrowded at peak times. So infrastructure will need improving dramatically here, to avoid people reverting to their cars. Planned infrastructure improvements need to be included in the local plan. Height of new buildings: 15 storey blocks are far too high, just look at how the Lewisham station area has been blighted by unsightly tower blocks? The views across London have been blighted. Existing vistas and outlooks will also be blighted, and shadow caused by this 15 storey block. The mobile phone antennas on the nearby fire station and also Merridale may be affected too, meaning more mobile phone towers will be needed. I think a maximum of 10 storeys is reasonable and in keeping with area. Lee Green is a unique area and people often comment on how different it is compared to other areas. Lewisham Council have a duty to protect the area from over development. Many thanks for your attention,	Noted. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. The remaining point seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

	3	LEA QD 04	I have read the planning details for development of the Leegate / Lee Green centre and wish to register my concern about the amount of high rise building as part of the development. The result of the traffic calming measures in the area has been an increase in traffic around the Burnt Ash Hill area - traffic regularly is stationery waiting for the lights towards the south circular creating intense pollution at this important cross roads for the local community. I am concerned that any major building around this area will place additional pressure on traffic. There does not seem to be enough space in the plans provided for green space to enable local community to enjoy the benefit of recreation and green space. I firmly object to the planned high rise developments. 15 stories is far too high for the area. I would support building proposals that are no higher than the fire station. This is a historic location and does not have a train station within 1/2 mile, therefore putting such an emphasis on high rise building will increase traffic in the near vicinity. It is unclear what the additional infrastructure plans are to support buildings of such a high number of stories. This is likely to have a detrimental impact on the existing community. I would support a reduced height for the buildings as well as enabling the independent shops and businesses that are currently operating in Lee gate to develop sustainable businesses.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA QD 04	I am concerned that the proposed development at Leegate includes a building which is 15 floors high. This is far higher than any other building in this area. It will create a hemmed in atmosphere in this area which often has a very heavy flow of traffic. I would like any new buildings in this highly populated area to maintain human proportions, capped at a safer eight floors. I feel this would be far-more fitting for this residential area. Very high buildings are being built nearby, next to Kidbrooke station. At least they are in a contained area, away from other homes and shops. The proposed Leegate development is in a different kind of place. It's where people live, shop, travel to work, socialise. I believe that having a very tall building here would irrevocably change the nature of our area. Please consider a maximum height of eight floors for any part of this development.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LEA	**Vision** 75 references to Blackheath (including 4 photo captions). Only three references to the large Blackheath CA. No holistic, balanced vision for Blackheath area and for preserving and enhancing its character in terms of Village, Heath and residential CAs, (economic, environmental, heritage/housing/design). See suggestion in Annex.	Noted. As set out in the draft Local Plan, Lewisham's East Area comprises of Blackheath, Lee and Grove Park and as such the vision and policies for the area straddles these three areas. Nevertheless there are a number of references to the spatial qualities of Blackheath and specific place policies relating to preserving and enhancing the distinctive qualities of Blackheath Village. The Local Plan is a strategic document and the Council needs to carefully consider the level of detail provided for each neighbourhood; it tends to focus on those areas that will be subject to	No change.

				higher levels of growth and significant change over the plan period. A more granular vision for Blackheath could be prepared through the neighbourhood planning process.	
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LEA	Concern at Blackheath being designated a District Centre (para. 16.6) (as in London Plan) and an area for 'a vibrant night time economy' i.e.6 p.m.-6 a.m. (para. 16.7). Blackheath Village currently only has a day and evening economy (6-12) because it is also residential. It is not suitable for nightclubs, all-night cafés etc.	Noted. Blackheath's designation as a District Centre has been carried forward from the adopted Local Plan and assessed against a defined set of criteria. Its designation as a night time economy area 'of more than local significance' is established by the London Plan. The suitability of appropriate uses within the town centre will be assessed against relevant Local Plan policies. Both the adopted and draft Local Plan include policies dealing with the protection of local amenity.	No change.
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LEA	Concern also at what is meant by 'the character of established residential areas will be reinforced, with their *sensitive intensification* [sic] providing for improvements throughout the wider area.' (para. 16.7)	Noted. This approach is considered to be consistent with London Plan policy GG2 Making the best use of land. The Council has prepared a Small Sites SPD to ensure that developments are appropriate to their context and respond positively to local character.	No change.
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LEA	Concern at no mention of volume and type of traffic through Village, over Heath and through residential areas. This is substantial and varied – including large and heavy lorries as well as many buses and cars. Big impact on pollution, noise, safety and general amenity and character of the Village and wider area.	Noted. As the Local Plan is strategic borough-wide document the Council needs to carefully consider the level of detail provided for each neighbourhood; it tends to focus on those areas that will be subject to higher levels of growth and significant change in the plan period. A more granular vision/approach for Blackheath could be prepared through the neighbourhood planning process.	No change.
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LEA	No mention of need for children's play facilities and public toilets on Heath/near Village, and other enhancement work to ensure 'residents and visitors will benefit from excellent access to high quality parks, open and green spaces.' (para 16.8)	Noted. As the Local Plan is strategic borough-wide document the Council needs to carefully consider the level of detail provided for each neighbourhood; it tends to focus on those areas that will be subject to higher levels of growth and significant change in the plan period. A more granular vision/approach for Blackheath could be prepared through the neighbourhood planning process. The Council's Parks and Open Spaces strategy sets out priorities for investment in these areas, and should be referred for further information.	No change.
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LEA	Talk of 'a network of walking and cycle routes' (para. 16.8) but no mention of idea of 15 minute city to encourage walking/cycling/bus use instead of cars/delivery vans.	The spatial strategy broadly supports the principles of the 15-minute city or neighbourhood. For clarification, the policy supporting text will be amended to refer to this.	Policy OL1 spatial strategy supporting text amended to refer the 15 minute neighbourhood concept.
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LEA	**Spatial objectives** We support spatial objective 2 'Preserve and enhance the distinctive qualities of Blackheath Village district centre whilst building on its strengths as a key visitor destination.' But we think it needs to be linked to include the Heath (mentioned opaquely in special objective 7 as 'Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site Buffer Zone at Blackheath') and the residential areas around the Village and Heath that together make up the neighbourhood and community of Blackheath. Some of these areas are just across the borough boundary in the Royal Borough of Greenwich, which adds to the challenge of managing the neighbourhood as a whole. No mention is made of the	Agree that more recognition should be give to the heath at Blackheath. References to joint working parties are beyond the scope of the Plan.	Local Plan amended to make reference to the heath at Blackheath, as part of the linear network of green infrastructure.

			Blackheath Joint Working Party (BJWP) set up by Lewisham and Greenwich Council to advise on management of the Heath.		
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LEA	**Site allocations** The overall scale seems broadly reasonable for the East Area, although some are very speculative. The south of the Area has only one modest site. We have expressed our opposition to the intensity of development at Blackheath Hill, now approved by Strategic Planning Committee. We have similar concerns about Leegate, part of the intensive cluster of Lee Green sites, where we fear excessive height and density, and too little high quality public realm.	Noted. The Council has engaged with and consulted landowners through the Local Plan process to help ensure that site allocations are deliverable and developable within the plan period. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital.	No change.
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LEA	**A Prospect for Blackheath – a vision for next 5-10 years** **Blackheath enjoys many attractive characteristics. The vision aims to conserve and improve Blackheath's historic liveability and charm as a Borough recreation, culture, and leisure resource by protecting and enhancing the distinctive character of its buildings, economy, natural environment, and the heath. The main aim is to support Blackheath's future as a lively and contemporary neighbourhood with exceptional heritage and unique open spaces, a strong local economy and community spirit within a 15-minute walk of extensive characterful residential areas.** **Village** • Maintain mixed economy of retail; food/drink, professional, personal, and financial/legal services; community/cultural facilities and varied historic residential areas and house types. • Develop support for small business, innovation, start-ups and cultural enterprises. • Reduce road traffic; increase walking and cycling in a safe and healthy environment. • Improve the quality of, and possibly extend, the public realm including pavements, squares, and greens. • Maintain the scale and special character of the village. • **Heath** • Protect existing local and distant views. • Plant more trees round the fringe to protect the skyline, maintain the existing character and reduce pollution. • Increase biodiversity and restore historic heathland character. • Continue to support greater, wider, and more varied use with more protection from degradation, and erosion. • Meet need for toilet and play facilities. • **Residential surroundings**	Noted. It is considered that the Local Plan broadly supports these objectives. However, as the Local Plan is strategic borough-wide document the Council needs to carefully consider the level of detail provided for each neighbourhood; it tends to focus on those areas that will be subject to higher levels of growth and significant change in the plan period. A more granular vision/approach for Blackheath could be prepared through the neighbourhood planning process.	No change.

			• Reduce rat running. • Plant more street trees. • Protect the historic fabric. • Promote improved energy efficiency in historic buildings, conservation areas and housing stock.		
Environment Agency	3	LEA Site allocations	**Lewisham East Area feedback** *LB Lewisham officer note: Table of sites with water management information included in original representation.*	Noted. The site allocations have been reviewed and amended to provide additional information on water management, in line with the information provided by the EA.	Local Plan amended to refer to water management in relevant site allocations.
Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LEA Para 16.4	Agree that the dominant roads are generally poorer in public realm. However, we'd like the Local Plan to note that along both Burnt Ash Road and Baring Road there are large very mature trees which line certain sections of these roads, and these need to be recognised, celebrated and protected, as it's their only good quality.	Noted. The draft Local Plan policy GR04 Urban greening and trees is considered to provide strong policy protection for trees. The details suggested for inclusion are captured in the recently Grove Park Neighbourhood Plan, which has now been 'made' and forms part of the Council's development plan.	No change.
Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LEA Para 16.8	Welcome the aim to deliver the vision set out in the neighbourhood plan in relation to the proposed 'urban national park'. We'd like this paragraph to expand this point, recognising that this will bring forward a 'district' level park in an area that is deficient, to realise and maximise the beneficial use of existing Metropolitan Open Land. This should also link to the proposal 21 that was set out in Government's Landscape Review 2019, which welcomed new landscape approaches and the ideas of how connected green and blue spaces across large areas can embody the idea of urban national parks as a concept. However, being in supporting text only does not adequately provide the mechanism to realise this vision. Therefore, it should also be better reflected in Policy LEA3.	Noted.	Revised text added to reference the Council's ambition to create an integrated district park.
Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LEA Key Spatial Objectives	Objective 3 should clearly state the aim to deliver the green infrastructure-led renewal of the local centre (in line with the Grove Park Neighbourhood Plan) and a new district park on Metropolitan Open Land. The park is the defining feature of the neighbourhood that will support existing and new communities arriving as a result of intensification of redevelopment sites in the town centre.	Noted.	Revised text added to reference the Council's ambition to create an integrated district park.
Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LEA Figure 16.2	In the previous table, objective 6 as well as clause D of policy LEA1 it states that Baring Road will also be transformed into a healthy street. This is not reflected in the map on Fig 16.2..	Noted. The Healthy Streets Approach is intended to apply to all streets, in accordance with the London Plan. The East Area section makes clear the Healthy Streets Approach will be advocated on the A2212. Fig 16.2 does not highlight all streets which have been identified as a focus for the Healthy Streets Approach, rather it reflects on those streets which are 'growth corridors' identified in the spatial strategy Policy OL1 - the A2212 road is not such a corridor.	No change.
Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LEA Figure 16.2	Amend Fig 16.2 to include the Grove Park Town Centre as a healthy street, as part of the redevelopment of the centre	Noted. The Healthy Streets Approach is intended to apply to all streets, in accordance with the London Plan. Fig 16.2 does not highlight all streets which have been identified as a focus for the Healthy Streets Approach, rather it reflects on those streets which are essential to the delivery of the spatial strategy.	No change.

Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LEA Figure 16.2	This area is about enhancing the Green Infrastructure Links, and therefore the map should better communicate this, by mapping all the key parks, MOL, and GI.	Noted. A balance needs to be struck regarding the clarity of the diagram and an excess of information. We have grey-scaled the base map in order to highlight the key principles for the sub area.	Local Plan amended to ensure the base map has all key open spaces illustrated.
Lee Forum	3	LEA	Lee Green specific 3. We request that the council conduct a Detailed Area Strategy SPD for Lee Green to provide more detailed guidance about how policies in the Local Plan will apply for the Lee Green district centre as a matter of urgency. With three large site allocations at a congested and polluted junction in Lee Green it's essential that transport, infrastructure, public realm and design are planned for holistically, not in a piecemeal fashion.	Noted. The preparation of SPDs is outside the scope of the Local Plan and the current consultation. We note the request and will give this due consideration. There are many areas across the Borough where significant growth is expected. Preparing SPDs for all of them will be challenging given the Council's budget pressures and current resources.	No change.
Lee Forum	3	LEA Site allocations	Lee Green specific 4. Since the three large site allocations at Lee Green significantly increase height and density in the area, quality of design is essential. The site allocations should include much more detailed design guidance around how to build sensitively in a heritage rich, conservation area recommended area, including e.g. step downs in height to respect local heritage, maximum heights, appropriate materials, massing and articulation.	Noted. The draft Local Plan policies in the Part 2 Sections on High Quality Design and Heritage must be read together with the site allocations. The Local Plan is a strategic document and the Council needs to carefully consider the level of detail provided for sub-areas and site allocations. A more granular approach to site design could be prepared through the neighbourhood planning process.	No change.
Lee Forum	3	LEA	Lee Green specific 7. Lee Green is poorly served for bus routes to Greenwich Peninsula and Greenwich village. A local consultation has been carried out and found that should such routes be put on that many more people would choose to take the bus rather than drive there, improving active travel. We would like to see the aspiration of these two bus routes included specifically in the Lee Green section of the plan.	Noted. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. Specific contributions to transport, including local bus routes etc. will be negotiated through S106 agreements with the developer. The Council will continue to work with and lobby the London Mayor and Transport for London for improvements to bus services.	No change.
Lee Forum	3	LEA Section 06	Lee Green specific 8.Lee Green is unusually rich in heritage. We suspect this point can get forgotten because it's heritage is split between two boroughs, both of which hold separate lists of Lee Green's heritage. We therefore request that this rich heritage is recorded holistically and clearly in the local plan so that developers might plainly see it. Specifically please show on the map the locally and nationally listed buildings shown here. *Officer note: Representation includes a map of heritage assets.* Please also mention that most of Lee Green has already undergone a conservation area assessment by [name removed], the Mayor or London's heritage officer, and include a link to his recommended conservation area boundaries in the local plan, which can be found here.	Noted. Planning policies within the Local Plan only cover areas within the Lewisham borough boundary. However, the Council has been liaising with the Royal Borough of Greenwich to inform the preparation of the Local Plan and fulfil its statutory Duty to Cooperate. The draft Local Plan Part 2 policies on Heritage seek to ensure that development proposals preserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets, and require applications to submit a Heritage Statement. The level of detail and cross boundary nature of the heritage assets could be captured in the emerging neighbourhood plan for the area.	No change.
Lee Forum	3	LEA	We support the key spatial objectives on page 635 but it is unclear how they are to be translated into reality when development takes place.	Noted. The spatial objectives are expanded on in the subsequent place principle policies for the East sub-	No change.

				area, which will be used to assess planning applications.	
Lee Forum	3	LEA	Almost the entire row of buildings on north side of Eltham Road and Lee High Road and up Lee Road in Lewisham and Greenwich are locally listed with Lewisham and Greenwich councils. Two buildings are Nationally Listed Grade II (The Fire Station and Old Police Station) The entire Lee Green town centre, excluding Sainsburys, Penfolds and Leegate, was recommended to become a conservation area by (name removed) in 2019, highly respected heritage advisor to the Mayor of London (see his Seven South London Town Centres Heritage Report). Lee Neighbourhood Plan echoes this and the policy has been highly popular at public consultation. This information should all be repeated in Lewisham's Local Plan	Noted. The draft Local Plan Part 2 policies on Heritage seek to ensure that development proposals preserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets, and require applications to submit a Heritage Statement.	Local Plan amended to refer to historic character of Lee Green in East sub-area section on Context and Character.
Lee Forum	3	LEA	On a scale of 1-6 Lee Green has a relatively low Public Transport Accessibility Level of 3. It is cut into four quarters by polluted and congested A and B roads. It is not close to a train station and no proposals for transport improvements have come forward.	Noted. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies. The Council's Local Implementation Plan (LIP) sets out further information on local area projects and investment to support the London Mayor's Transport Strategy.	No change.
Lee Forum	3	LEA Site allocations	Lee Green is not identified as an area for intensification in Lewisham's Local Plan and for that reason none of Lewisham's planned Infrastructure Levy spending is planned for Lee Green. Lee Green is not allocated any spending for new schools for example, despite the proposed Leegate having over 450 units it and Lee Green having several more large site allocations in it. 450 housing units is more than the Leybridge Estate has. Yet when the Leybridge Estate was built Brindishe Lee was built to educate its children. By what mechanism can we expect Lee Green's infrastructure to be improved to accommodate the several thousand new residents planned for Lee Green?	Noted. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. Specific contributions to local areas will also be negotiated through S106 agreements.	No change.
Lee Forum	3	LEA	We've no doubt developers will try to say that distinct and well designed tall buildings can support place making, act as focal buildings that support legibility and wayfinding and contribute to the character and identity of new quarters. Saying it doesn't make it so: There is no evidence people are struggling to find their way around Lee Green or that Lee Green is not already rich in character.	The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
Lee Forum	3	LEA Site allocations	Sites 3 to 7 are in within the Lee Forum boundary and the descriptions for these site allocations need to align with the Lee Neighbourhood Plan site allocations. If not, developers will not know which one to follow. Whilst there is a good deal of commonality they are not exactly matched. We ask the Council to adopt the Lee Forum site allocations as it is to be submitted shortly, once Lee Forum is redesignated, as there are key elements missing from the council's site allocations which have already been	Noted. Neighbourhood plans are required to be consistent with the strategic policies set out in the Local Plan. Neighbourhood plans can provide policies and guidance which are additional to those set out in the Local Plan. In preparing the draft Local Plan the Council has had regard to the Lee Neighbourhood plan.	No change.

			approved locally through advanced consultation. The Lee Neighbourhood plan is now close to adoption.		
Lee Forum	3	LEA IDP	Lee Green specific 5. Lewisham's (2015) Infrastructure Delivery Plan is included in the evidence base of its local plan. It states that Lee Green's population is expected to grow by 670 people by 2033. For this reason no infrastructure improvements are planned for Lee Green. Yet its estimated Galliards proposal of 630 new homes will bring around 1700 new residents and the other 4 site allocations in Lee Green will bring an estimated 6000 new residents. The non site allocation but large Eurocar site on Lee High Road is currently preparing to make an application to build new housing as will other sites in Lee Green. Bringing non site allocation and site allocation development together, it's estimated Lee Green's population may increase by 7000 people during the life of the plan. The Local Plan says The IDP will be subject to regular review and updating over the plan period. We request that a promise of this be reiterated in the Lee Green section of the plan to reassure the community given that the current IDP is particularly out of date as regards Lee Green.	Noted. Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been revised to include the latest GLA population projections on a ward by ward basis. The Council has engaged with key stakeholders to consider the updated projects and input into the IDP, where appropriate.	Infrastructure Delivery Plan amended to include latest GLA population projections, and project lists updated to take account of these, where appropriate.
Lee Manor Society	3	LEA QD 04	An important driver of the plan is the council's desire to provide sufficient **housing** and the need to meet the London mayor's plan housing targets. This can conflict with local character which is for low-to-medium rise buildings in many parts of the borough. Approvals for **tall buildings** up to 30 or 35 storeys in central Lewisham have created canyons and overshadowing in the town centre and an unattractive street-level atmosphere. We do not want to see this approach extended to other parts of the borough – our specific concern is with the Leegate redevelopment – where it is even less appropriate with a proposed 15 storey 'signature' building overwhelming the modest crossroads. Many high-rise developments of the 1960s (rising to much less than 30 storeys) proved unsuitable for family occupation and – just 60 years on – are being demolished. We note that Robert Jenrick, secretary of state for housing, has issued a direction regarding Policy D9 Tall Buildings to ensure such developments are only brought forward in appropriate and clearly defined areas.	Noted. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The London Plan includes detailed design requirements for tall buildings, which the draft Local Plan proposes to take forward along with additional local requirements.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
Lee Manor Society	3	LEA	**East Area** It should be made clearer that the proposals are aspirational because there is already widespread concern that the plans are already agreed.	Noted. The purpose of the Local Plan and the process for preparing the plan is set out clearly within Part 1 of the Main Issues and Preferred Approaches document.	No change.
Lee Manor Society	3	LEA	**Lee Green**. The Plan recognises that this, one of the smallest district centres, has poor quality public realm and is dominated by busy roads and a busy road junction. It speaks of a hope that the proposed redevelopment of **Leegate** could provide 'a catalyst for renewal, making Lee Green vibrant, more welcoming and accessible.' (p633 para 16.7). It speaks of addressing 'the dominance of vehicular traffic at the main junction.' (p635). It is difficult for us to see how traffic can be much reduced at the junction even if London-wide proposals for Low Traffic Neighbourhoods are pursued. The Eltham Road/Lee High Road corridor will	Noted. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies. The Healthy Streets Approach is established by the London Plan and includes a wide range of measures and interventions, the specific nature of which will be considered on a case-by-case basis. The Council will	No change.

			remain busy. It is not clear in the Plan to see how these roads could be transformed into 'healthy streets.' The answer, we suggest, is to move the traffic-free hub of Lee Green some 50 yards to the south combining public space in a redeveloped Leegate with a redeveloped **Sainsbury's site** on the west side of Burnt Ash Road. The latter should also include a decently sized public square with expanded pedestrian links further west to Brightfield Road and Hedgley Street. (p658 et seq.). The design and potential height of the development needs to be handled sensitively because the site abuts the **Lee Manor Conservation Area** immediately to the west. This would leave the north side of the Lee Green junction (p659) cut off from the south. But a public path/square running alongside the river Quaggy on the car salesroom site and a public space on Osborn Terrace overlooking the Quaggy to the east of Lee Road (requiring cooperation with Greenwich borough) would go some way to pedestrianizing the north side and re-integrating the two sides of Lee Green. We support the Plan's proposal for mixed use, including housing, on the car showroom site and improvements in access to the Quaggy. Unfortunately extending a path along the Quaggy as far as Lee Road will need creative solutions because the Lee Road shops run right up the bank of the river.	continue to work with and lobby Transport for London to deliver investment in support of this approach. The site allocations for the Lee Green centre sets out requirements for public realm and access improvements, which will be considered through the site masterplanning process. These comments will be forwarded to colleagues within the Council's Highways service.	
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LEA Key spatial objectives	Page 635 Key Spatial Objective 6 in the main document refers to "transform the South Circular (A205, Baring Road) and Lee High Road (A20) into a Healthy Street". We would suggest the wording of this is altered to "adopt the healthy streets approach along the A205, Baring road and A20 corridor" and encourage the planning team to follow TfL guidance on this which is clear and unequivocal. This should also form part of the strategic planning document for the whole corridor, and form conditions of planning along the corridor, including CIL contributions to part fund improvements.	Noted. Planning conditions attached to consents will be determined on a case-by-case basis. These are outside the scope of the Local Plan.	Terminology for Healthy Streets Approach amended as suggested. Local Plan amended to refer to London Cycle Design Standards.
Lewisham Liberal Democrats	3	LEA	Lib Dem response to Lewisham Local Plan (with specific reference to the East area) The Lewisham Local plan is fundamentally a plan to build more housing, with aspirations to improve retail outlets, enhance the environment (including access to the Quaggy), protect (but not increase) green spaces and to offer community /cultural /work spaces so that more facilities are provided locally. In order to produce a healthier, safer environment for us all, it also promotes cycling and walking, wants to improve the areas around train stations, and proposes to create 'healthy streets'.	Noted.	No change.
Lewisham Liberal Democrats	3	LEA	• Two of the buildings in the borough which are going to be demolished and replaced by residential accommodation are a **hostel** and a respite centre. What alternative arrangements are being made for their clients?	Unclear which buildings are being referred. Current planning applications are outside the scope of the Local Plan. The draft Local Plan sets out requirements dealing with re-provision of specialist accommodation.	No change.
Lewisham Liberal Democrats	3	LEA	• We are told that '**Blackheath Village district centre** will build on its unique qualities as a visitor destination with a vibrant night time economy',	Noted. Blackheath's designation as a District Centre has been carried forward from the adopted Local Plan and assessed against a defined set of criteria. Its	No change

			but have residents been asked whether or not they would like this increase in footfall and noise at night?	designation as a night time economy area 'of more than local significance' is established by the London Plan. The suitability of appropriate uses within the town centre will be assessed against relevant Local Plan policies. Both the adopted and draft Local Plan include policies dealing with the protection of local amenity.	
	3	LEA Leegate	The thought of Sainsbury's and the BMW site being developed to be part of the high rise development just adds to the existing issues.	Noted. The indicative site capacities are not predicated on high rise development. They have been set using a standard methodology, which is in line with that used in the London Plan Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Further details are set out in the Council's Site Allocations Background Paper. The site capacities will however represent a step change in density from the existing character. The Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital.	No change.
	3	LEA Leegate	The London Plan and Lewisham's response are quite clear that Lee Green should not qualify as a Tall Building area. There is no evidence to change this.	The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA Leegate	Local residents and trades people are fully aware that the Lee High Road is heavily congested and polluted for large parts of the day and significant junctions such as Lee Road/Burnt Ash Road are heavily over used. This has of course been exacerbated by the introduction of the Low Traffic Neighbourhood. To build along the routes seems to be a folly: it will create homes in the air that are less polluted but their tenants will contribute, towards making those on a lower level even more polluted than they are now.	Noted. Low Traffic Neighbourhoods are outside the scope of the Local Plan. Your comments will be forwarded to colleagues in the Council's Highways service.	No change.
	3	LEA Leegate	Part of any plan should look at the refurbishment of the accommodation between Lee crossroads and Lewisham. The properties are already poor and will be made worse	Noted. The nature of this comment is too detailed for a strategic policy document.	No change.
	3	LEA Leegate	It was interesting to read the logic behind the building of Brindishe Lee School which clearly failed because of the size of the catchment area. This proposed development will need a new school on the same side of the road. With the increased intensity of traffic it would be un reasonable to ask families to cross the main roads.	Noted. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	No change.
	3	LEA Leegate	The plans need far more detail to be taken seriously. We need to be able to see the reality of proper infrastructure: Schools, play space, leisure facilities, Medical provision (GP, health centres, chemists etc.)	Noted. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate	No change.

				the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA	I note the vision in the various documents about the Plan. REVIVING HIGH STREETS Lee Green will once again become a focus for community activity and the shops and commercial space will be enhanced to serve the local neighbourhood. Leegate Shopping Centre and other town centre sites will deliver new genuinely affordable homes and workspace. Reducing the dominance of vehicle traffic at the main junction, will allow further improvements to public space in the town centre. Re-establish Lee Green district centre as a welcoming and thriving hub of commercial and community activity. Deliver public realm improvements and high quality, mixed-use developments through the renewal of Leegate Shopping Centre and other town centre sites. Address the dominance of vehicular traffic at the centre's main junction. I like the sound of the vision	Noted	No change.
London Wildlife Trust	3	LEA 01	We support these principles, especially in respects of Parts J and L.	Support noted.	No change.
	3	LEA 01	**States there will be "intensification of sites.....on Baring Road from Grove Park Station to Heather Road/Bramdean Crescent** There needs to be clarity regarding which sites would be deemed appropriate for intensification as these are not highlighted under site allocations and there is no way of scrutinising the intentions behind this principle or determining its consequences. This stretch of Baring Road includes some extremely important local facilities and buildings including: **Ringway Community Centre and gardens.** The Ringway Centre, gardens including the wooded area should be better protected from development. The gardens need to be recognised as community gardens. The historical importance of the house at the Ringway Centre as a base for activism against inappropriate development in London should be noted and the house locally listed. If the proposed road structure had not been defeated there would have been significant impacts on communities and neighbourhoods along the proposed route. The campaign reflected an era dominated by the car and large road infrastructure projects taking precedence which is in direct opposition to current thinking and of interest in the development of public attitudes and political direction. Please see: https://www.roads.org.uk/ringways **Napier House TA Centre.** Napier House should be locally listed and protected against inappropriate development.	The Local Listing process is outside the scope of the Local Plan. Buildings can be nominated for Local Listing however. Please see the council website for details. The Local Plan provides policies to protect open space and biodiversity sites. The intensification along strategic corridors refers to brownfield / previously developed land, not open space and ancillary facilities.	Local Plan amended to provide clarification on approach to intensification within this area.

			This general principle of intensification could see sections of housing demolished to create inappropriate higher/denser development - especially close to the Grove Park Local Centre this could seriously affect the open 'village' feel and give a sense of enclosure.		
	3	LEA 01	LEA1 - A c) p637 and p653 - 656 I agree the Lee Green Centre needs support. The carpark site needs regeneration. However, the car cleaning business is really important for the area and well used. This should remain in some form or another and I'd like to see this business and the people it employs protected as a regular visitor to the car wash site. The Yoga House London Studio is important for the local area and one I use - how will Lewisham protect or offer an alternative site for the yoga space if the centre undergoes renovation. Will it still have the same rent if a new building is placed on that site? Will the rent be controlled for a long period of time to ensure that the studio isn't pushed out of the area by rising/recoupment of building costs? Will the same be true for the Faction Bookshop and Rhubarb and Custard Cafe? As these are key things I and other local residents want to keep not to be displaced in the Local Area Plan. How will Lewisham Council partner and preserve these key businesses for our local area? How far will the renovations on this site go? Will they stretch as far as the row of shops on Burnt Ash Road (Leegate House)? As this is where I do my weekly shop in the SWOP market. This is a key aspect of my day-to-day life it has a huge positive impact on Lewisham (the shop owners won the Mayor's Enterprise Award) and on the environment, reducing my carbon footprint through reducing the plastic I use. Arts Network is also a great local charity and there is a grocer that supplies SWOP. Will these sites be protected/supported as above? Could the grocers be expanded to provide plastic free fruit and veg (so missing from the area? Could there be a space for a weekend market? (The local pizza van at Hither Green Station could come, as could the German Sausage van if it could be spared from Lewisham market one day!) This would be such a huge improvement for the local community. Could the wetherspoons be kept in some way but given a new modern and outdoor space? D p637 I agree with the improvement of the roads including the A205 and A20. Flower Pots	Any future application for Leegate will include non-residential floorspace and a re-location strategy for the existing businesses. The Council's Economic Development team will be heavily involved in this process and will seek to retain as many viable local businesses as possible. Flower pots are outside the scope of the Local Plan but we will pass your comments on to the Transport team. With regard to the suggested road improvements we will pass your comments on to the Transport team.	No change.

			However, I am concerned about approaches to these. The introduction of flower pots across South East London has made driving incredibly difficult for me and has increased the pollution my car has given out. I have the smallest car and engine possible and only use the car when I have to, but with friends in Peckham, Herne Hill and Brixton the alternative is three lots of public transport and a journey exceeding an hour and a half rather than a 20-minute car journey. The layering of flower pots on flower pots has made it so incredibly difficult and a labyrinthine approach to getting to even my most simple of drives. To give one particularly horrific example, I had a recent cancer scare where I had to drive to Lewisham Hospital to get a scan. The journey should have lasted 12 minutes. It lasted an hour and a half and I was late for my scan. You can imagine the mental strain of having to do that alone in a pandemic, regardless. Add blocked off roads around Manor Park which meant I couldn't get through to Lewisham High Street to get to the hospital as each way I turned was blocked off. Add turning back to go down the South Circular to try going that way to find back-to-back traffic all the way passed Lee station back to the South Circular and all the way to Hither Green Lane. And then add all the closures on Hither Green Lane to Lewisham High Street. I have never been so stressed in all my life. I am pro-environment but the emissions and traffic I have seen every day show this is not working. This is more likely to drive me out of London than stop me using my small, energy efficient car to make journeys I can't make by ill-connecting cross-town South London public transport. Burnt Ash Hill / South Circular The crossing at Burnt Ash Hill where it intersects the South Circular is incredibly dangerous. When I moved here there were no traffic lights or place for pedestrians to cross. There are now traffic lights but these have caused additional dangers to crossing the road safely. 1) If crossing to go towards Lee Station down Burnt Ash Hill, the lights never turn green across the whole road. This means as a pedestrian, in order to not spend a large amount of time waiting at the crossing most people run in the shortest of spaces between the lights changing or when only one lane is turning round the corner from BAH onto the A205. This is incredibly dangerous and more often than not people get caught out. The lights need to be green for pedestrians to cross the whole of the South Circular not just half of it at the time. 2) The area in the middle has been given a lip of concrete which is a serious trip hazard as no-one follows the path laid out by the initial improvements apart from prams. It's just not human behaviour. This way you have lots of people walking over a three inch plus lip every day, often in a hurry to catch the brief moment they can run across the road in one go. It's dangerous.		

			3) The staggered traffic light on the corner of BAH and A205 (I'd say North East?) actually makes it more dangerous for people to cross. If you'd previously been running across while the light was red for the cars on the South Circular now you have the added complication of the cars that would be turning from BAH getting stuck at that staggered traffic light. So now you are stuck between cars stopping for the traffic light, oncoming traffic from BAH while trying to run quickly before the light changes. It's a nightmare. All of this could be avoided by sending someone to see how local people use the crossing at peak morning, evening and an off-peak time before putting in these changes. It is no less dangerous to cross this road now, it's just dangerous in different ways caused by the improvements. I'd also say that during lockdown, I've made less and less of an effort to go down Lee High Street. This is 1) because of the high levels of active begging outside of the Coop and 2) because of the dangerous crossing. F, G & H - I'm a frequent visitor and orderer of Brockley Brewery on the Chiltonian Estate. It has a taproom which is tucked away and underused in the middle of an industrial estate. This seems like such a waste in terms of footfall to the site. In my mind, the garage owned by Travis Perkins on the corner of Holme Lacey and Burnt Ash Hill Road would be much better purposed as a public-facing brewery opposite Lee Station or a multi-purpose site with a Brockley Brewery and other bars/shops/butchers/greengrocers than it will ever be as an extension of Travis Perkins' timber yard (which already has an entrance less than 5 mins walk from BAH). Imagine the increased business, jobs and look of the area of a local brewery with a high street facing taproom than an extended entrance to a specialist merchant site that not many local people use. This is a local business that is underutilised and known about. It could do with some council support and a better site. BAH crossing in front of Sainsburys. It is difficult to access the shops on Burnt Ash Hill and Lee Gate House. There is a crossing at the crossroads (but not much there) and a crossing at the corner of the Sainsbury's and the wetherspoons but many people try to cross the road right in the middle from the Sainsburys exit to the SWOP shop. It would be much easier to cross safely if a pelican crossing was put there or the crossing across BAH was moved further down BAH to opposite the Sainsbury's.		
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LEA 01	**LEA1 East Area place principles**. The mixing of statement of general principles and application of principles to specific centres is unclear, scattered and confusing. As a result, no clear, coherent and unique vision for each centre emerges. See specific comments below for how this affects the Blackheath District town centre.	Noted. Lewisham's East Area comprises of Blackheath, Lee and Grove Park and as such the vision and policies for the area straddles these three areas. Nevertheless there are a number of references to the spatial qualities of Blackheath and specific place	No change.

				policies relating to preserving and enhancing the distinctive qualities of Blackheath Village.	
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LEA 01	We see **LEA1 East area principles** B, C and H as crucial to preserving and enhancing the wider setting of Blackheath, but are disappointed that there is no mention of reducing the traffic problems of the area that impinge on the walking and cycle environment and public realm, as mentioned specifically in D in relation to the A205, Baring Road and Lee High Road in the Lee neighbourhood.	Noted. The borough-wide policies address reducing car use and public realm enhancements.	No change.
Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LEA 01	Clause M of Policy LEA1. Typo, refers to north area, but should read East Area.	Noted.	Point M has been deleted as a repetition from points covered elsewhere.
Lee Manor Society	3	LEA 01 LEA 02	Suggestions are made in the Plan to 'naturalise the **Quaggy** river'. We support this idea but wonder how it can be achieved in the built-up townscape along its path in Lee. (p639 -L and 640 -F). Public space, as suggested above, at the car showroom site and Osborn Terrace could include more natural banks to the river.	Noted. Whilst river naturalisation, and particularly deculverting, may be difficult to achieve in some areas the Local Plan ambitions and policies will be the starting point for discussions with developers. Where the Council considers that river enhancements can be feasibly delivered, requirements have been set out in the site allocation policies.	No change.
Lee Manor Society	3	LEA 01	The Plan suggests a more prominent role for what it calls the **Burnt Ash local centre.** We assume this to mean the shopping parades to the west of Burnt Ash Road between Southbrook Road and the railway line and to the east of Burnt Ash Hill between the railway line and Our Lady of Lourdes Catholic church. The shops on the Burnt Ash Hill side have a run-down appearance, narrow pavements and unnecessary 'anti-pedestrian' railings at some points. We welcome any attempt to improve this area which includes the approaches to Lee station.	Noted.	No change.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LEA 01	LEA1 East Area place principles; In order for the council to meet Policy TR3 in the East area, LEA1 sections D, G and K need to state the requirement for public realm to be provided with the Healthy Street approach adopted throughout the corridor from Blackheath Village, via Lee Road, through Lee Green junction, along Burnt Ash Road and Baring Road up to and including Grove Park town centre.	Noted.	Local Plan supporting text amended to strengthen and make clear this objective in terms of implementing the Healthy Streets Approach.
London Wildlife Trust	3	LEA 02	We support this policy in respect of Part F.	Support noted.	No change.
	3	LEA 02	LEE GREEN ROPOSED DEVELOPMENT: It seems to me that Lewisham needs to take a look at what Greenwich is doing: only building eco-friendly homes; structuring the new builds taking into account the local environment - green spaces/ trees/ etc. Looking at the result of Lewisham's building policy around and near the station, nothing could be more hideous, less people-friendly or less environmentally responsible. You are at the moment creating the slums of the future. I know you are instructed to build x-number of homes but you have to find far more innovative & creative ways to do so. It's your job to do so.	Noted. The draft Local Plan is considered to set out a positive strategy for managing future growth and development across the Borough, consistent with the Good Growth policies set out in the London Plan, and the principles of sustainable development set out in national planning policy. The draft Local Plan introduces a significant step-change from the adopted Local Plan on policy approaches across a number of policy areas such as design quality, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and sustainable transport.	No change.
	3	LEA 02	Dear Sir/madam	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Lee Gate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to	No change.

			I am appalled at the changes suggested at Leegate. 15 stories for the tower blocks is too high in a residential area such as Lee where we suffer from daily traffic jams. What's more what are you thinking of at the plans to build further tower blocks on the Sainsbury site and the garage space on Lee high Rd. - another heavily congested area. All this building, if it happens will add to the very poor air quality in the area, second only to Greenwich as being one of the most polluted areas in the country.	express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	
	3	LEA 02	We write with reference to the planned development at LeeGate. We are very concerned to see the density and sheer amount of housing that is planned for this area by Galliard homes. We are very concerned at the proposed height of these blocks and tight density of the buildings in this area. We think this will have a negative impact on the aesthetics of the local area. We cannot understand how Lewisham Council can sanction this when there is no existing building at this height around locally. We are extremely concerned about the prospect of more housing in this area without the needed infrastructure to support an increase in the local population, medical needs and education to begin with. We are also very concerned at the impact this would have on the local traffic situation, which is already diabolical, in light of so many of the local roads being closed off. We would like these plans to be withdrawn and reconsidered. Also for them to be put out for proper public consultation so that as local residents we are consulted properly. We believe that any new housing must not exceed that of the existing flats in this area. We also feel there needs to be much work done to improve the infrastructure of the area. We wish to be kept updated with all developments with this proposal.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Lee Gate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The Local Plan consultation is being carried out in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).	No change.
	3	LEA 02	I welcome the proposal to develop Lee Green. However, the plans are not appropriate for the area for the following reasons - the height of the proposed buildings is not in keeping with the area - road traffic will only get worse. Eltham road is already congested and the size of the proposed development would make this worse I would also like to reiterate the importance of having local shops on the ground floor of the proposed developments.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Lee Gate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The draft Local Plan site allocations for the Lee Green centre seek to ensure that for mixed-use developments main town centre uses are retained or re-provided at the ground floor level.	No change.

			The area needs amenities. A large supermarket with parking access also needs to be maintained		
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I have read the plans for Lee Green and surrounding area and would like to express my absolute objection to what is being proposed. My reasons are as follows. I totally disagree with the height of the buildings on the plans. Lee agreed is a small community area and should not become dominated by such huge buildings that will Have very densely populated accommodation. They are way too high and it would totally block out the sky line and make the area very overpowered by huge buildings. It totally unsuitable for such a small area. I understand the need for increased b b housing in London , but this has to be balanced with sensible developments that do not impact negatively on people's lives. The proposal stated 450 more housing units. How is the local area going to cope with such an increase? With not enough amenities to meet the needs of all the people who would then be living there. Where are the schools and doctor surgeries that Would be needed to accommodate all these new residents. Increase in through traffic to an already car heavy main road. This would be Unsustainable if you introduce more residence on that scale into the area. There has been no local consultation People who live here were fully involved. Last time when St. Modwen were proposing new buildings for the Lee gate space. All local residents must be consulted, I live very close to the proposed site and this Will affect my life hugely.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within the Local Plan we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am shocked to learn that Lewisham Council might approve the plan proposed by Galliard Homes for Leegate. This plan includes 15-torey high blocks. This is a monstrous development for Lee Green, if allowed by Lewisham Council. The highest building currently in Lee Green is 10-storey. What about schools and medical services for such a development? Don't children and families in this proposed development need such services?	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	As a resident of Lee Green, I was very very concerned to see the new proposals relating to Leegate. Whilst there are some positive aspects to the plans - particularly the 'green' aspects of the proposals and the plans for public spaces - there are several other elements that will be severely damaging to the local area. My main concerns are: 1. **The height of the proposed buildings**. The illustrations of the development illustrate very graphically how out-of-keeping the buildings will be with the rest of the area. The nearest tall buildings are I believe 10 storeys high - I feel	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.

			very strongly that this new development should not be allowed to exceed that height. 2. Related to this, the proposed increase in **the amount of accommodation** will add a very large population to the locality and it is not clear how this will be assimilated by local services (such as health, education and transport). 3. The document has reassuring words about limiting the amount of parking, but it seems very clear that adding such a large increase to the population of the area, will inevitably lead to **a large increase in the number of cars on the roads locally** and can only add to the already over-whelmed traffic lights at Lee Green - particularly at a time when the Council have introduced a LTN locally in an attempt to deal with the large volumes of traffic going through the area. Whilst there is an urgent need to address the situation on the site at Lee Green, I hope the Council will ensure that these grotesque proposals do not proceed in their present form.		
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I object to the proposed plan which is too ambitious and will ruin the identity of Lee green and ignores the listed buildings and dwarfs them impacting on the light for current residents. The density is a concern there already has been too much development putting demand for the local infrastructure and this plan will triple it. The proposed plan for building so high will ruin the sky line. The 15 storey high is exceeding maximum local height by 37%. This must be reduced and kept in line. 450 homes is far too high this needs to be reduced to at least 250 and 75% help to buy or similar. Young working people are struggling to buy homes this needs to be addressed. I oppose the current plan and will be taking this further.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am writing to express my concerns on the proposed development of leegate by galliard homes. I am concerned about over development, density and the impact on infrastructure and services namely Lewisham hospital which is already over stretched and under resourced and would like to know how Galliard homes propose to mitigate against this with the increase of people in the area?	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I live at SE12 0PH I and many others believe you should add a Lidl and 1 fast food restaurant or cinema to make it better maybe a VUE cinema or Mac Donald fast food restaurant. A Lidl will be much appreciated.	Noted. The draft Local Plan makes provision for a wide range commercial uses to locate within town and local centres, including supermarkets and restaurants. However, the plan cannot make requirements for particular businesses or commercial operators.	No change.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	If Lewisham Council had the gumption, and it must be said the money given the way central government has starved local authorities, it would have compulsorily purchased this site (if it does not already own it) and built what the area actually needs - a decent state secondary school - either to	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.

			replace or extend nearby Trinity, which has to do its best on an entirely inadequate site in nearby Taunton Road. The proposed redevelopment exists solely to meet targets and make money for the council and developer. It shows no consideration for the local community, who will be negatively impacted. I have seen the proposed development by Galliard of the Leegate Centre site. Whilst the decrepit, redundant Leegate Centre should have been replaced many years ago, it must not under any circumstances be with this development. It is completely out of scale with the surrounding area, and will bring the soulless banlieues of Lewisham Way to a new outpost on the Lee High Road, where once established, we can expect a multiplier effect with similar proposals for the Sainsbury's and BMW sites. I would want to know much more about how the local infrastructure of roads, schools, medical facilities etc., already under pressure, will be supported to sustain a development on this scale. If Lewisham Council had the gumption, and it must be said the money given the way central government has starved local authorities, it would have compulsorily purchased this site (if it does not already own it) and built what the area actually needs - a decent state secondary school - either to replace or extend nearby Trinity, which has to do its best on an entirely inadequate site in nearby Taunton Road. The proposed redevelopment exists solely to meet targets and make money for the council and developer. It shows no consideration for the local community, who will be negatively impacted.	As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I would comment on the Local Plan/plans to build new homes in three locations including the Leegate Centre, BWW garage on Lee High Road and Sainsbury's Lee Green as follows: Amenities/traffic – Sainsbury's in Lee Green. It is a good local supermarket in a residential area that serves the community well. Local residents often walk or cycle to Sainsbury's in Lee Green or use the buses 178, 122, 202, 261 and 321 to reach the supermarket. I often see elderly local residents using the bus to take a short ride to the supermarket. If it was too closed it would mean that local people would need to travel further to larger supermarkets using cars to travel longer distances, increasing traffic pollution and congestion in the local area. Employment - Sainsbury's provides employment for many local people.	Noted. Much of this response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The draft Local Plan site allocations for the Lee Green centre seek to ensure that for mixed-use developments main town centre uses are retained or re-provided at the ground floor level. The allocation for the Sainsbury's site will enable the retention or reprovision of the supermarket on site. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update

			Density – If the current level of housing is to be increased in Lee Green, then a corresponding increase in infrastructure, such as schools, traffic congestion and pollution, doctor surgeries, and transport (trains, buses, cycle lanes) is required. Planned infrastructure improvements for Lee Green should be explicitly named in Lewisham's Local Plan. It is troubling that the Leegate Centre, Sainsburys and BMW garage could be built upon to provide more housing when doctors surgeries, school places, public transport etc. are already oversubscribed. As a local resident of Lee Green, parent of school age children and frequent bus user overcrowding on buses at peak times is very unpleasant and stressful. It is difficult to get local children into local schools, an increase in homes would increase demand for school places. As a primary school teacher in the local area, I am well aware that local children sometimes have to travel great distances to get to school because they were unsuccessful obtaining a place in the area, despite having named several local choices on their list. Height of buildings - The maximum height of any new buildings should be no taller than the current buildings on the sites of Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW garage. A 15-storey building would be entirely out of keeping with the area. I would want this maximum height for Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW garage sites to be included in Lewisham's Local Plan. Housing - I would want the Local Plan to explicitly state that any new development on the sites in Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW should not just be studio or 1/2-bedroom flats but would be a mix with family suitable homes (3 bedrooms). Affordable homes for families and key workers should be a priority. On the 12th of March 2021 mayor Sadiq Khan confirmed plans to prioritise key workers for new build intermediate-level affordable homes. I would want the Local Plan to state that there must be significant green and public spaces in any development of Lee Green, including Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW. In December 2020 a coroner made legal history by ruling that air pollution was sadly a cause of death of a 9 year old girl, who was resident in the local area. Failure to reduce traffic pollution levels and increasing demands on local services could again see a similar tragedy occurring. Illegal and toxic air pollution is a public health crisis for all.	requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The draft Local Plan Part 2 policies on Housing set out the Council's objectives around genuinely affordable housing, which are in line with the London Plan. It is acknowledged that the plan could provide more details around housing size mix, informed by needs identified in its Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies. The Part 3 East Area policies include additional details, including requirements for public realm enhancements in the site allocations. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I appreciate you've received a few of these by now, but as a resident of Leyland Road, SE12 8DT I wanted to add my voice to the below. TLDR version: Broadly think the Local Plan sounds great.	General support for Local Plan noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.

			Definitely want to see the Leegate centre redeveloped, but unlike the last round of the plans from St. Modwen (which seemed reasonable) the most recent proposals from Galliard feel a bit extreme in terms of density and height. Hoping this is the opening move of their negotiation strategy, rather than a proposal that's being seriously considered. The Leybridge estate height feels like it should become the maximum, but also not the norm across the development.		
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I live in SE13 5QL postcode, a 10-minute walk from Leegate. I a m very concerned at talk of 15-storey tall buildings. In my opinion, this would genuinely ruin the area. Whilst I am disappointed that it is taking years to sort out the mess that Leegate has become, and I recognise that there is a shortage of housing in Lewisham borough, I feel that anything higher than eight or maybe ten storeys would be detrimental to the locality. Tidied up, I see this area as potentially having a village feel, but if a very tall building goes up - followed by others, no doubt - then this area will become uglier and a place no-one will want to visit or care much about. There is huge potential to make the Leegate development a real asset that people want to visit; a "windy city" ambience is not wanted. Also, I feel very strongly that, whatever happens, Sainsburys must continue trading and not close - should building plans make this preferable. Please note what happened in Burnt Ash Lane, Bromley, when Waitrose shut down - for a few weeks, supposedly - and Lidl took over a year to open its new store, leaving vulnerable people high and dry. I know the circumstances are very different but plans can change. This sort of behaviour - where customers are treated badly by supermarkets - cannot be allowed. I have previously taken a keen interest in the original plans for re-development, attending presentations and talking to the planners. I hope that we will be kept informed about plans. I don't like to be cynical but I also hope that Covid-19 is not used as a handy excuse to plough on without consulting the local population who care very much about their neighbourhood.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The draft Local Plan site allocation for Sainsbury's Lee Green, LEA SA04, will enable the retention or reprovision of the supermarket on site. The Local Plan consultation has been carried out in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.	No change.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding to the Local Plan in particular on the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. It is very important that the Centre is redeveloped into a good shopping and social meeting area with new housing as well but as a local resident I do have some major concerns about the current proposals being developed by Galliard Homes which I will outline below. I understand the Council is potentially looking at 3 sites to develop, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage Site and Sainsbury. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other and	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. East Area site allocations development guidelines amended to refer to Grade II listed fire station and local listed Old Tigers Head.

			enhance the whole area. The Plan should state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. However, I have major concerns about the height of the buildings now proposed for Leegate by the current developers, Galliard Homes, as it seems they intend one block to reach 15 storeys high which far exceeds the height of any other building in the area and is fifty percent higher than the other highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - which are 10 storeys high. I think the Local Plan should set a10 storey maximum height limit for any single building planned for the Lee Green area and also state an expectation that most new housing development should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys so that the public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings which would block out light from these areas. Very tall buildings would make the area unwelcoming and unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being planned for the site. There is an opportunity now to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. But to do this any development will need to respect the proportions of the local area and not create the highrise blocks of parts of Kidbrooke Village and Lewisham town centre. It is important to note that although the existing Leybridge flats are 10 storey blocks they are set well back from the road and are situated in large green spaces which is very different to the mass of high buildings bunched closely together that appear in Galliard Homes simulated pictures of their proposed Leegate development. I believe it is essential that the infrastructure should be developed so it can match the number of new residents with increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a good size community centre for people to use and sufficient parking facilities which will be especially needed by older people when shopping etc.	The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The site allocations require that the sites are re-integrated with the surrounding street network and take account of locally listed heritage assets. Each application will be considered serparately, taking into account its surroundings.	
	3	LEA 02	Lee Green Development Area This area is already far too busy with traffic. It would be good to put right the buildings opposite the fire station but not to increase the population by adding more buildings.	Noted. The draft Local Plan must set a positive framework for managing growth and development in order to meet identified local needs, consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. The amount of development sites and growth planned for the East area is relatively limited when compared to the North, Central and South areas of Lewisham. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan	No change.

				requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	Lee Green Development proposals The emerging Plan from the Leegate pre consultation is not in line with Lewisham council's 'Draft Local Plan.' Density and height are out of proportion to infrastructure. Mass and bulk proposed which is up to 15 storeys is out of proportion to the setting of the local area. The plans also suggest additional areas which will be encompassed in the future plans. i.e. Sainsbury's, the BMW garage at Lee Green etc. without setting a clear limit of height, bulk or density. The plan does not currently explain Lewisham's budget or infrastructure improvements necessary to support the proposed additional housing. As residents of and contributors to the local community we would ask that the following is considered and is written into the Local plan prior to acceptance of planning permission. 1) Maximum height for Leegate centre to be in accordance with existing buildings and reflected in the plans and within the Lewisham local Plan rules. 2) Maximum height of other buildings to be introduced to Lee Green is no higher than the existing 4 storey Victorian buildings on Lee High Road. 3) The development rules are fixed in terms of mass, height and density for all Lee Green surrounding areas so that creeping high rise sprawl is avoided within the area. 4) The development takes into consideration and sets out the infrastructure improvements that are required. Lewisham council sets out how they will fund this with clear plans and time scales. 5) Lewisham sets out a plan for how the green space behind Eltham Road to the north side can be used to facilitate increasing levels of population, whether this area forms Parkland for use by the whole community. We really need the support of our local council and must be able to trust them to ensure that our local area is not ruined by their lack of foresight or planning and non-adherence to their own policies	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. Any planning application that may be submitted for the site will be assessed against our adopted Development Plan. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA 02	Large increases in housing need corresponding increases in infrastructure. The resulting development of the three sites at Lee Green would need an increase in the provision of schools, particularly local primary schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, transport, parking and children’s playgrounds.	Noted. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update

			The Lee Green development will have a big impact on the lives of the local residents and we would like the planned infrastructure developments for Lee Green to be explicitly named in the plan. The current transport links and other infrastructure would not support such the proposed development. The development of tall buildings such as the ones proposed at Lee Green would a hostile environment with a wind tunnel effect. These are not developments that are for families but dormitory accommodation for a more transient population. The development around Lewisham station is proof of that. We should be making new developments more human and people friendly. Lee Green has a community feel and any new developments should be on a low level fitting in with the area that exists. Developments should include play areas and open spaces, small shops and doctor's surgeries, a new primary school. Developments should build a community not a dormitory. Buildings at Lee Green should be no higher than 10 stories with lower level buildings and space between. This height should be written into Lewisham's Local Plan to ensure developers cannot exceed that limit or try to sneak higher developments through at a later stage in the planning, as nearly happened with the development of the Catford Dog Track.	The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding to the Local Plan in particular on the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. It is very important that the Centre is redeveloped into a good shopping and social meeting area with new housing as well but as a local resident I do have some major concerns about the current proposals being developed by Galliard Homes which I will outline below. I have major concerns about the height of the buildings now proposed for Leegate by the current developers, Galliard Homes, as it seems they intend one block to reach 15 storeys high (!) which far exceeds the height of any other building in the area and is fifty percent higher than the other highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - which are 10 storeys high. The new housing development should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys so that the public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings which would block out light from these areas. I believe very strongly that the Merridale flats at the top of Carston Close should not have their view obscured or their sunlight blocked out by tall buildings. Also, tall buildings would make the area unwelcoming, unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being planned for the site. There is an opportunity now to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. But to do this any development will need to respect the proportions of the local area and not create the highrise blocks of parts of	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The Local Plan is a strategic policy document and the Council needs to carefully consider the level of detail provided for each area within the site allocations. Further detailed guidance at a masterplanning level would normally be undertaken as part of a Framework Document or Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			Kidbrooke Village and Lewisham town centre. It is important to note that although the existing Leybridge flats are 10 storey blocks they are set well back from the road and are situated in large green spaces which is very different to the mass of high buildings bunched closely together that appear in Galliard Homes simulated pictures of their proposed Leegate development. I believe it is essential that the infrastructure should be developed so it can match the number of new residents with increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a good size community centre for people to use and sufficient parking facilities for residents and people when shopping etc. There are not enough school places for children in the borough of Lewisham as it is! I understand the Council is potentially looking at 3 sites to develop, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage Site and Sainsbury. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other and enhance the whole area. The Plan should state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head.		
	3	LEA 02	I have read some of the plans for Leegate and the Lee Green area and have several concerns: 1) no new buildings directly on the Lee Green crossroad or the 3 sites of interest should be above the height of the local historic buildings e.g. the Old Tigers Head and the Fire Station. 2) any buildings should be sympathetic to the original style and feel of Lee Green. 3) the density of housing should take into account the limited capacity of local schools, for parking, and transport services. Over populating the area will have serious consequences if these are not in place first. 4) the council should be careful not to set precedents which will blight planning and the quality of life in the area for years to come	Noted. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The draft Local Plan Part 2 policies on High Quality Design and Heritage seek to ensure that development proposals respond positively to local character, along with preserving and enhancing the significance of heritage assets. These policies must be read in conjunction with site allocation policies.	Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station.
	3	LEA 02	LEA2 - Lee Green district centre and surrounds An extract from the draft is as follows: "There is significant potential to reinforce the role of Lee Green District Centre through targeted renewal. It contains a number of sites, including the Leegate Shopping Centre, whose comprehensive redevelopment will significantly enhance the place qualities of the centre whilst delivering new housing, improved retail provision and community facilities. They should also deliver a complementary mix of uses, including new housing, whilst ensuring that the centre's predominant commercial and community role is maintained and enhanced".	Noted. Much of this response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The draft Local Plan Part 2 policies on High Quality Design and Heritage seek to ensure that development proposals respond positively to local character, along with preserving and enhancing the significance of	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			There are three significant sites identified at Lee Green: Leegate, Sainsbury's and BMW. When all are developed the character of Lee Green will be radically altered. While the district centre undoubtedly requires improvement it is vital that Lewisham Council ensures all three schemes are in accordance with the wording of the draft Plan: "Development proposals should respond positively to the evolving urban scale and character of the town centre and its immediate surrounds. Development should be designed to provide for an appropriate transition in scale, bulk, mass and height between the centre, its edges and surrounding residential neighbourhoods." However, while supporting the principle of these words, I am concerned how developers will be held to account in terms of implementation, especially as the Leegate proposals are already in the development pipeline and will set a precedent for the other sites. The Leegate Environmental Impact Assessment screening and scoping report submitted to the Council in March 2020 already prepares the way for buildings of 16 storeys and up to 486 dwellings, albeit as a worst case development scenario. Both figures exceed the current proposals and suggest the developers will push for taller buildings and an increased intensification of housing which is unacceptable on a site less than 2 hectares and will set a precedent for the other development sites. The tallest buildings in the vicinity are c11 storeys, to go up 16, even at the junction of Burnt Ash Lane and Lee High Road, is excessive and is not in keeping with the scale of the surrounding low rise neighbourhoods to the west and north, or with the rest of the junction with the two Tiger Heads buildings. The Local Plan should be clear on the maximum height appropriate for each of the three development sites at Lee Green and not allow these to be exceeded. It should also set maximum acceptable density levels for each site. High density need not necessarily mean high rise development and the density and building height limits are both critical information. Nevertheless, the redevelopment of the three sites is to be welcomed as long as they add amenity value and are implemented with regard to the local neighbourhood. The BMW site should be required to open up and improve the River Quaggy. All three sites should be required to included retail and commercial space at the ground floor in order to encourage active frontages on this busy pedestrian intersection. Despite the impact of COVD on retail, it is important that Lee Green remains, and is encouraged to be an improved local retail centre. The addition of c 600+ residential units on the three sites will mean that shops will be more viable and local residents, as now, will walk from Blackheath and Manor House to use them. Loss of shops and any food retail would mean increased driving to supermarkets causing more congestion. Lewisham should ensure appropriate local retail and commercial provision at Lee Green is retained in the Plan.	heritage assets. These policies must be read in conjunction with site allocation policies. The draft Local Plan site allocations for Lee Green centre will enable provision for a wide-range of main town centre uses at the ground floor level with residential above. They also require significant public realm enhancements to be delivered to support the centre's vitality and viability. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	

	3	LEA 02	Solving the Tigers Head crossroads: Traffic and better pedestrian crossings linking all 4 sides of the junction Lee Green and particularly the Tigers Head Junction are extremely dangerous and awkward to navigate as a pedestrian. I have frequently encountered cars running the Red lights and travelling across the pedestrian crossings when the Green Man is showing. This is due to a tight junction which is barely possible to turn right/left without running the red lights. The junction takes a long time to cross and usually requires a wait in the central reservation surrounded by heavy goods traffic and idling vehicles. It is essential to the local area that this junction be made pedestrian friendly and also easier for vehicles to navigate without driving dangerously. As it stands, I avoid crossing this junction with a pushchair and use businesses further away with easier access.	Noted. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies. The issues around traffic, movement and safety in the area (particularly around the junction) are recognised, and the site allocations for Lee Green require that development proposals deliver significant public realm enhancements to help address this. The Council will continue to work with and lobby Transport for London to deliver improvements in the area. These comments will also be forwarded to colleagues in the Council's Highways team.	No change.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03	I was so disappointed to learn from BetterLee Green that the consultation period is very short indeed, so proper consultation is not being facilitated by the council. Additionally such a disappointment to see that the development proposals for Leegate are again totally disproportional to the space and location. The Galliard plan is much more intensive and less green as well as fewer spaces for public than even the first St Modwen proposal which the local BetterLeeGreen community fought so hard to get amended, with the support of Lewisham council officials who listened. The amended version was much better on all accounts with no unneeded supermarket and more green and public space. There should be limited developments of green sustainable flats but focus on local amenity shops, workshops, and open spaces. It's been shown that the area is highly polluted. New the even taller high rise buildings shown in artists plans will exclude light as well as trap the traffic pollutants within enclosed buildings.. The development should go no higher than it currently is, unless an entirely green design, and should be improved to include much more greenery at ground level, Ideally keeping all the mature trees while greening up the public square. It is so ironic that Lee Green, the first area in London reached on the A20 from the M25 which sounds so green, has no connection to its name or history, although the development of Leegate offered the chance to rectify this with a green outdoor area. Lewisham council listened to the community with the St Modwen proposal making them amend their initial design on these points. Why are they ignoring all the community requests made at the time in allowing anything like the new proposal? The standards	Noted. The Local Plan consultation was carried out in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. The consultation ran for roughly a 12-week period, well over the statutory minimum 6-weeks. Much of this response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The draft Local Plan includes provisions around urban greening and green roofs, open space and biodiversity. Please refer to Part 2 policies on Green Infrastructure. Air quality is addressed in the Part 2 policies on Sustainable Design and Infrastructure.	No change.

			approved before ought to be the minimum standards and even more requested from Galliard. It is known affordable homes are needed but many of those proposed won't be affordable, but solely creating profits for Galliard without improving local amenity and communal space! In these covid times not only is the importance of green space as opposed to flats with no access to greenery known to be harmful for mental health, but the demand for them is decreasing as people with cash to invest in property are moving out of London. Additionally the inevitable result of people working from home much more, there will be even more empty former office spaces - it is these that should be converted into the needed affordable homes. Please use joined up thinking and look at quality of life for local communities which has been so important in lockdown, and halt the relentless flat building for investors with reduced quality of life for locals. The new Lewisham centre including the new roundabout is now so dense with high apartments that lack of light and green space will be the main problem for any new occupiers. And fewer post-Covid will find the main benefit to be buying there to commute into London via the train service on the doorstep. It has been shown the main priority during And post Covid times is likely to be properties with gardens or green space not the former closeness to public transport as working patterns will be changing forever. Please take on these issues and don't make the same mistake at Lee Green. And finally most importantly please ensure any new developments, apart from essential outside quality spaces, also have green roofs and green walls beneficial for biodiversity, air quality, and quality of life for residents which has been long proven beneficial. Please make the developments necessary be models of what can be achieved as opposed to repeating the same mistakes which are now completely out of date with modern life and sustainability, and connection to our living planet. Present these as minimum standards to developers like Galliard whose main aims are making short term profits regardless of quality of life for the future community and urban biodiversity.		
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding to the Local Plan in particular on the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. I also understand the Council is potentially looking at 3 sites to develop, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage Site and Sainsbury. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all	Noted. Much of this response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other and enhance the whole area. The Plan should state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. I have major concerns about the height of the buildings now proposed for Leegate by the current developers, Galliard Homes, as it seems they intend one block to reach 15 storeys high which far exceeds the height of any other building in the area and is fifty percent higher than the other highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - which are 10 storeys high. I think the Local Plan should set a 10 storey maximum height limit for any buildings planned for Lee Green so that the public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings which would block out light from these areas. This would make the area unwelcoming and unattractive. I believe it is essential that the infrastructure should be developed so it can match the number of new residents with increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a vibrant community centre and parking facilities especially needed by older people when shopping etc.	As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. The Local Plan is a strategic policy document and the Council needs to carefully consider the level of detail provided for each area within the site allocations. Further detailed guidance at a masterplanning level would normally be undertaken as part of a Framework Document or Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	
	3	LEA 02	Additionally if 630 new homes are to be developed at Leegate (and presumably with more to follow at Sainsbury's and the BMW garage once they are redeveloped) where is the infrastructure that will be needed? The local primary and. Secondary schools don't have capacity, more doctors surgeries will be needed and the transport links at Lee and Hither Geeen are over-crowded during non-COVID times and do not have capacity for many more additional commuters. The traffic is already a nightmare around Lee and the extra demands on the roads (many of which are closed off under the healthy neighbour scheme) both due to works vehicles during the development stage and then from the increased density once the housing is built will result in constant traffic jams. The intersection by the Tigers Head is a nightmare now with traffic going from the A2 to Lewisham constantly blocking the box junction and making it difficult to travel from Lee to Blackheath.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. Any major application that is submitted to the Council must be accompanied with a comprehensive Transport Assessment, and will be assessed against the existing Development Plan policies.	No change.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I would comment on the Local Plan as follows: • Density - if the current level of housing is to be increased in Lee Green, there needs to be a corresponding increase in infrastructure, such as schools, doctor surgeries, and transport (trains, buses, cycle lanes). I would want planned infrastructure improvements for Lee Green explicitly named in Lewisham's Local Plan. I am not happy for Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW garage to be built upon more intensively in order to include more housing.	Noted. With regard to density and the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Local Plan housing policies amended to include a target housing size mix.

			• The maximum height of any new buildings should be no taller than the current buildings on the sites of Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW garage. I would want this maximum height for Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW garage sites to be included in Lewisham's Local Plan. • I would want the Local Plan to explicitly state that any new development on the sites in Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW should not just be studio or 1/2 bedroom flats but would be a mix with family suitable homes (3 bedrooms). • I would want the Local Plan to state that there must be significant green and public spaces in any development of Lee Green, including Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW.	The draft Local Plan site allocations for Lee Green centre make provisions for public realm enhancements, including new publicly accessible open space. The draft Local Plan Part 2 policies on Housing set out the Council's objectives around genuinely affordable housing, which are in line with the London Plan. It is acknowledged that the plan could provide more details around housing size mix, informed by needs identified in its Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding to the Local Plan about the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. It is important that the Centre is redeveloped but as a local resident I do have some concerns about the current proposals being developed by Galliard Homes. I understand the Council is potentially looking at 3 sites to develop, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage Site and Sainsbury. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other and enhance the whole area. The Plan need to state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head.	Noted. This initial comment seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The draft Local Plan Part 2 policies on High Quality Design and Heritage clearly set out that development proposals must respond positively to the site context, including local character. The plan must be read as a whole.	Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03	I will focus my comments on one area and that is the proposals for growth in Lee and specifically the Lee Gate centre. I welcome the regeneration of this site, being under utilised and not hugely attractive. I am supportive of mixed use development, of medium to high density, however the resulting density would need to respond to the existing surrounding context which, apart from the neighbouring point blocks of Leybridge Court Estate, is predominantly low to medium rise development and the PTAL of this area is only a 3. The outline proposals from Galliard, look somewhat blocky and the neighbouring Leybridge Court should not be the only reference point for character and height. The height of new proposals should be determined through design, but I would consider that heights in any redevelopment proposals to be a maximum of 8-10 stories and these would need to be carefully integrated and respond to the	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			wider townscape. Whilst this important junction can take some increased development, this is an opportunity to mend the urban fabric and reinstate a more in keeping street and perimeter block layout, which would integrate this currently isolated site much better into the surrounding area and be more in accordance with its previous historic form, prior to the 1960s development. Redevelopment to higher densities here would require careful consideration of enhanced infrastructure, in particular, public transport and active travel improvements would be required, (further roll outs and public realm improvements of the LTN would be supported as s106 contributions) and car parking standards would need to be extremely low or even car free due to the existing junction being likely near to or at capacity and enhanced walking and cycling facilities to neighbouring main line rail stations would be beneficial for new residents and the existing community. As part of the mixed use space, it is considered that some community uses should be included. Supportive of new housing with affordable and a good proportion of family housing.	Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding to the Local Plan in particular on the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. It is very important that the Centre is redeveloped into a good shopping and social meeting area with new housing as well but as a local resident I do have some major concerns about the current proposals being developed by Galliard Homes which I will outline below. I understand the Council is potentially looking at 3 sites to develop, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage Site and Sainsbury. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other and enhance the whole area. The Plan should state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. However, I have major concerns about the height of the buildings now proposed for Leegate by the current developers, Galliard Homes, as it seems they intend one block to reach 15 storeys high which far exceeds the height of any other building in the area and is fifty percent higher than the other highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - which are 10 storeys high. I think the Local Plan should set a10 storey maximum height limit for any single building planned for the Lee Green area and also state an expectation that most new housing development should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys so that the public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings which would block out light from	This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The draft Local Plan Part 2 policies on High Quality Design and Heritage clearly set out that development proposals must respond positively to the site context, including local character. The plan must be read as a whole. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			these areas. Very tall buildings would make the area unwelcoming and unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being planned for the site. There is an opportunity now to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. But to do this any development will need to respect the proportions of the local area and not create the highrise blocks of parts of Kidbrooke Village and Lewisham town centre. It is important to note that although the existing Leybridge flats are 10 storey blocks they are set well back from the road and are situated in large green spaces which is very different to the mass of high buildings bunched closely together that appear in Galliard Homes simulated pictures of their proposed Leegate development. I believe it is essential that the infrastructure should be developed so it can match the number of new residents with increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a good size community centre for people to use and sufficient parking facilities which will be especially needed by older people when shopping etc.	facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding to the Local Plan regarding the future development of Lee, particularly Leegate Shopping Centre. It is very important that the Centre is redeveloped into a good community area for local businesses to have affordable rent and new housing. As a neighbouring resident, I'm raising concerns about the current proposals suggested by Galliard Homes. Lewisham Council is planning to develop three sites:- The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage, and Sainsbury's. Guidance in the Local Plan doesn't ensure that all these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other and enhance Leegate. The Plan should state clearly that new developments in the area must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads. These buildings average two storeys and have a maximum height of four storeys. They include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head pub. The River Quaggy alongside the BMW site and the back of Weigall Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all as nature is very important for people's health. The work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee. My main concern is the planning of up to 630 new homes, their height and the infrastructure regarding them in Lee.	Noted. The Local Plan is a strategic policy document and the Council needs to carefully consider the level of detail provided for each area within the site allocations. Further detailed guidance at a masterplanning level would normally be undertaken as part of a Framework Document or Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Much of this response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. When a planning application is submitted for any of the 3 sites within Lee Green a comprehensive Construction Management Plan will need to be submitted, and assessed by the Council to minimise disruption. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements	Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			The proposed height of the new buildings in the Leegate development by Galliard Homes, is I proportional to existing buildings and the current structure. Their proposed block heights will reach 15 storeys high, which far exceeds the height of any other building in the area and is fifty percent higher than the other highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - they are 10 storeys high. Any new Local Plans should set a 3-storey maximum height limit for any single building planned for the Lee Green area. It should also state an expectation that most new housing developments should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3-storeys. This will ensure public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings, overcrowding and helps to ensure safety. Tall buildings reduce natural light in surrounding areas - may I see a light study test please? Very tall buildings will make the area unwelcoming, unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being planned for the site. With up to 630 new homes, this increases crime and shall place a big burden in already over-subscribed services such as schools, GPs and hospitals. Most trains do not run very frequently and most mornings (prior to lock down) it was impossible to fit into an overly crowded train carriage. The amount of new people into Lee will place a burden on services. How is the building work, particularly large lorries, gas and electrical digging, going to affect local residents? With Local roads closed off and traffic congestion, particularly school runs, this is going to exasperate traffic standing still and poor air quality. There is an opportunity now to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. Developments need to respect the proportions and community feel of the local area and not create the highrise blocks of parts of Kidbrooke Village and Lewisham town centre. I believe it is essential that the infrastructure should be developed so it can match the number of new residents with increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a good size community centre for people to use and sufficient parking facilities which will be especially needed by older people.	etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	We have read the plans for developing the Leegate site and as very longterm residents in the local area would like to offer the following comments 1. Further development on the Leegate site (and possibly later also the Sainsburys and BMW sites) should be permitted. But NOT to 15 storeys in height. The maximum height should be 10 storeys, as on the neighbouring Leybridge Estate.	Noted. Much of this response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			2. There should also be the return of the short line of small shops along Burnt Ash Road which were demolished when Sainsburys was built. The loss of some Sainsburys parking could easily be compensated by Sainsburys' huge underground car park. This half-dozen small shops would help to return the 'town-centre' feel to Lee Green, which has been lost in recent years, and is clearly featured in 20th century photographs of Lee Green. 3. If the target of 600+ new housing units is to be pursued (and these homes may well be needed), it is essential that expanded education, health, and transport and parking provision is built into the development plan.	Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03	I have been made aware of the latest plan for the development of LEEGATE, which is directly adjacent to where I live, in Burnt Ash Road, SE12 8RF. Local neighbours have drawn up a response (we were given just 2 days to respond – not very long at all.) I agree with every single point made in this response, which comprises 5 paragraphs, and is regarding the 3 sites mentioned in the Plan, the past good development of the River Quaggy, the height of the proposed buildings (15 storeys high(), and the necessity of infrastructure to support the massively increased housing here. I will therefore not repeat what has been written to you, as I support all of it. I do want to stress that I am most concerned about the height of the proposed housing – 15 storeys is totally out of keeping with this Lee Green area - the highest building at present being 10 storeys high; and parking. Parking here is nearly impossible at present. And while the demolition and building is progressing, it will be totally impossible, as a large car park will be demolished. After completion, where will the new owners/tenants park? I am pleased that Leegate is to be dealt with, after all these years of dereliction, but fear what the new development is going to look like, and how very crowded this area will then be. I have lived here since 1943, with the exception of about 5 years in Brockley, so I remember what Leegate looked like before the shops were demolished and the current (now empty) buildings erected.	Noted. Much of this response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am horrified by the local plan in respect of the proposal that the Leegate centre, the Sainsbury's site, and the BMW site should be targeted for high rise flats densely populated offering low quality Homes. The high-rise building that exists at the Lee gate centre has always looked out of place, is an eye site and overly high in comparison to the surrounding older buildings which are much more in keeping with Lee Green. Our feedback to the Lee forum was that we wanted the area to improve not go further downhill.	Noted. With regard to densities and the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. With regard to access to public transport we appreciate that Lee Green is not Lewisham and as such the densities of site allocations have been reduced to reflect the hierarchy of centre.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			Why is the council putting forward a proposal to denigrate where we live? Why are your expectations for our community so low? Why doesn't the local plan focus on infrastructure improvements, amenities improvements, safety improvements? Lee Green is not Lewisham. It does not have hundreds of buses. It does not have multiple trains every hour going direct to multiple London destinations. It does not have a DLR or underground station no are any of these things likely to come to Lee Green based on the councils total Phalia in this area over the last 25 years. Given TfL's plans for reducing the quality of the Lee train service (i.e. to remove all direct trains to London Bridge forcing everyone to change at Hither Green) the idea of adding so many extra homes is ludicrous. The current residents of the existing high-rise buildings rely extensively on cars due to poor public transport. Where will all the extra cars go? The triangle of roads formed by the South circular Burnt ash Road and Eltham Road are already congested and the pollution has already killed one little girl. How does this plan in any way support the reduction of traffic pollution or the encouraging of cycling? The focus should be on building homes with each one having some private outdoor space (garden, decent balcony). Human beings need access to outdoor space. One would've thought that the pandemic would've shown you the importance of individual outside space. Why does the Lewisham plan persist in a development approach which has already been shown to damage both the mental and physical well-being of its residents? We don't want mass produced low-grade ugly housing forced on us. Nobody wants to live in a rabbit hutch or rely on dirty unsafe elevators to reach their homes. Where in the local plan don't you give any consideration to the safety of the residents? How many women will be attacked on their way home into these high-rise monstrosities? How many will be too many? Come on Lewisham raise your game. Lee and Lee Green already have some really lovely independent shops in the Lee gate centre and the surrounding area. We do not want chain stores selling cheap (because they rely on child labour and cheap labour from abroad) products which do not last.	With regard to car use the London Plan sets out targets for 90% of all trips in inner-London to be made by sustainable modes by 2041. As such all new development will be car-free or car-'lite' with minimal parking to discourage car use. The draft Local Plan takes forward the London Plan housing design standards, including for outdoor amenity space. We do not agree with your characterisation of new development within Lewisham. With regard to policies on improving access to green spaces please refer to draft Local Plan Part 2 on Green infrastructure. With regard to policies on sustainability please refer to draft Local Plan Part 2 on Sustainable design and infrastructure. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	

			This is Lee Green not Lewisham. The two locations are very different. Why doesn't the local plan include introducing a large green? It is after all Lee Green. The densification of the Lee gate centre with any green area above ground level being invisible to local residents/users of the Lee gate centre is unimaginative and suggests a lack of diversity in the team. I am against the proposal to build 630 homes at the Lee gate centre. I am against the proposal to build high rise flats all the way around the Leegate centre. I am against the proposal to turn Sainsbury's into another high-rise monstrosity. I see nothing in the plan that shows you have integrated The need to create an environment which is safe for women at all hours of day and night whether they are out socialising or travelling to and from work. I see nothing in the plan that promotes individual and community well-being through the increasing of green spaces which are accessible by all and through the development of homes which allow the residents the dignity of having some individual private outside space. I see nothing in these proposals to indicate you have taken any account of the need to reduce pollution nor to increase the safety of cycling or indeed to improve public transport links for Lee Green and Lee. In summary the local plan shows you haven't listened to local residents at all.		
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03	I understand that we can write to you with comments on the Galliard Leegate development plans. Please see my comments below. Whilst I am supportive of new housing I have serious concerns about the height of the proposed development. Galliard Homes are proposing building up to 15 storeys high, exceeding maximum existing local height by 37%. This is far too tall and will drastically change the feel of the area which has locally and nationally listed buildings which are much smaller. The galliard homes should be no taller than the existing leegate Centre. Allowing Galliard to build at 15 stories would also set a precedent for developers wanting to redevelop the Sainsburys and BMW sites, who would think they could also exceed existing local height by 37%. I am also very concerned about the lack of infrastructure locally for all of these new homes. Where will this be	Noted. Much of this response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	No change.

			funded from? If the Sainsburys and BMW garage sites are developed to similar density as Galliards proposed Leegate plans, demand for local infrastructure will be tripled. There must be adequate additional schooling, transport and Nhs services provided for all of these new homes.		
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I have looked at the 3 areas designated under this plan, namely Leegate, Sainsbury's and the car dealers all of which appear to be scheduled for demolition. This would appear to be a very long, noisy, dusty project whether taking the whole area or one section at a time, rather ironic in view of all the road closures in the area to improve air quality. There are also the problems of already being a very busy traffic junction before the increase in vehicles to the building proposals is taken into account, a terrible wind corridor with many umbrellas lost each year (which will be exacerbated due to the height of the new buildings) and depreciation of the surrounding properties, both by lack of privacy and noise pollution. Just look at how long the building works by Lewisham Station/Loampit Vale have taken under the Regeneration project of 2000 (?) and still the chicken boxes continue to be built along that road. How many storeys high and percentage of affordable/social housing are also ongoing issues at Lee - we all know now that developers' put down the percentage necessary to obtain planning permission which is removed to a token when building commences (due to increased costs not previously factored into the calculations!)..... On a more practical note, I do hope a supermarket provision with parking will remain throughout or the 'new' one will lose a lot of trade by people having changed habits over a period of deprivation.	Noted. If and when a planning application is submitted for any of the 3 sites within Lee Green a comprehensive Construction Management Plan will need to be submitted, and assessed by the Council to minimise disruption. The draft Local Plan sets a strategic target for 50% of new homes to be for genuinely affordable. The percentage of affordable housing approved at the planning stage is agreed within a legally binding S106 agreement. We are not aware of any development in Lewisham where this legal agreement has been breached. Draft Local Plan Site allocation 4 Sainsbury's Lee Green includes the requirement for main town centre uses, which could accommodate the re-provision of a supermarket.	No change.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	Employment Leegate – 570m2 currently with 36 homes and capacity for approximately 500 FTE jobs in retail and offices Sainsbury – 500m2 currently no homes and approximately 200 FTE jobs in retail BMW site – 230m2 currently no homes and capacity for approximately 20 FTE jobs in retail and industrial Schemes that have been considered by the council for these sites all put at risk all of the actual and potential employment on these sites. Leegate applications made by, and discussions with, St Modwen and, more recently, Galliard have had ever decreasing space for employment opportunities. The draft Plan says "re-establish Lee Green district centre as a welcoming and thriving hub of commercial and community activity" but the talks with Galliard recently make no indication of this commitment by	Noted. Much of this response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The draft Local Plan Part 2 policies on High Quality Design and Heritage clearly set out that development proposals must respond positively to the site context, including local character. The plan must be read as a whole. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local	Local Plan Part 2 policy on High Quality Design amended to refer to building to a human scale as a design principle. Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			the council. The draft Plan also says the council will "introduce stronger protections for employment sites, so they remain in business use" but the Galliard proposals indicate that the council have no intention of keeping to this principle either. The other two sites (Sainsbury and BMW) have never had any residential use so the only protection for the 220 FTE jobs is in the draft Plan principle that would "enable the mixed-use redevelopment of some sites for new workspace and housing - but only where there is no loss of business space". It appears that the Galliard Homes proposal is allowed to play the trump card of "1,667 new homes a year" that allows all other considerations being ignored – height, bulk, employment, heritage, density. Heritage and local character The area around Lee Green often falls outside the narrow definition of "heritage" but its 20th century heritage of interwar housing, neighbouring early Conservation area, post war developments (Leybridge Court, residential infill and early shopping centre) give the area a special "heritage". The Leegate Centre as well as the Sainsbury and BMW site contribute to that mixed local character. Encapsulating the rapid expansion and development of the twentieth century within a small space shared with much older buildings and a major junction of the A20 arterial road. The close proximity to the significant Leybridge Court Estate (and later Millford Tower) along with an example of a very early (1970s) Conservation Area (Lee Manor) and high quality interwar development of the Crown lands of Eltham Palace make this a special place. The Quaggy River, along with its culverted tributaries, are testament to both Lee Green's more ancient past and its future potential as a cultural and bio-diverse centre. The Leegate Centre is an eyesore. But this is the fault of the recent owners. A much smaller investment could revive the shopping centre as an employment hub for local people, a cultural centre, contribute to the successful retail District Centre and could even accommodate more homes. It appears that the Galliard Homes proposal is allowed to play the trump card of "1,667 new homes a year" that allows all other considerations being ignored – height, bulk, employment, heritage, density. Tall buildings and bulk I would echo an answer given on Commonplace regarding the height of new buildings at Lee Green District Centre: I am also worried that there is no mention of building to human scale, with generous public realm, set-backs and articulations to reduce any sense of scale. I would like all these details spelled out in policies and site allocations Here is the kind of text I would like to see included (taken from Hounslow's Great Western Corridor Masterplan and	Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	

			Capacity Study 2019) “Where the height differential between areas with different height approaches is more than two storeys, the abrupt change in height creates an imbalance and breaks the coherence of the urban fabric’’. ‘’Higher development may feel domineering and undermine the integrity of buildings with lower height’’. ‘’Generally heights should overcome strong height differentials through the stepping down of development at the interface with public realm’’. ‘’Buildings may have one or two set-back storeys behind the main frontage. Due to their limited visibility from the street space set-back storeys have little impact on the perceived building height or enclosure of the street space’’. ‘’The approach is to promote mid-rise buildings rather than very tall buildings, as they will be better able to avoid or limit harm to heritage assets’’. ‘’There will be occasions where a tall or bulky development of a certain scale is simply unacceptable due to the potentially destructive effects on the setting of heritage assets’’. ‘’The higher a building, the greater will be its propensity for harm, fuelled by developer ambition rather than any genuine pressing economic, regenerative or environmental driver’’. I would also like to see this kind of wording from Historic England's Tall Building guidance included in Lewisham's Local Plan ''There will be some locations where the existing qualities of a place are so distinctive or sensitive that new tall buildings will cause harm regardless of the perceived quality of the design'' and that ''conservation area appraisals identify areas of increased sensitivity to tall buildings''		
	3	LEA 02	I live in the eastern part of the borough and I am especially concerned about the site allocations in Lee Green (District Centre) and at Lee Station (Local Centre) Note: This area is not called Burnt Ash. Locally it is sometimes called Lee and sometimes called Lee Station – the area sometimes called Burnt Ash is likely to be found somewhere around the top of Burnt Ash Hill. The Chiltonian Industrial Site can only be accessed from Manor Lane and this is not in this Local Centre. These types of error on a local planning document is very disheartening to find as it indicates a poor understanding of the area by officers and/or consultants.	The name Burnt Ash is simply being used to distinquish appropriately between Lee Gate and other areas and references the principle north south road running through it. The naming of Burnt Ash centre is consistent with the previous Local Plan.	Local plan amended to remove reference to Chiltonian Industrial Estate.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I would comment on the Local Plan as follows: • Density - if the current level of housing is to be increased in Lee Green, there needs to be a corresponding increase in infrastructure, such as schools, doctor surgeries, and transport (trains, buses, cycle lanes). I would want planned infrastructure improvements for Lee Green explicitly named in Lewisham's Local Plan. I am not happy for Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW garage to be built upon more intensively in order to include more housing. • The maximum height of any new buildings should be no taller than the current buildings on the sites of Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW garage. I would want this	Noted. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Local Plan housing policies amended to include a target housing size mix.

			maximum height for Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW garage sites to be included in Lewisham's Local Plan. • I would want the Local Plan to explicitly state that any new development on the sites in Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW should not just be studio or 1/2 bedroom flats but would be a mix with family suitable homes (3 bedrooms). • I would want the Local Plan to state that there must be significant green and public spaces in any development of Lee Green, including Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW.	Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The draft Local Plan Part 2 policies on Housing seek that developments provide a mix of housing tenures and sizes. It is acknowledged that the plan could provide more details around housing size mix, informed by needs identified in its Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Given the urban nature of the sites in Lee Green and the need to optimise the use of available land to respond to London's housing crisis it not possible to include significant, large open space – however each scheme should provide adequate public and private amenity space.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	Thank you for consulting on your Local Plan. I see that the plan envisages redevelopment of the Leegate shopping centre and the Sainsburys and BMW garage sites. I appreciate that there are demands to provide new housing across LBL and do not object to this in principle for these sites. That said any development needs to be in keeping with the existing built environment. In particular buildings should be of a similar height to those already in the area. This is mainly low rise residential with the exception of the Leabridge estate where the tower blocks are some 10 storeys high. Ten stories would seem to be a reasonable cap for this part of the Borough. Additionally the Leabridge estate has significant green areas around the blocks so providing a people friendly environment. Any new development should replicate this spacing /density as far as possible. Also the Leabridge estate is set a distance back from the road ways which avoids a canyoning effect. The local plan should include strict requirements about the effect of tall buildings on wind and sunlight. There is not much point having open spaces which are rarely in sunlight and act as wind tunnels. The two listed buildings on the north side of Eltham Rd/Lee High Rd are of 3/4 storeys and their value will be diminished if they are overshadowed by very tall buildings. The plan should address this point with height restriction s of 10 floors. The junction at Lee Green is already very heavily congested. This is often caused by buses stopping to pick up on the southbound side of Burnt Ash Rd (opposite Sainsburys) which creates a back up of traffic across the lights. As part of any redevelopment a pull in for buses should be created on the east side of Burnt Ash road and preserved on the west side. The development should be as car free as possible with no street parking permits being granted. This is reasonable as the site is close to bus links and within walking distance of two railway lines. These	Noted. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. With regard to car use the London Plan sets out targets for 90% of all trips in inner-London to be made by sustainable modes by 2041. As such all new development will be car-free or car-'lite' with minimal parking to discourage car use. The remainder of the comment seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			infrastructure concerns should be explicitly covered in the plan. The cgi images provided in support of development proposals show very heavily massed and tall buildings completely out of character with the local surroundings. The plan should allow for redevelopment with is more sympathetic in style/size/configuration to its surroundings. This should also include the green environment. New developments should not be required simply to improve on the intensity and diversity of wildlife on the site in question but should be required to at least match that of their surrounding neighbourhood. This requirement should be included in the plan.		
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03	I have seen some of your proposals for a local Plan and have heard something of the Galliard Homes proposals for the Leegate site, though these last have not been published, still less been the subject of any public consultation. In the light of this we have the following comments : - GENERAL 1. We are concerned that the Council's draft plan appears to give too much latitude to developers in the area around the LeeGreen road junction. It looks like an invitation to excessive development there. 2. We do not want to see a forest of high buildings there which would not be appropriate for the site. Lee Green is not a genuine "town centre", unlike Lewisham; it is more akin to a village centre. The buildings of Leybridge Court provide a misleading comparator. They are well spaced and well set back from the roads and the rest of the surrounding area.We suggest that 10 storeys should be the maximum with any such blocks set back from the roads, with most buildings significantly lower. 3. The potential for very substantial numbers of new housing units would be likely to lead to unreasonable pressure on local infrastructure and community services. For example schools, health and community facilities, traffic and parking.	Noted. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding to the Local Plan in particular on the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. It is very important that the Centre is redeveloped into a good shopping and social meeting area with new housing as well but as a local resident I do have some major concerns about the current proposals being developed by Galliard Homes which I will outline below. I understand the Council is potentially looking at 3 sites to develop, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage Site and Sainsbury. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites are	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			developed in ways that link up with each other and enhance the whole area. The Plan should state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. However, I have major concerns about the height of the buildings now proposed for Leegate by the current developers, Galliard Homes, as it seems they intend one block to reach 15 storeys high which far exceeds the height of any other building in the area and is fifty percent higher than the other highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - which are 10 storeys high. I think the Local Plan should set a10 storey maximum height limit for any single building planned for the Lee Green area and also state an expectation that most new housing development should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys so that the public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings which would block out light from these areas. Very tall buildings would make the area unwelcoming and unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being planned for the site. There is an opportunity now to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. But to do this any development will need to respect the proportions of the local area and not create the highrise blocks of parts of Kidbrooke Village and Lewisham town centre. It is important to note that although the existing Leybridge flats are 10 storey blocks they are set well back from the road and are situated in large green spaces which is very different to the mass of high buildings bunched closely together that appear in Galliard Homes simulated pictures of their proposed Leegate development. I believe it is essential that the infrastructure should be developed so it can match the number of new residents with increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a good size community centre for people to use and sufficient parking facilities which will be especially needed by older people when shopping etc.	Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	The emerging Plan from the Leegate pre consultation is not in line with Lewisham council's 'Draft Local Plan.' Density and height are out of proportion to infrastructure. Mass and bulk proposed which is up to 15 storeys is out of proportion to the setting of the local area. The plans also suggest additional areas which will be encompassed in the future plans. i.e. Sainsbury's, the BMW garage at Lee Green etc. without setting a clear limit of height, bulk or density. The plan does not currently explain Lewisham's budget or infrastructure improvements necessary to support the proposed additional housing.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			As residents of and contributors to the local community we would ask that the following is considered and is written into the Local plan prior to acceptance of planning permission. 1) Maximum height for Leegate centre to be in accordance with existing buildings and reflected in the plans and within the Lewisham local Plan rules. 2) Maximum height of other buildings to be introduced to Lee Green is no higher than the existing 4 storey Victorian buildings on Lee High Road. 3) The development rules are fixed in terms of mass, height and density for all Lee Green surrounding areas so that creeping high rise sprawl is avoided within the area. 4) The development takes into consideration and sets out the infrastructure improvements that are required. Lewisham council sets out how they will fund this with clear plans and time scales. 5) Lewisham sets out a plan for how the green space behind Eltham Road to the north side can be used to facilitate increasing levels of population, whether this area forms Parkland for use by the whole community. We really need the support of our local council and must be able to trust them to ensure that our local area is not ruined by their lack of foresight or planning and non-adherence to their own policies.	The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I have recently read of the plans for the development of the Leegate Centre at Lee Green and the potential for development on the current Sainsbury's site and BMW site. This plan is not in line with the council's own 'Draft Local Plan'. 1. The proposal includes 15 storey blocks on the current Lee Green/Leegate site which is 37% higher than the blocks further down Eltham Road. The Mayor of London's planning policy states that tall buildings should only be built in places with transport links and other infrastructure that can support them. Lewisham has already explicitly excluded Lee Green from its Tall Building opportunity areas in its draft Local Plan. Tall buildings are expressly against the wishes of the community in the Lee Neighbourhood plan which has been widely consulted on. The development at the Leegate site should not be higher than it currently stands. 2. The Sainsbury's site and BMW site should be kept at heights of the Victorian buildings that surround them - certainly no higher than the three storeys of the Tigers Head, houses on Lee High Road and the Victorian villas on Burnt Ash Hill. This maximum height needs to be written into the Lewisham Local Plan for certainty.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			3. The creeping high rise sprawl that has occurred at Kidbrooke and Lewisham must be avoided in this residential and historic area. Therefore, the development rules should be fixed in terms of appropriate mass, height and density (see points 1 and 2 above) for all Lee Green surrounding areas. 3. Local infrastructure will not support development at this scale. Two trains an hour have already been cut from Lee Station and (out of lockdown) the trains are packed at rush hour; it is difficult to get on to the packed trains from Lee Station or Hither Green station at morning rush hour or on trains to these destinations from Waterloo or London Bridge at rush hour. Since the implementation of the LTN (much needed), the main roads are extremely congested (even in lockdown and we await to see the increase in traffic on the main roads after lockdown); this obviously has an impact on the length of bus journeys. The local schools are at capacity. It is nigh on impossible to get an appointment at local GP surgeries and the waits in Lewisham A&E are already untenable. I hope that residents can trust the local authority to honour their views and take account of the Lee Neighbourhood Plan	As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding to the Local Plan in particular on the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. It is very important that the Centre is redeveloped into a good shopping and social meeting area with new housing as well but, as a local resident, I do have some major concerns about the current proposals being developed by Galliard Homes. I understand the Council is potentially looking at three sites to develop, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage site and Sainsbury. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other and enhance the whole area. The Plan should state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. However, I am concerned about the height of the proposed new buildings. The three blocks of flats on the Leybridge Estate are 10 storeys but one of the proposed buildings will be 15 storeys, a 50% increase in height and far exceeds buildings in the surrounding area. I think the Local Plan should set a 10 storey maximum height limit for any single building planned for the Lee Green area and also state an expectation that most new housing development should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys so that the public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The draft Local Plan Part 2 policies on High Quality Design and Heritage clearly set out that development proposals must respond positively to the site context, including local character. The plan must be read as a whole. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			array of high buildings which would block out light from these areas. Very tall buildings would make the area unwelcoming and unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being planned for the site. Also, on past research carried out by various groups, the pollution level at the cross roads is many times higher than the European recommended rate and higher buildings will make that worse as will the increase in traffic. Parking on local streets will also cause problems for residents living in the immediate vicinity. There is an opportunity now to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. But to do this any development will need to respect the proportions of the local area and not create the highrise blocks of parts of Kidbrooke Village and Lewisham town centre. It is important to note that although the existing Leybridge flats are 10 storey blocks they are set well back from the road and are situated in large green spaces which is very different to the mass of high buildings bunched closely together that appear in Galliard Homes simulated pictures of their proposed Leegate development. It is essential that the infrastructure should be developed so it can match the number of new residents with increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a good size community centre and sufficient parking facilities which will be especially needed by older people when shopping etc.	As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	Lewisham Local Plan Consultation - Leegate, BMW and Sainsbury Development. Regarding the Lewisham Local Plan Consultation any development plan proposals should not include any buildings higher than the surrounding area and should provide local amenities and local infrastructure needed to support increases in population.	Noted. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	Leegate, Sainsbury & BMW development proposal Traffic:- Since the introduction of the current Low Traffic Neighbourhood scheme the current roads, particularly in this area are unable to cope with the filth pollution and traffic jams created. You cannot cycle everywhere and the public transport system is atrocious in south London. People therefore need to use cars particularly the old snd disabled. The current roads can't cope and adding significantly more homes will exacerbate the problem.	Noted. Low Traffic Neighbourhoods ae outside the scope of the Local Plan. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	No change.

			Schools, doctors, hospitals. How many new schools, doctors surgeries and hospital beds are you intending to create? Trying to register at a doctors, find a school place or get seen at a hospital in this area is impossible.		
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	As a local resident (SE12 8NU) I am writing concerning the local plan for Lee Green and Leegate. I am very concerned that the three sites in this area not be overdeveloped. Any development on the Sainsbury's site should not exceed the height of the existing buildings adjacent to the site, or the Old Police station. This is also true of the BMW garage site where any new structure should not exceed the height of the Old Tiger's Head and adjacent buildings. On the Leegate site the redevelopment should not exceed the height of the current buildings on that site. Sufficient parking should be made available for the new properties and shoppers. The building of genuinely affordable family homes should be prioritised over high density housing. Due consideration should be given to the surrounding infrastructure - roads, schools, GPs, parking and public spaces and the number of new homes limited accordingly. Any redevelopment needs to enhance the character of the area rather than change it beyond recognition as has happened in Lewisham. Proper consultation with existing residents of the area should take place.	Noted. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The Local Plan sets out a policy of a strategic target of 50% affordable homes	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding to the Local Plan in particular on the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. In my opinion it is very important that Leegate Centre is redeveloped into a thriving attractive and welcoming shopping and social meeting area catering for residents well-being alongside new housing. As a local resident I do have some major concerns about the current proposals for the development by Galliard Homes which I will outline below. I understand the Council is potentially looking at 3 sites to develop, the Leegate Shopping Centre, the BMW garage site and the Sainsbury site. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites are developed in a cohesive and linked way in order to enhance the whole historic area of Lee Green. The Plan should state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit alongside and complement existing older buildings at the Lee Green cross roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. It would be a main feature of the plan to ensure that the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigall Road playing fields is opened up with pedestrian access and pathways for all. The work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has been effective in developing some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the LeegGate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The draft Local Plan Part 2 policies on High Quality Design and Heritage clearly set out that development proposals must respond positively to the site context, including local character. The plan must be read as a whole. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			work should continue and now be of benefit to the residents of Lee. I have major concerns about the height of the buildings proposed for Leegate by Galliard Homes. The plans suggest blocks of flats to reach 15 storeys high which by far exceeds the height of any other building in the area and is fifty percent higher than the highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - which are 10 storeys high. I think the Local Plan should state an expectation that most new housing development should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys in order to facilitate walking, sitting and shopping in pleasant landscaped public areas. Very tall buildings are overbearing, they block out light and create wind tunnels. This makes areas unattractive, undesirable and unwelcoming and could deter people from shopping or meeting and using planned local facilities. A congestion of towering flats and the very busy and polluted junction and feeder roads would in my opinion only attract loitering and encourage anti-social activities. There must be a maximum height limit set for this development. There is an opportunity to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. In order to do this any development will need to respect the proportions of the local area and not create a ghost town of highrise blocks as seen in parts of Lewisham town centre. It is important to note that although the existing Leybridge flats are 10 storey blocks they are set well back from the road and are situated in large green spaces which is very different to compaction of very high buildings that appear in Galliard Homes simulated pictures of their proposed Leegate development. It is essential that the infrastructure is developed to match the number of proposed new residents with increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a good size community centre for people to use and sufficient parking facilities which will be especially needed by older people when shopping etc.	As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03	I have just learned today of the Leegate /Lee Green proposed plans. I do have some concern that details of this have not been more widely circulated. From what I see so far, I would have concerns on the following matters: 1. Duration of the building work. There does not seem to be any timeline. This appears to be a major infrastructural development and the risk for chaos, additional traffic and	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.

			pollution over a protracted undefined period would not be welcome - nor safe - at an already very busy strategic transport interchange and residential area. 2. Increased Environmental pollution. During build and after completion with the additional proposed c.600 dwellings this would be adding further to the road traffic and numbers of cars moving generally through - in what is already an area suffering high levels of air pollution (from traffic). 3. Where are the plans for more cycling and more pedestrian-friendly areas? 4. The height of the proposed building - 15 stories - is vastly out of proportion to the rest of the locality. There is no visual of what is proposed, that I can find, but this would seem unsightly. How can this high density of housing be able to provide the space (inside and outside) to support the good mental wellbeing of those who will live there? 5. Local infrastructure and public amenities. I do not see plans for the additional schools, GP/health services and other public amenities - will there be such additional provision made to accommodate the enlarged community and within the time frame?		
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	Lewisham's Local Plan and Galliard Homes proposals to develop Leegate: 1. In the draft Local Plan, three large sites in Lee Green have been allocated for housing – Leegate, Sainsburys and the BMW garage. These sites cannot possibly sustain a high volume of housing without a corresponding substantial increase in infrastructure. How would this be effected? Where is it suggested there would be space for the required schools, GP surgeries, dentists, and all the other services required by the residents. Where would there be open green spaces, it would appear that the housing would take up all the available space. The nearby parks are already very busy. Has any thought been given to the level of pollution which would inevitably increase on the present levels? What about transport links, these are barely sufficient for the existing population , hence the reliance on cars and over recent months the low traffic neighbourhood scheme has led to an increase in congestion, delay for emergency services and resulted in more pollution. Lastly on this point is this density of housing actually required given the fact that London's population is decreasing and are flats in tower blocks the type of accommodation actually required? Is there not a need for low rise housing for young families and the elderly?	Noted. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which looks at housing needs of different groups. This has informed the preparation of the Local Plan. Further details are set out in Part 2 Housing policies.	No change.
	3	LEA 02	3. Re Timing I realise that I am commenting on the last day but due to the lack of consultation with the local community I have only just learned of this	Noted. The Local Plan consultation was held for roughly a 12-week period which is 6 weeks more the statutory minimum set out in our Statement of community involvement.	No change.

	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding to the Local Plan in particular on the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. It is very important that the Centre is redeveloped into a good shopping and social meeting area with new housing as well but as a local resident I do have some major concerns about the current proposals being developed by Galliard Homes which I will outline below. I understand the Council is potentially looking at 3 sites to develop, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage Site and Sainsbury. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other and enhance the whole area. The Plan should state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. However, I have major concerns about the height of the buildings now proposed for Leegate by the current developers, Galliard Homes, as it seems they intend one block to reach 15 storeys high which far exceeds the height of any other building in the area and is fifty percent higher than the other highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - which are 10 storeys high. I think the Local Plan should set a 10 storey maximum height limit for any single building planned for the Lee Green area and also state an expectation that most new housing development should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys so that the public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings which would block out light from these areas. Very tall buildings would make the area unwelcoming and unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being planned for the site. There is an opportunity now to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. But to do this any development will need to respect the proportions of the local area and not create the highrise blocks of parts of Kidbrooke Village and Lewisham town centre. It is important to note that although the existing Leybridge flats are 10 storey blocks they are set well back from the road and are situated in large green spaces which is very different to the mass of high buildings bunched closely together that appear in Galliard Homes simulated pictures of their proposed Leegate development. I believe it is essential that the infrastructure should be developed so it can match the number of new residents with increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a good size community centre for people to use and sufficient parking facilities which will be especially needed by older people when shopping etc.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03	I am writing with regards to the plans for Leegate in Lee Green. As a resident of Lee for over two years and growing up in the Borough of Lewisham, I have seen many changes. From Lewisham Centre, where the ever growing and influx of new build properties and high risers. To the gentrification of areas like Deptford and New Cross its looks like a completely different Lewisham. I would like the Leegate area to be a place where people can socialise and keep a community feel. The area in general lacks spaces to socialise and has many historical properties. I understand that there is a housing crisis, however I feel that building so align with what already exists. Furthermore many of these new builds claim to be affordable but are really not. It would be nice for local people to have a place to start up a small business and include their community for support. After the pandemic it will be needed to have a place to socialise after so much time in isolation. I think that our young people also need somewhere to safely socialise. This in turn could limit the amount of criminal crime that we see if under 25's. Many young people result to this because of a lack of community and productive things to do on their doorsteps. It would be great to see young and old in one space to limit any further stereotypes and prefigured and mass media publicises. These are my opinions on what I would like to see happen in my local area and the proposed plans for Leegate.	Noted. The draft Local Plan proposals broadly seek to support the revitalisation of Leegate centre to secure its future as a vibrant hub of community and commercial activity. This includes the provision of significant public realm enhancements, modern workspace and business units, and a wide range of complementary main town centre uses. The draft Local Plan sets an overall target for 50% of new homes to be genuinely affordable, with affordability linked to local income levels.	No change.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03	I was shocked to learn of the plans for the new Lee Gate Centre and the surrounding area which reached me last night with a deadline for this Sunday. The proposals show no understanding of the area, its infrastructure and traffic burden that is already thundering through it. Area: At a proposed height of up to 15 storeys, the building would be by far the highest in the area. We have seen at the Lewisham roundabout what eyesores these are likely to be. If you are going to build ugly and brutal, why make it the most visible building in the area? Why do you want to change a community by parachuting Canary Wharf type blocks? There are better ways to achieve affordable housing. You would also add a large amount of people to an area that is creaking at the seams, where a school development was blocked allegedly for lack of space. Infrastructure: The "Tiger" junction is known across London for the wrong reasons. Routine floodings, a traffic choke point, pollution and lack of educational facilities in the surrounding area mean that already with the existing amount of people, the infrastructure is creaking. Catchment areas for primary schools are tiny not to speak of secondary school. I cannot see how this fragile and overwhelmed infrastructure will absorb such a high density project.	This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process Low Traffic Neighbourhoods are outside the scope of the Local Plan. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	No change.

			Traffic: We all "fondly" remember the LTN project last year that put the community under strain. LTN was introduced by a general agreement that the area suffers from ridiculous amounts of traffic congestion, leading to pollution (we have the first casualty with "pollution" on the death certificate), ridiculous delays for traffic and a general hostility to cyclists and pedestrians. The current situation is unacceptable, adding another 450 households would be plain stupid. I would already encourage future residents to sue Galliard Homes for the damages caused by pollution on their health and properties. I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal that would make the area unliveable for current and future residents. If only in your own interest, the resale value of your properties will decline substantially once the dynamics that I have described above play out.		
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding in a personal capacity to the Local Plan in particular on the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. It is fundamentally important that the Centre is redeveloped into a good shopping and social meeting area with new housing as well, but as a local resident for over 20 years, I share a number of very significant major concerns about the current proposals being developed by Galliard Homes with many neighbours and local residents, which I will outline below. I understand the Council is potentially looking at 3 sites to develop, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage Site and Sainsbury's. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other, do not change the character of the current layout and enhance the whole area. The Plan has to state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. However, I have extremely serious concerns about the height of the buildings now proposed for Leegate by the current developers, Galliard Homes, as it seems they intend one block to reach 15 storeys high which far exceeds the height of any other building in the area and is fifty percent higher than the other highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - which are 10 storeys high. I think the Local Plan should set a10 storey maximum height limit for any single building planned for the Lee Green area and also state an expectation that most new housing development should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys so that the public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings which would block out light from these areas. Very tall buildings would make the area unwelcoming and unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being planned for the site.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			There is a great opportunity now to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. But to do this any development will have to respect the proportions of the local area and absolutely must not create disproportionately large high rise blocks - like parts of Kidbrooke Village and in Lewisham town centre. It is important to note that although the existing Leybridge flats are 10 storey blocks they are set well back from the road and are situated in large green spaces which is very different to the mass of high buildings bunched closely together that appear in Galliard Homes simulated pictures of their proposed Leegate development. The overpowering development as shown would simply dwarf the surrounding area. I believe it is also essential that appropriate infrastructure should be developed so it can match any influx of new residents with the right amount of increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a good size community centre for people to use and sufficient parking facilities which will be especially needed by older people when shopping etc.		
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding in a personal capacity to the Local Plan in particular on the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. It is fundamentally important that the Centre is redeveloped into a good shopping and social meeting area with new housing as well, but as a local resident for over 20 years, I share a number of very significant major concerns about the current proposals being developed by Galliard Homes with many neighbours and local residents, which I will outline below. I understand the Council is potentially looking at 3 sites to develop, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage Site and Sainsbury's. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other, do not change the character of the current layout and enhance the whole area. The Plan has to state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. However, I have extremely serious concerns about the height of the buildings now proposed for Leegate by the current developers, Galliard Homes, as it seems they intend one block to reach 15 storeys high which far exceeds the height of any other building in the area and is fifty percent higher than the other highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - which are 10 storeys high. I think the Local Plan should set a10 storey maximum height limit for any single building planned for the Lee Green area and also state an expectation that most new	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the LeeGate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The draft Local Plan Part 2 policies on High Quality Design and Heritage clearly set out that development proposals must respond positively to the site context, including local character. The plan must be read as a whole. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			housing development should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys so that the public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings which would block out light from these areas. Very tall buildings would make the area unwelcoming and unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being planned for the site. There is a great opportunity now to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. But to do this any development will have to respect the proportions of the local area and absolutely must not create disproportionately large high rise blocks - like parts of Kidbrooke Village and in Lewisham town centre. It is important to note that although the existing Leybridge flats are 10 storey blocks they are set well back from the road and are situated in large green spaces which is very different to the mass of high buildings bunched closely together that appear in Galliard Homes simulated pictures of their proposed Leegate development. The overpowering development as shown would simply dwarf the surrounding area. I believe it is also essential that appropriate infrastructure should be developed so it can match any influx of new residents with the right amount of increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a good size community centre for people to use and sufficient parking facilities which will be especially needed by older people when shopping.	necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding to the Local Plan regarding the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. It's great to see ideas for a redevelopment into a good shopping and social meeting area with new housing, but as a local resident I do have some major concerns about the current proposals being developed by Galliard Homes which would be detrimental. My first concern is regarding the height of the buildings I understand the Council is potentially looking to develop across The Leegate Shopping Centre. One block is intending to reach 15 storeys high which far exceeds the height of any other building in the area and is 50% higher than the other highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - which are 10. I strongly believe that the Local Plan should set a10 storey maximum height limit for any single building planned for the Lee Green area and also state an expectation that most new housing development should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys so that the public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings which would block out light from these areas. Very tall buildings would also make the area unwelcoming and unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			planned for the site, as well as deterring potential future residents on the nearby roads - I know for a fact it would deter me should I be looking in the local area. I welcome the opportunity to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16. but to any development will need to respect the proportions of the local area and not create the highrise blocks of parts of Kidbrooke Village and Lewisham town centre. Lee Green's most vibrant parts are based on the period buildings and green spaces, so it is important to respect this. Whilst the existing Leybridge flats are 10 storey blocks, they are set well back from the road and are situated in large green spaces which is very different to the mass of high buildings bunched closely together that appear in Galliard Homes simulated pictures. It's in the name Lee Green, and development should look to accentuate this - bringing a natural feel with communal green spaces that sets it apart from over-tall and overbearing concrete blocks. Regarding the BMW garage Site and Sainsburys, the plan has to ensure that all these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other and enhance the whole area. The Plan should state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. I also believe that the local infrastructure should be developed so it can match the number of new residents from schools and green spaces to sufficient additional parking facilities. We have already been known to face a rat-run in commuter times as well as intense traffic, and local residences need no more pressure on our streets.	As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA 02	Development of Lee Green I support the stand that Lee Green development needs to be limited in height and density. There are old, neglected building that must be restored and re-purposed. Plans must ensure that the quality of life for Lee residents is improved with less traffic and parking.	Noted. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding to the Draft Local Plan in particular on the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. It is very important that the Centre is redeveloped into a good shopping and social meeting area with new housing as well but as a local resident I do have some	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			major concerns about the current proposals being developed by Galliard Homes which I will outline below. I understand the Council is potentially looking at 3 sites to develop, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage Site and Sainsbury. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other and enhance the whole area. The Plan should state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. However, I have major concerns about the height of the buildings now proposed for Leegate by the current developers, Galliard Homes, as it seems they intend one block to reach 15 storeys high which far exceeds the height of any other building in the area and is fifty percent higher than the other highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - which are 10 storeys high. I think the Local Plan should set a10 storey maximum height limit for any single building planned for the Lee Green area and also state an expectation that most new housing development should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys so that the public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings which would block out light from these areas. Very tall buildings would make the area unwelcoming and unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being planned for the site. There is an opportunity now to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. But to do this any development will need to respect the proportions of the local area and not create the highrise blocks of parts of Kidbrooke Village and Lewisham town centre. It is important to note that although the existing Leybridge flats are 10 storey blocks they are set well back from the road and are situated in large green spaces which is very different to the mass of high buildings bunched closely together that appear in Galliards simulated pictures of their proposed Leegate development. I believe it is essential that the infrastructure should be developed so it can match the number of new residents with increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a vibrant community centre and parking facilities especially needed by older people when shopping etc. The plan should state the importance of developing new green spaces and improving existing ones for leisure use as more families come into the area. For example, the Edith Nesbit Gardens on Leyland Rd. provide a small but well landscaped area for people to walk and exercise dogs but the play area is in great need of refurbishment. As more young families move into the area they will need more play areas and safe green spaces for their children.	The draft Local Plan Part 2 policies on High Quality Design and Heritage clearly set out that development proposals must respond positively to the site context, including local character. The plan must be read as a whole. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	

			The infrastructure improvements needed for Lee Green's development should be explicitly outlined in Lewisham's Local Plan.		
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I agree about the need for developing Leegate and the BMW garage for housing. However, the 'tall building' clause that excludes Lee Green from developing high rise buildings is not honoured in the plans. The criteria for excluding 'tall buildings' has not changed and Lee Green remains very much a low rise low density residential area that promotes community and inclusivity. A high rise and high density building plan will be detrimental to this and to the health and wellbeing of Lee Green residents. Any plans that also increase the density also impact on local infrastructure, services and transport. There is already significant congestion and pollution in Lee Green and having tall building on 3 sides will create a stagnant pool of pollution that is against the clean air commitments being made. This is especially in relation to December's Southwark Coroner's Court inquest that found that air pollution 'made a material contribution' to the death of Lewisham resident 9-year old [name removed]. I urge Lewisham Council to consider these points and be accountable to its resident on these matters for the long term. The environment and 'community for all' should be at the heart of any development.	This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The Council acknowledges the issue of poor air quality. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am concerned about the current proposal to redevelop Leegate and the other sites on the Lee Green junction that could result in tall buildings being built in the area that are not suitable or sustainable within the community. The current proposal does not provide any commitment to increase service provision for health, education and transport. If the current proposal goes through it will set a precedent that will repeat the same mistakes that were made when Leegate was first built in the 1960's. High density building can work but only if the right infrastructure is baked in from the start. The lessons from previous failed estates are well known and Lewisham council should hold the developers accountable for creating a sustainable community. The redevelopment of Leegate is long overdue and should be an opportunity to enhance the neighbourhood.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			Lewisham council can help support the community by ensuring: 1. Maximum of 10 stories high 2. School and healthcare facilities on site 3. Dedicated cycle lanes at Lee Green 4. Pedestrian Access to River quaggy 5. Increased public green space.	The draft Local Plan proposals for the Lee Green and East area include provisions around Healthy Streets to support walking and cycling, and improving access to the Quaggy.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03	Galliard Homes should not be allowed to exceed maximum existing local height by 37% including the Sainsburys and BMW sites, which also should not exceed existing local height by 37%.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am emailing to submit my views with regards to the consultation of the draft Lewisham Local Plan. I have just been informed that Galliards Homes have purchased the site at Leegate, Lee Green which is opposite my home in Eltham Road, SE12 8ES. I am aware that Galliards are in talks with Lewisham regarding their plans for the Leegate site which includes a proposal of up to 630 new units up to 15 storeys in height. I am also aware that included in the local plan are potential new building sites at Sainsbury's and the BMW garage, all located very close to each other in the same area. I understand there is no guidance in the local plan for height limits for the Leegate site, even though the Lee Neighbourhood Plan states that "building height should be in keeping with the surrounding buildings including the building design, mass, scale and detailed design and that generous set backs and public realm are included in order to build human scale". This needs to be clearly clarified in the local plan. Also The plan needs to give detailed guidance and clear plans on future building developments within the Lewisham and Lee Green area in order to guide future developers on what can and cannot be permitted in the area. The London plan states that tall buildings should only be built in places with transport links and other infrastructure that can support them. Well clearly the team at Galliards do not live in the area as although there is transport links in place these are severely stretched to the limit and if you add a possible 630 new units (or more) it will be impossible to get anywhere on public transport. This will include more cars in the area and what with the recent introduction of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods you will be contributing to the increase of traffic along Eltham Road and surrounding areas. Increasing pollution and poor living conditions to the residents already in place. We also do not have the infrastructure in place in the area to deal with the mass	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The draft Local Plan Part 2 policies on Sustainable design and infrastructure address low and zero carbon development.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			increase on local resources, including Schooling, healthcare, car parking and shopping access. The Local plan needs to address these issues and state clearly with regards to housing intensification how it will support low carbon emissions, promote positive health for local residents impacted by the new developments, and how it will create more amenities needed for the growth in the area. It will also need to state how it will look out for current residents during the construction of these new properties with regards to noise pollution, dust pollution, access to their homes during the many years it will take to complete. I believe the maximum story height of any new developments in Lee Green should be four storeys in keeping with the area. The proposal shows that the buildings will be far too close to the main road and will take any natural light and overshadow the houses on the opposite side of the road, negatively impacting residents that already live there. There will also need to be more green areas to help with the increase in pollution that this design of buildings will create in the area on top of an already busy main road.		
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding to the Local Plan in particular on the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. It is very important that the Centre is redeveloped into a good shopping and social meeting area with new housing as well but as a local resident I do have some major concerns about the current proposals being developed by Galliard Homes which I will outline below. I understand the Council is potentially looking at 3 sites to develop, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage Site and Sainsbury. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other and enhance the whole area. The Plan should state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. However, I have major concerns about the height of the buildings now proposed for Leegate by the current developers, Galliard Homes, as it seems they intend one block to reach 15 storeys high which far exceeds the height of any other building in the area and is fifty percent higher than the other highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - which are 10 storeys high. I think the Local Plan should set a maximum height limit for any single building planned for the Lee Green area and also state an expectation that most new housing development should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys so that the public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings which would block out light from these areas.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			Very tall buildings would make the area unwelcoming and unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being planned for the site. There is an opportunity now to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. But to do this any development will need to respect the proportions of the local area and not create the highrise blocks of parts of Kidbrooke Village and Lewisham town centre. It is important to note that although the existing Leybridge flats are 10 storey blocks they are set well back from the road and are situated in large green spaces which is very different to the mass of high buildings bunched closely together that appear in Galliard Homes simulated pictures of their proposed Leegate development.		
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I was shocked to see the new plans for Leegate and the proposals to permit future tall buildings on the nearby Sainsburys and BMW sites. Whilst I support the building of affordable and sustainable new homes, and believe that Leegate has been allowed to fall into disrepair, I object to the density and height of the proposed new buildings. Please can you inform me how the current infrastructure (in particular access to schools, health centres, public open space, public transport) will be developed to support the building of up to 630 new homes. It is a blessing that planners of the past retained the heritage of the Grade II listed buildings that make up the North side of the Lee Green junction, giving the location a sense of place and character today. This heritage was destroyed on the South side of the junction. Current and future generations would value decent, sustainable and attractive homes, community services and infrastructure that enhance the character of Lee Green, rather than maximum height, maximum density blocks, with maximum profit for developers and long lasting negative impact on local people. Please do not allow buildings of up to 15 storeys on this site: it is not appropriate. None of the blocks should be higher than the nearby 10 storey Leybridge blocks, which are of much lower density, surrounded by green space, trees and hedges and not overshadowing listed buildings.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	No change.
	3	LEA 02	I do understand the need for increased housing stock. I also welcome development of the Leegate site in Lee Green, however I would like to a significant proportion of green spaces within any developments and a maximum building storey height for any future housing developments to be no higher than 4 storeys on the Leegate site in keeping with the surrounding area and for building height and density of any developments to be mentioned in the Local Plan. I would like to see a building height of no more than 4 storeys at the Sainsbury's site and no more than 4 storeys at the BMW garage site..	Noted. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

				Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. Given the urban nature of the sites in Lee Green and the need to optimise the use of available land to respond to London's housing crisis it not possible to include significant, large open space – however each scheme should provide adequate public and private amenity space.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am aware that the is a need for housing stock within London and that within the Local Plan in addition to the Leegate site, Sainsbury's and the BMW Garage which are all in close proximity to my home have been identified as potential sites for housing developments in the future. It concerns me that there is no detailed guidance within the Local Plan setting out clearly the plans for future developments within Lewisham and the Lee Green area specifically and this may allow future developers the right to build as set out in the Local Plan. If guidance is not robust and clear the impact on the Lee Green and surrounding area will be detrimental in so many areas. The infrastructure within the area does not support any extensive developments. The area is already negatively impacted by the introduction of the Low Traffic Neighbourhoods which is unfairly and dangerously contributing to increased traffic along Eltham Road and the surrounding streets. Mass housing developments will exacerbate this, resulting in huge volumes of traffic and carbon emissions which come with it, affecting the health of the residents who live in the area. In addition, huge developments will lead to an increase in car parking, shopping access, schools, along with a huge demand on public transport. We do not have the infrastructure in place to support this.	Noted. The Local Plan is a strategic policy document and the Council needs to carefully consider the level of detail provided for each area within the site allocations. Further detailed guidance at a masterplanning level would normally be undertaken as part of a Framework Document or Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Low Traffic Neighbourhoods are outside the scope of the Local Plan. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies.	No change.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	In respect of Local Plan guidance for Lee Green, I am happy for the Leegate, Sainsbury's and BMW Garage sites to be built on for housing, but the density of housing must be in keeping with the surrounding area and adhere to the London Plan. The Sainsbury's site could be redeveloped to include low-level housing but the supermarket must be retained, particularly as the demand for such facilities will increase if more housing is built. The BMW Garage is on a small site and I would prefer the garage to remain, but if the site is to be used for housing, it must not tower above the adjoining buildings and must also allow for access to the River Quaggy as stated in the Local Plan. I would be delighted if Leegate is developed, but there must be facilities for the local community including neighbourhood retail space and other community facilities such as a community centre and fitness/wellness facilities. The London Plan clearly states that tall buildings should only be built in places with transport links and other infrastructure that can support them, and on that basis Lewisham has explicitly excluded Lee Green from its Tall Building	This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Geen we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			opportunity areas in its draft Local Plan. Galliard's plans to build up to 15 stories high are totally unacceptable and would severely detract from the overall look of Lee Green. We have all seen the detrimental effect of the large number of tower blocks in Lewisham town centre and this building density would be completely out of place in Lee Green. In my opinion the maximum height of the Leegate development should be 10 stories (with some variation between the buildings), 5 stories for the Sainsbury's site and no more than 3 stories on the BMW Garage site.	Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	Galliard Homes should not be allowed to exceed maximum existing local height by 37% including the Sainsburys and BMW sites, which also should not exceed existing local height by 37%.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	We wish to make the following points regarding Lewisham's Local Plan and Galliard Homes proposals to develop Leegate: **Density** In the draft Local Plan, three large sites in Lee Green have been allocated for housing – Leegate, Sainsburys and the BMW garage. It is questionable whether these sites can all sustain a high volume of housing. Large increases in housing need corresponding increases in infrastructure. Lee Green is not currently allocated any money from Lewisham council's major infrastructure spending pot. Other wards are. Lee Green also receives the lowest amount of all Lewisham's wards from the much smaller 'community' infrastructure pot. Galliard Homes proposals for Leegate are for over 630 housing units; more units than the Leybridge Estate behind Leegate has. When the Leybridge Estate was built, Brindishe Lee was built to educate its children. To serve all the residents of the proposed Galliard Homes development, considerable increase to the infrastructure of Lee Green will be needed and if the Sainsburys and BMW garage sites are developed to similar density as Galliards proposed Leegate plans, demand for local infrastructure will be tripled. In addition to schools, GP surgeries, dentists, improvements in public transport and green spaces would be required for residents. These infrastructure improvements should all be named in Lewisham's Local Plan, and information given on their location, when this will happen and how they will be paid for. Increasing the housing density would also add to traffic generated by the residents by way of delivery vans, visitors etc. The newly imposed Low Traffic Neighbourhood scheme has generated considerable additional traffic congestion at the traffic lights at Lee Green as traffic is funnelled on to Eltham Road and Burnt Ash Road and a huge residential increase will bring more traffic delays into the area.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			We also question the necessity of developing all three sites with the population of London shown to be decreasing. **Height** The 10 storey Leybridge Estate behind Leegate is currently the tallest building in Lee Green but Galliard Homes are proposing building up to 15 storeys high, exceeding maximum existing local height by 37%. If this were allowed, it could be a precedent for developers wishing to redevelop the Sainsburys and BMW sites, therefore we propose that the 10 storey height limit for each site is written into Lewisham's Local Plan. The London Plan states all tall buildings should only be built in places with transport links and other infrastructure that can support them. Any new development should fit in with the local area which has a 4 storey high Grade II listed fire station opposite Leegate, a locally listed Old Tigers Head of 3 storeys opposite and the Lee Manor Conservation Area in the vicinity.		
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding to the Local Plan in particular on the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. It is very important that the Centre is redeveloped into a good shopping and social meeting area with new housing as well but as a local resident I do have some major concerns about the current proposals being developed by Galliard Homes which I will outline below. I understand the Council is potentially looking at 3 sites to develop, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage Site and Sainsbury. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other and enhance the whole area. The Plan should state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. Lewisham Homes have been very supportive of adding Swift boxes or Swift bricks into the soffits of new buildings and I think that addition would also be very welcome along with any other nature friendly initiatives that can be added. I do have major concerns about the height of the buildings now proposed for Leegate by the current developers, Galliard Homes, as it seems they intend one block to reach 15 storeys high which far exceeds the height of any other building in the area and is fifty percent higher than the other highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - which are 10 storeys high. I think the Local Plan should set a10 storey maximum height limit for any single building planned for the Lee Green area and also state an expectation that most new housing development should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys so that the public areas provided	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Local Plan amended with new policy on Biodiversity Net Gain, including for individual developments. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings which would block out light from these areas. Very tall buildings would make the area unwelcoming and unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being planned for the site. There is an opportunity now to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. But to do this any development will need to respect the proportions of the local area and not create the high rise blocks of parts of Kidbrooke Village and Lewisham town centre. It is important to note that although the existing Leybridge flats are 10 storey blocks they are set well back from the road and are situated in large green spaces which is very different to the mass of high buildings bunched closely together that appear in Galliard Homes simulated pictures of their proposed Leegate development. I believe it is essential that the infrastructure should be developed so it can match the number of new residents with increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a good size community centre for people to use and sufficient parking facilities which will be especially needed by older people when shopping etc.		
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding to the Draft Local Plan, As a local resident I have focussed on the proposals as they affect Lee Green and especially the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. I do also have some major concerns prompted by recent and current development proposals which prompt some of our comments below. The draft plan proposes that Lee Green be designated a District Centre and there is a cluster of 3 sites proposed for development, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage Site and Sainsbury. There should be guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other and enhance the whole area and do not negatively affect the area. DESIGN Context The Plan should state clearly that new developments on these sites must sympathetic with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. Figure 5.1 in the draft plan appears to identify the Lee Green sites as a proposed location for tall buildings (30m plus). Lee is a suburb and not a city centre, this scale is not appropriate to the existing fabric and the phrase "emerging context" looks like a pretext for overdevelopment.	Noted. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The Local Plan is a strategic policy document and the Council needs to carefully consider the level of detail provided for each area within the site allocations. Further detailed guidance at a masterplanning level would normally be undertaken as part of a Framework Document or Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The new London Plan has removed the density matrix, as developments are now expected to use the design-led approach to demonstrate how the 'optimal capacity' of a site will be realised. Therefore it is not considered appropriate to set a fixed plot development / density ratio for housing. The Local Plan takes forward the London Plan approach, with additional details to ensure full consideration of a site and its local context, including heritage and character. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			Plot Development ratio/ Density There should be some form of guideline to the allowable density of building footprints. Increased building Height should be balanced against reduced plot coverage. Permeability, rights of way, access to Daylight & Sunlight minimum Pavement widths The Leybridge Court Towers are 10 stories above ground level and were recently used by st Modwen as a benchmark for height and a justification for their proposals however these towers have shallow floorplates and have significant landscaped grounds surrounding them and allow daylight Public green space and amenity The maps in the Draft Plan identify that there is a lack of public open space the substantial increase in population density resulting from the development of these three sites will create an increased need for open spaces for leisure and sport. While the neighbourhood has several lovely existing parks (some of which are located in Greenwich). These are all well used and the increase in population will place these under greater pressure. Most of the existing open spaces are the legacy of historic planning or post war development. The local plan should include some proposals for improved public space and amenity in Lee. The recent developments proposed at Leegate reduced public civic space. Ecology The work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lewisham. Infrastructure There appears to be no explicit link between the additional development/population, proposed at Lee Green and the provision of social infrastructure. Parks, sports facilities. Nursery Schools, primary Schools, Secondary schools, Doctors, Dentists, The infrastructure improvements needed for Lee Green's development should be explicitly outlined in Lewisham's Local Plan.	Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. We will continue to work with key stakeholders, including the Friends of the Quaggy, through the plan making and development process. The draft Local Plan includes a number of provisions for river protection and improvements, including in the East area. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03	I am responding to the local plan for the redevelopment of the Leegate centre. While I understand the need for redevelopment of the Leegate, I would ask the current proposal by Galliard to be scrapped and redesigned. I DO NOT believe we need over 10 storey or higher buildings in area which is typically built no higher than three. We live right by the Leegate centre and the area has been brought to life by the new shops and yoga studio which has allowed independent businesses and a community hub to	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. It should be noted that although the Council does encourage developers to carry out pre-application consultation with residents there is no statutory requirement and this is at the discretion of the developer.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			thrive. This has added real value to our local area and I would hope that any new proposals would incorporate opportunity for independent businesses into the new space. Lockdown has also show that we desperately need to protect public space, so the centre of the Leegate and green space should not be built on. But most importantly the towers should be in keeping with other buildings in the area, as has always been the case with new buildings. Our flats on Burnt Ash Road are three storeys high and set back from the road and this is high enough. There is not enough green space to accommodate the increase in people or community facilities such as schools or doctors for anything bigger. We desperately need affordable housing in the area, but not luxury apartments or similar. Please do not go ahead and give more time for public consultation before allowing this redevelopment.	The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The site allocations for Lee Green district centre include requirements for development to contribute to the delivery of significant public realm enhancements, including new publicly accessible open space within the town centre. The draft Local Plan Part 2 Green infrastructure section also set out policies for the protection and enhancement of open and green spaces.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am writing to let you know my opinion on how the draft Local Plan could better support quality development in Lee Green. I am in principle supportive of the Leegate, Sainsburys and BMW garage sites being built on as they are brownfield sites and there is a clear need to protect the existing Metropolitan Open Land in the area. I am also happy to hear of the intention to open up public access to the Quaggy and aim to create high quality public space for pedestrians in Lee Green. However, I am concerned by the density of development suggested e.g. in St Modwen's former plan for Leegate, and apparently also in the draft plans for Leegate suggested by Galliard Homes. I feel that it is especially important to set specific limits for the density of development in the Lee Green area, as it would not be reasonable not to expect all possible sites to be developed to the same intensity in future, once a precedent has been set with one site. There are several important potential negative impacts of too dense development on these sites, which I shall detail below. Infrastructure I am concerned that developing these three sites intensively could lead to many new housing units being added to the area, without making allowances for improving local transport infrastructure. Public transport in the area appears to be good, with bus services and three train stations within walking distance. However, at peak times much of this existing public transport is already at full capacity. To build many more homes, without enough dedicated parking space for household cars because of the aim for new developments to be greener – which I am very supportive of – further investment in safe cycling infrastructure in this area, especially segregated lanes, and consultation with TfL on how local stations and bus services can support such an increased demand in public	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			transport is needed. I am concerned that otherwise the impact of dense new developments putting many more people onto public transport will cause such overcrowding that those people who do have the option of using cars will be more inclined to do so, which would be against the council's intention for the area with the work on introducing Low Traffic Neighbourhoods. Education I am concerned that the aim to develop the Leegate, Sainsbury's and BMW garage sites as mixed retail and residential use has not properly taken into account the current provision of education in the area. The primary schools in the area seem to be at or over capacity according to Ofsted, and it will not be an easy thing to set up new schools – the International Academy of Greenwich has just attempted to set up in the Lee Green area, and is now closing to all years except its current Year 10, which seems to be partly due to inability to source a permanent site. I urge the council to carefully consider the density of residential development which can be supported by existing primary schools, especially as the existing housing in the area remains attractive to young families according to the material put through my door by estate agents! Unless the council has evidence that the number of children in the area will somehow be going down soon, which continued movement of families into the area does not suggest, dense residential developments in the Lee Green area will cause a considerable local shortage of school places and this must be considered when decisions on housing density are made. Height Lewisham has explicitly excluded Lee Green from its Tall Building opportunity areas; yet Galliard Homes are proposing to build up to 15 storeys high, again setting a precedent for future development at the Sainsbury's and BMW sites to also build so high. Galliard claim that this height will not negatively impact on the three conservation areas and Lee Green's own listed buildings – which I question – however the council must also consider the likely impact on the conservation areas and Lee Green's own heritage features once the Leegate scheme has set a new maximum height for the area. In my opinion, the Leybridge Estate's ten storey height should be the maximum for the Lee Green area. Also, this ten-storey maximum height should be allowed only when there is significant space between buildings of the maximum height; even if there are low-rise blocks between these. Several suggested schemes for Leegate have created considerable mass at around eight storeys across most of the development, and then top this with multiple even higher buildings. Even by itself, this will create a considerable change to the character of the area, and should something similar be planned for the Sainsbury's site the area and its listed buildings will become considerably overshadowed, certainly figuratively		

			and probably also literally. Great height and large massing of just-a-bit-shorter buildings will also certainly impact on the quality of public space at ground level in the area. I look forward to seeing the results of the consultation and the final Lewisham Local Plan		
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	From what I have read in the proposal the plan does not provide information on how improvements to infrastructure and funding for such infrastructure will be met. For such a large development (and possible future developments on the nearby BMW garage and Sainsbury's sites) infrastructure improvements will be required. The emerging Plan from the Leegate pre consultation is not in line with Lewisham council's 'Draft Local Plan.' As residents of and contributors to the local community we would ask that the following is considered and is written into the Local plan prior to acceptance of planning permission. 1) Maximum height for Leegate centre to be in accordance with existing buildings and reflected in the plans and within the Lewisham local Plan rules. 2) Maximum height of other buildings to be introduced to Lee Green is no higher than the existing 4 storey Victorian buildings on Lee High Road. 3) The development rules are fixed in terms of mass, height and density for all Lee Green surrounding areas so that creeping high rise sprawl is avoided within the area. 4) The development takes into consideration and sets out the infrastructure improvements that are required. Lewisham council sets out how they will fund this with clear plans and time scales. 5) Lewisham sets out a plan for how the green space behind Eltham Road to the north side can be used to facilitate increasing levels of population, whether this area forms Parkland for use by the whole community. We really need the support of our local council and must be able to trust them to ensure that our local area is not ruined by their lack of foresight or planning and non-adherence to their own policies.	Noted. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. Further details on the infrastructure funding are set out in Part 4 of the Local Plan on Delivery and monitoring. The site allocations for Lee Green district centre include requirements for development to contribute to the delivery of significant public realm enhancements, including new publicly accessible open space within the town centre. The draft Local Plan Part 2 Green infrastructure section also set out policies for the protection and enhancement of open and green spaces.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding to the Local Plan in particular on the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. It is very important that the Centre is redeveloped into a good shopping and social meeting area with new housing as well but as a local resident I do have some major concerns about the current proposals being developed by Galliard Homes which I will outline below. I understand the Council is potentially looking at 3 sites to develop, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			Site and Sainsbury. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other and enhance the whole area. The Plan should state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. However, I have major concerns about the height of the buildings now proposed for Leegate by the current developers, Galliard Homes, as it seems they intend one block to reach 15 storeys high which far exceeds the height of any other building in the area and is fifty percent higher than the other highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - which are 10 storeys high. I think the Local Plan should set a10 storey maximum height limit for any single building planned for the Lee Green area and also state an expectation that most new housing development should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys so that the public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings which would block out light from these areas. Very tall buildings would make the area unwelcoming and unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being planned for the site. There is an opportunity now to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. But to do this any development will need to respect the proportions of the local area and not create the highrise blocks of parts of Kidbrooke Village and Lewisham town centre. It is important to note that although the existing Leybridge flats are 10 storey blocks they are set well back from the road and are situated in large green spaces which is very different to the mass of high buildings bunched closely together that appear in Galliard Homes simulated pictures of their proposed Leegate development. I believe it is essential that the infrastructure should be developed so it can match the number of new residents with increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a good size community centre for people to use and sufficient parking facilities which will be especially needed by older people when shopping etc.	character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03	I would like the plan to state that all future developments in Lee should be in keeping with existing developments, which are three or four stories high. The vast majority of buildings in this area are low rise. I would like the plan to state that if buildings are going to match the height of the one building that is taller - the Leybridge estate - that they must, like Leybridge, be set back from the main road and have a similar proportion of communal space per square foot of housing.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			The plan should state that no new buildings in Lee should be taller than Leybridge and should recognise that Leybrige is an anomaly in the area. Leybridge's 10 stories are not a baseline for the area. There are serious issues around pollution on the junction by the Tigers Head and I understand these have previously been illegally high. The plan should state that new developments must not add to pollution on this junction. Any new developments must contribute to the local infrastructure in a proportionate and meaningful way. That means schools, community centres and green space along with genuinely affordable housing. It's really important that we ensure communal access to the Quaggy and the plan should prioritise access to green space and waterways. I think all of us who live in and around Leegate are happy that St Modwen are finally doing something about their poor quality stewardship of this part of our neighbourhood – even if 'that thing' is selling Leegate on. Their inability to do what they wanted with the site was in large part to do with our co-ordinated local response to their unsuitable plans. We will expect Gaillard to do better, and local people will expect them to present a plan for Leegate which is in keeping with the area. We will support the council as much as we can in ensuring a good result for Leegate and our community. The plan should as far as possible ensure new development balances social good with private profit – or at the very least, to ensure developers cannot use our neighbourhood simply to boost multi-million pound profits (Gaillard reported profits of £62m in 2019) and shareholder returns to people who live far away from here.	housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04	I understand the consultation on the plans for Leegate closes on 11 April. Lee Green has been run down for some time and this does need to be addressed but I do have some concerns about the plans I've seen and whether what's proposed is really consistent with the principles for development reflected in Lewisham's Local Plan. My main concern is about the potential height of the new development. I understand that it's proposed that properties may be up to 15 storeys high. This seems excessive and out of step with the rest of the local area. The Leybridge Estate is 10 storeys and most other buildings in the neighbourhood are considerably less. As well as dominating the landscape, tall buildings, especially when grouped together tend to block out light which would have an impact on for passing pedestrians, residents and the planting at ground level. I'm concerned that allowing 15 storeys here could set a precedent for other developments in the area. My personal preference would	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. Site allocation 4 Sainsbury's Lee Green includes the requirement for town centre uses which could accommodate the reprovision of a supermarket.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			be for the new development to be no higher than Trinity School. I hope that Sainsburys will be retained and that the retail facilities will be expanded and improved. Given the potential increase in population arising from the plans, local facilities and services will need additional capacity. At the moment it's not clear to me how this will be addressed. Finally, while I welcome the suggestion that the River Quaggy should be opened up, more generally in the models of the development that I've seen it looks as if many - and possibly all - of the current trees around Sainsburys and on the adjacent streets would be removed and the extent of any new planting around the site looks quite limited. I hope that's not the case. Apart from aesthetic considerations, trees and other planting help counterbalance the effects of air pollution. These are busy roads.	Both the current and draft Local Plan include provisions around tree protection and, where necessary, appropriate replacement. This will be assessed through the Development Management process, should any future development proposal come forward.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	A number of sites have been identified in Lee, being Leegate, Sainsbury's, Holme Lacey and Burnt Ash. Whilst I do not disagree that these areas are in need of development and improvements the current infrastructure is already under pressure. For instance: 1. It is already difficult to get a doctors appointment within 7 days of request (and this was pre-Covid). We are not alone, this is a common problem in the area.; 2. school places are difficult to get locally (I note that your LP summary states that there are extra spaces to pupil uptake but I do not believe this is the case in this locality) albeit it might be the case Borough wide. 3. The transport network cannot currently cope and this cannot expect to improve with an even greater population in the "east" of the borough. Roads, buses and trains are at times impossible to use due to high volumes of traffic/ people. 4. Green areas and play parks are already extremely busy and more families moving into the area will only further negatively impact on this. 5. Shops - there needs to be sufficient shops for the proposed size of the population and a variety of sized shops and offerings. Smaller shops should be given assistance to establish themselves. 6. Extra policing - greater population will require great police presence. Given that the Leegate development alone is for 630 residential units - the potential strain on the current infrastructure is deeply concerning for us as current residents. What action will be taken to ensure that all developments are committed to a measurable improvement to all aspects of the current infrastructure which will be impacted by the development. For instance, I see that the Leegate proposals suggest financial contributions will be made - how can it be measured that all such contributions are	Noted. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. The remainder of the response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The site allocations for Lee Green district centre include requirements for development to contribute to the delivery of significant public realm enhancements, including new publicly accessible open space within the town centre. The draft Local Plan Part 2 Green infrastructure section also set out policies for the protection and enhancement of open and green spaces, and Part 2 Community infrastructure dealing with children's place space.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			spent on improving infrastructure in the immediate vicinity to the development which will be most affected and not dispersed through the borough. Also, I note that the proposed height of the Leegate development is 15 storeys. This is excessive and not in keeping with the area creating an eyesore and a "concrete jungle" feel. This should not be permitted at this height.		
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LEA 02	**LEA2 Lee Green district centre and surrounds.** We support the thrust of this policy. We particularly support the policy assertion in A that 'Development proposals must contribute to a coordinated process of town centre renewal that responds positively to the area's distinctive character.' This implies a much-needed masterplan for the whole area rather than separate uncoordinated proposals for, say, Leegate and the Sainsbury's site opposite it. We are concerned that the Plan as it stands may allow developers to argue for excessively tall, dense redevelopment of Leegate with poor public realm and lack of coordination with the rest of the District town centre. We are concerned that many of the same mistakes in respect of height, density, traffic, public realm and general lack of masterplan that have been made in recent town centre development in Lewisham centre will be repeated in Lee Green.	Noted. The Local Plan is a strategic policy document and the Council needs to carefully consider the level of detail provided for each area within the site allocations. Further detailed guidance at a masterplanning level would normally be undertaken as part of a Framework Document or Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital.	No change.
Lee Forum	3	LEA 02 Site allocations	Lee Green specific 2.The height of all site allocations in the Lee Green area need to set out a maximum height for each site allocation.	The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. More explicit thresholds and guidance will be included in a revised policy on building heights, which will need to be read together with the site allocations.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
Lee Forum	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03	Leegate is a test case for the draft plan. The developer is currently proposing building 37% higher than the nearest tall building, which itself would not be admissible under the draft plan. Will Lewisham fight this? We consider there to be a danger of a mini cluster of buildings built ever higher by ambitious developers thinking each can build 37% higher than the last one. Should this happen the height of the 3rd site will be 28 storeys. This will not reflect the context and surrounding 3 storey buildings that the draft local plan claims to aspire to.	This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
Lee Forum	3	LEA 02	The Lee Neighbourhood plan calls for a detailed design guide/master planning of Lee Green District Centre. This is essential given the above points and that Lewisham's draft local plan includes three site allocations which together, when accounting for planned density, will overwhelm the rest of the town centre put together. We ask that Lewisham include an SPD specifically for Lee Green District centre.	Noted. The draft Local Plan provides a renewed emphasis on planning for the future of Lee Green, with an expanded suite of area-based and site specific policies, which represents a step change from the adopted plan. The Council has no plans at present to carry out a masterplanning exercise for Lee Green. We will keep this under review.	No change.

Lee Forum	3	LEA 02	Lee Green district centre has three large site allocations in it which will, when built, increase the housing on those sites by a multiple of over 40. Yet no mention is made of how and what local infrastructure will be built to cater for hundreds of new homes.	Noted. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	No change.
Lee Forum	3	LEA 02	Page 640 LEA2 Lee Green district centre and surrounds makes no mention of the Forum or Lee Manor Conservation area or Proposed Conservation by *(officer note: name redacted)* and Lee Forum that comprise the bulk of the area. It should do. Extensive consultation with residents has been conducted about how they want the area to develop in drawing up the Neighbourhood Plan. The draft Neighbourhood plan, which is at an advanced stage, should be referenced in this section of Lewisham's Local Plan.	Noted. The Local Plan part 2 policies on Heritage address the historic environment including Conservation Areas. The place principles for the East Area reflect the need for development proposals to respond positively to the distinctive character of neighbourhoods within the sub-area. The plan must be read as a whole. The designation of new CAs is separate to the Local Plan process. Officers have taken into account emerging Neighbourhood Plans during the preparation of the Local Plan, having regard to the stage they have reached in the plan process. This is consistent with national planning policy and guidance. Many of themes and objectives for the Neighbourhood Plan have been captured by the local plan, for example, recognition of the network of green infrastructure and revitalisation of the town centre. Neighbourhood plans should set non-strategic policies which complement and help implement the Local Plan.	No change.
Lee Forum	3	LEA 02	We support the inclusion of workspace for Leegate where there is to be development for housing, a mix of retail and business units. Small offices add to a flexible mix and will increase local employment possibilities.	Support noted.	No change.
Lewisham Liberal Democrats	3	LEA 02	1. The work must be planned carefully so that residents have alternative places to shop during the rebuilding process (for supermarket sites). (LEA2 claims that development at Leegate and Sainsbury's, etc. should be coordinated, but there is no reference to this in individual site allocations.) What plans are there for the sequencing of work to ensure that benefits are maximised and disruption/costs are minimised?	Noted. The three sites at Lee Green are privately owned and as such it is difficult to predict when the sites will come forward. If and when planning applications are submitted these will need to be supported by a Construction Management Plan.	No change.
Lewisham Liberal Democrats	3	LEA 02	2. While it is a good idea to develop small shopping centres near railway stations, the Lee Green shopping centre is not served by a train station within a reasonable distance and public transport would have to be improved for it to be viable without substantial car parking.	Noted. The approach to focus development within and around town centres is a policy principle established by the London Plan, which the Local Plan takes forward.	No change.
Lewisham Liberal Democrats	3	LEA 02	3. The effects of the Lee Green LTN on traffic flow in the area has not been properly considered. The expressed aim to turn major arterial roads (onto which traffic has been funneled by LTNs) into 'healthy streets' seems a vain hope. With no plans for widening the roads or diverting the through-traffic travelling from central London to Kent and vice versa, it is not clear how Lee High Road, parts of Baring Road, the South Circular or the A21	Noted. Low Traffic Neighbourhoods are outside the scope of the Local Plan. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies.	No change.

			(Bromley Road) can be made more user-friendly. How are we going to reduce 'the dominance of vehicle traffic at the main junction', i.e. the crossroads at Lee Green? A thorough analysis of traffic flow throughout the borough taking into account recent modifications such as LTNs and cycle routes needs to be undertaken.	The site allocations within Lee Green set requirements for significant public realm improvements to support the Healthy Streets approach, the detailed natured of which will be considered through the development approvals process.	
Lewisham Liberal Democrats	3	LEA 02	• If planning permission is granted, how will an increase in residential units from 450 to 630 in the **Leegate** development be supported and how will this affect the height of proposed buildings? See the scoping letter at https://planning.lewisham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=_LEWIS_DCAPR_108788. Will the financial contribution mentioned in the scoping letter (p. 7) be adequate to cover all the extra facilities needed: 'If the socio-economic assessment demonstrates that there will be an impact, mitigation will likely take the form of a financial contribution'?	Noted. This response relates to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
Lewisham Liberal Democrats	3	LEA 02	• Consideration should be given to the establishment of an arts and creative industries hub in part of the **Leegate** Centre similar to those seen in East London e.g. at the Chisenhale Artplace https://chisenhale.co.uk/	Noted. The draft Local Plan makes provision for main town centre uses within Lee Green, which can include business and cultural uses. However in taking a flexible approach to support town centre viability it does not specify individual uses. The draft Local Plan has however identified where there may be scope for new Cultural Quarters, and these are set out in Part 2 in Economy and culture.	No change.
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	As a local resident I am responding to the Local Plan in particular on the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre as I have some concerns about the proposals being developed by Galliard Homes. I understand the need for additional housing but it is essential that this it is redeveloped alongside shopping, nature and social meeting areas. Consideration need to be given to cyclists and cycle storage too for the residents of Lee. I understand the Council is potentially looking at 3 sites to develop, The Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage Site and Sainsbury. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites are developed in ways that link up with each other and enhance the whole area. The Plan should state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads most of which have a height of 3 or 4 storeys and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. I do have major concerns about the height of the buildings now proposed for Leegate by the current developers, Galliard Homes, as it seems they intend one block to reach 15 storeys high which far exceeds the height of any other building in the area - the flats on the Leybridge Estate -	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			which are 10 storeys high. I think the Local Plan should set a 10 storey maximum height limit for any single building planned for the Lee Green area and also state an expectation that most new housing development should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys so that the public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings which would block out light from these areas. Very tall buildings would make the area unwelcoming and unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being planned for the site. Surely such high buildings would create a wind tunnel and be most unpleasant for people to use the space socially. There is an opportunity now to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. But to do this any development will need to respect the proportions of the local area and not create the highrise blocks of parts of Kidbrooke Village and Lewisham town centre. It is important to note that although the existing Leybridge flats are 10 storey blocks they are set well back from the road and are situated in large green spaces which is very different to the mass of high buildings bunched closely together that appear in Galliard Homes simulated pictures of their proposed Leegate development. I believe it is essential that the infrastructure should be developed so it can match the number of new residents with increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a good size community centre for people to use and sufficient parking facilities which will be especially needed by older people when shopping etc.	necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA 02 LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I am responding to the Lewisham Local Plan in particular on the issue of the future development of the Leegate Shopping Centre. It is very important that the Centre is redeveloped but as a local resident I do have some major concerns about the current proposals being developed by Galliard Homes and I would like to share these with you. I also understand the Council is potentially looking at three sites to develop, the Leegate Shopping Centre, The BMW garage site and Sainsbury's. It would be helpful to have some firmer guidance in the Local Plan to ensure that all these sites - should one or more be chosen for development - are developed in ways that link up with each other and enhance the whole area. The Local Plan should state clearly that new developments on these sites must fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads, most of which have a height of three or four storeys and include a Grade 2 listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head public house. I have major concerns about the height of the buildings now proposed for Leegate by the current developers, Galliard Homes, as it seems they intend one block to reach fifteen storeys high which far exceeds the height of any	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			other building in the area and is fifty percent higher than the other highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - which are ten storeys high. I think the Lewisham Local Plan should set a ten storey maximum height limit for any buildings planned for Lee Green so that the public spaces provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings which would block out light from these areas. To build to the heights proposed would make the area unwelcoming, unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being planned for the site. There is an opportunity now to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Lewisham Local Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. But to do this, any development will need to respect the proportions of the local area and not create the high-rise blocks that have now been erected in parts of Kidbrooke Village and Lewisham town centre.	As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LEA 03	However, the policy falls short in setting out the vision for Grove Park especially the town centre and new district park that was put forward in the neighbourhood plan. Policy LEA3 should be elaborated, as it is done so for LEA2 for Lea Green. All the development principles especially a green infrastructure led development approach should be stated. Including the need for a collaborative masterplanning approach.	Noted. Officers have taken into account emerging Neighbourhood Plans during the preparation of the Local Plan, having regard to the stage they have reached in the plan process. This is consistent with national planning policy and guidance. Many of themes and objectives for the Neighbourhood Plan have been captured by the local plan, for example, recognition of the network of green infrastructure and revitalisation of the town centre. Neighbourhood plans should set non-strategic policies which complement and help implement the Local Plan. The key spatial objectives for the sub-area address the future of Grove Park Local Centre, and this is carried through to the place principles and site allocations, which reinforce the need for sites to be delivered comprehensively through a masterplan process. Policy LEA3 deals more broadly with the Strategic Area for Regeneration, rather than the town centre itself. The more extensive list of policies for LEA2 (in comparison to Grove Park) is commensurate with the higher order of Lee Green in the town centre hierarchy as a District Centre, as well as the nature and scale of development that is planned to come forward within the centre.	No change.
Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LEA 03	Welcome clause A, especially given the effort put in by the local community in establishing its neighbourhood plan.	Support noted.	No change.
London Wildlife Trust	3	LEA 04	We welcome and support this policy.	Support noted.	No change.
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LEA 04	**LEA4 Linear network of green infrastructure**. We support the development proposals. However we think the network of green infrastructure has been under defined and overstated. There appears to be no map showing the open spaces and parks and the lengthy built-up river, walking and cycle routes between them.	Noted.	Local Plan amended to show green infrastructure on Policies Map and other maps

Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LEA 04	Clause A rightly points out the network of GI, however the corresponding map in Fig 16.2 does not represent this very well. We propose that the map is edited to highlight all GI in the neighbourhood area. Clause A could also relate back to the main policy which delivers Lewisham's green grid.	Noted.	Local Plan amended to show green infrastructure on Policies Map and other maps
Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LEA 04	Clause B should also highlight the ecosystem services offered by GI. Ecosystem services is now a well-known term and firmly established in Government strategies (i.e. 25 year environment plan) and documents, and is a fundamental aspect of why GI should be promoted, protected and enhanced, so that the multiple benefits are realised. While it can be covered by term 'environmental value', it should more explicitly make the links to the totality of services it offers, particularly in relation to climate adaptation and mitigation.	Agreed.	Policy LEA4.A amended to highlight the multifunctional value of Green Infrastructure.
Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LEA 04	This policy fails to highlight and promote the delivery of the most key objective, which is to deliver a new district park in this area as a key component of the linear network of green infrastructure, to bring about the beneficial use of MOL, in line with existing London and national policy.	Noted.	Text amended to make reference to the Councils ambition to create an integrated District Park at Grove Park.
Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LEA 04	Clause B(c) rightly promotes the enhancement of Green Chain Walk, which provides an east-west walking and cycling link. However, it should also highlight the nature trail from south circular to Elmstead Wood, through the proposed new district park and south through the renewed town centre, which creates a north – south link and connects the green spaces along the highlighted 'strategic green link' on the map in Fig 16.2.	Noted.	Local Plan amended to refer to east-west and north-south links.
Blackheath Society no 2	3	LEA 05	**LEA5 East Lewisham links**. As with LEA4, we support the development proposals, which they complement. However, again we feel the concept has been under defined. Again there seems to be no map (or cross-reference to one elsewhere).	Noted. The sub-area Lewisham Links policies have been absorbed into a borough-wide policy. Maps of the links for each of the sub-areas will be provided in the Regulation 19 plan. The plan must be read as a whole.	Local Plan amended with Lewisham links maps for each of the sub-areas.
Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LEA 05	Fig 16.2 highlights 'Lewisham Links'. However, to make clear that this is the same (?) as East Lewisham Links, the key label should be made the same.	Noted. The sub-area Lewisham Links policies have been absorbed into a borough-wide policy. Maps of the links for each of the sub-areas will be provided in the Regulation 19 plan. The plan must be read as a whole.	Local Plan amended with Lewisham links maps for each of the sub-areas.
Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LEA 05	Clarification is needed on the terms town versus local centres. Policy seems to designate two types? Locally one tends to refer to a 'town centre' when talking about Grove Park, even though its 'designation' is a local centre. Some clarity on the definition is needed to avoid confusion.	Noted. The hierarchy of centres is defined within the draft Local Plan part 2 Policy EC11 Town centre network and hierarchy.	No change.
Royal Borough of Greenwich	3	LEA SA 01	Heathside and Lethbridge Estate: While we support the redevelopment of the site, the improvements to the public realm and the increased permeability it provides, the allocation should be more explicit regarding appropriate heights. This site is on relatively high ground and those tall buildings that have already been delivered on the site are extremely prominent in views towards the west from Greenwich Park and Blackheath, more prominent than the much taller buildings at Lewisham Town Centre. The allocation should acknowledge this prominence and restrict building heights to ensure that further development does not exceed the heights of the already-delivered tall elements.	Noted. Heathside and Lethbridge has an existing planning approval and as such the heights for the development have now been established.	No change.

	3	LEA SA 03	I have concerns about the height of the buildings now proposed for Leegate by the current developers, Galliard Homes, as it seems they intend one block to reach 15 storeys high which far exceeds the height of any other building in the area and is fifty percent higher than the other highest nearby buildings - the flats on the Leybridge Estate - which are 10 storeys high. I think the Local Plan should set a 8 storey maximum height limit for any buildings planned for Lee Green so that the public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings which would block out light from these areas. This would make the area unwelcoming and unattractive and deter people from using the shops and facilities being planned for the site. There is an opportunity now to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7. But to do this any development will need to respect the proportions of the local area and not create the highrise blocks of parts of Kidbrooke Village and Lewisham town centre. I believe it is essential that the infrastructure should be developed so it can match the number of new residents with increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a vibrant community centre and parking facilities especially needed by older people when shopping etc.	Noted. This response relates to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA SA 03	Dear Team, Having lived in the area since 1989, I have seen many changes. Thankfully, nothing as ridiculous as the latest Galliard Home plan for the Leegate Centre Site. This site changed hands for £Few hundred thousand when St Mowden first bought it. Now, with 650 units being submitted, the land could be worth £Millions And let's not beat around the bush, just a £Few hundred thousand will come back as Section 106 The rest, into the Galliard Homes pockets and out of the Borough Meanwhile, we will be living with this monstrosity for the next 10 years > and then the next 20 years as it sits empty waiting for another land speculator makes a play. Meanwhile the Borough will carry the cost of another failed development. Please, have some dignity. Tell the developer what can be done on this site. If you do not know the area – let me know and I'll show you around Density & Height Match the density of the Leybridge Estate Match the height of the Tigers Heads … 4 storeys on any building fronting the roads Peak up to 8 on 2 towers at the back of the plot Add some green > plenty of green Its call Lee Green after all	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.

			Have proper spaces between the blocks With Green Space in between And a little water feature [do you know that the Quaggy River is a short skip from the plot ?] Use Flats and apartments A little street level retail space – boutique shops [if you know the area – you will know what I mean] A little small office space Precedent If you green light this clump of building on an inappropriate site > it starts an arms race The Sainsbury's site can be traded up … to match the same height & density So to the Stephen James site Why not add the Pentacostal Church Set an honest and suitable precedent This is not Lewisham Town Centre Representatives You are our representatives You are not Galliard Homes employees, on a profit share You ask, "where do we find space for additional homes ?" It is in front of you Use the space wisely, and get properties built [not more land speculation that your indecision on this site has allowed on this site for decades] The site can take some 250 units Plus a handful of small retail space & space office space --- for local people … serving local people Just look at the drawings The plan is obscene Look at all the green space on the Leebridge Estate Compare that with the Galliard site Make a difference to the neighbourhood Two 8-storey towers – adjacent to Leebridge Four 4-storey blocks … 2 facing Sainsburys and 2 facing the fire station All landscaped Please don't forget about balance > look after the people Badly design & built developments = vacant properties = vandalism, neglect, insufficient funds for management fee = cycle of decline Overcrowding = deprivation Density = squeeze on local amenities Too many units = squeeze on social services Lack of green space = pollution Lack of green space = bleak, unwanted properties > blight You 3 know the site as well as I do.		

			If the history of Leegate tells us anything If the history of “London’s ugliest shopping centre” tells us anything The last thing we need on this site is an ugly, over crowded, ill thought out development Ie just bigger and uglier than the one it replaces Please represent the interests of the area Demand that Galliard Homes make a fair profit from the site by building what is needed Not an exorbitant profit and stuff us for years		
	3	LEA SA 03	Lee Gate Proposed Development: I am a local resident and am very concerned to read the plans by Galliard Homes to develop this site with 3 x 15 storey buildings for 450 homes. 15 storeys will be completely at odds with the current architecture, most of it low rise, max 3 storeys high, with the exception of the 10 storey existing block of flats. This will be a complete eyesore, akin to the ugly high rise development in central Lewisham. I am concerned that 450 homes here will create even more traffic, more overcrowding getting across Lee Green, and more car fumes. We need low rise, green spaces and more trees planted. How is it proposed that the infrastructure will be expanded to accommodate the additional 450 new homes, the traffic is tailing back at that junction at 7am. There is already a huge squeeze on school places, as well as no room at GP surgeries for new patients. I would appreciate the opportunity to review the planning application.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 03	To the Planners The proposed development at LeeGate is unacceptable to any rational councillor or resident. The height and density of the 450 homes is completely out of character with the area and should not be allowed. This is a blatant profit maximisation scheme at the expense of local residents. Not only will the proposal completely dominate the skyline, the local infrastructure will simply not be able to cope. Has the experience with St Modwen taught the council nothing about the motives behind the developers. If Galliard have over paid for the site, that’s their problem, not the local residents. I will strongly object and consider a civil legal case against Galliard and the Council if these proposals are passed by Lewisham council.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the LegGate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.

	3	LEA SA 03	I am writing in response to reading about the Local Plan for Lewisham and also the new proposals to redevelop the Leegate Centre. I live in Lee and have lived in LB Lewisham for the majority of the last 23 years. I am excited that Lee is to benefit from new homes and regeneration however I have some concerns. These points should be included in the local plan and be included in the brief for redeveloping Leegate; Building Design & Layout I am worried that the height of the tower in Leegate will be too high and may set a precedent for future new buildings in the area e.g. the proposed BMW garage and Sainsbury sites. I am concerned that any new buildings should complement the surrounding buildings and that height is a key consideration. I don't think the new developments should be higher than the existing Leybridge Buildings. Dense, high buildings worry create dark, unsafe, unwelcoming public areas between them. I would ask that distance between buildings, total height and pedestrian access are carefully considered so that Lee is a welcoming, safe place to live and shop. Increasing local facilities and schools in relation to additional homes I feel strongly that there is a need to build new, affordable housing in our area but the number of homes must be matched with additional green spaces, schools and transport links and capacity. I am the mother of a toddler and am concerned that there are too few school spaces already, it is unfair that we may need to travel by bus or car with primary school children.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA SA 03	Galliards proposed Leegate plans: I'm writing to you regarding the plans to re develop Lee Gate. At present, with the introduction of the LTN in Lewisham, the thought of over another 1000 drivers entering the junction at Lee Gate means that Lewisham will be grid locked. Therefore, it is unsustainable to be building 650 new properties on this small site unless you ensure that the residents do not own motor cars. I live in [text removed] and the barricades mean that I just drive further to get to the same place to avoid the traffic jams. This is the main route from Kent and the only people this affects is the local residents. You cannot stop through traffic by blocking the roads - the drivers have an inelastic demand and have no alternative. How else will goods imported get to their destination without a significant increase in transport costs? Is the borough going to provide more refuse dumps locally? Driving to New Cross from Lee is impossible so the rubbish is being dumped on the streets because the	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The LTN is not part of the consultation and is outside the scope of the Local Plan. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies. The site allocations set out requirements for public realm improvements to support this approach. The London Plan also has stringent parking requirements which promote car-free development in accessible locations and car-'lite' development elsewhere. As such an increase in homes should not necessarily correspond with an increase in car use.	No change.

			borough makes it impossible for people to dispose of their items and so they fly tip. I thought that we'd had one development with high rises and that has just been knocked down. It was called Kidbrooke. This was on a much bigger site and failed so why will this be any different? The two policies - building homes and preventing road use are diametrically opposed. More people mean more consumption, more cars and more carbon emissions. Without a sensible road use policy, the traffic caused by this development will be horrendous and pollution worse. I therefore object to this proposal and would like my comments noted.		
	3	LEA SA 03	The proposals are not acceptable. They are a dominating mass of building which would overwhelm and be disproportionate in a community of homes and businesses of much smaller stature. The proposals are a cynical over development of a site which would distort a junction which has a listed four storey fire station and buildings of interest. This area is named Lee Green but the proposals have no 'green', indeed the large plane trees would be lost and public space disregarded. Over developing to this extent would set a precedent for the Sainsbury's and BMW garage sites and build problems for the future of our community. During our post COVID-19 recovery period where will the finance come from for schools, health- centres, transport and other infrastructure which would be needed to support a development like this? Where would this sit with the 'healthy neighbourhood scheme' when it would vastly increase the number of vehicles on our streets?	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. Details on the approaches on infrastructure funding are set out in the draft Local Plan Part 4 section on Delivery and monitoring.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 03	The Leegate centre is rundown so it would be great for it to be developed but the proposal from Galliard Homes will not result in a development that complements the area and develops the site in a sympathetic way. The proposed height and density of the development will be out of scale to the surrounding area. There is no need to build to 15 storeys - that will be completely out of character for the area and result in "tower blocks" with little landscaping, dark area and little green space. Lower rise buildings with landscaping and mixed use areas to reflect how we can live post-COVID would be a better way to develop - the Kidbrooke Estate has used landscaping effectively.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 03	At more local level I am concerned about the scale of the plans for redevelopment of the Leegate Shopping Centre. It is important that the redevelopment provides a good shopping and social meeting area alongside new housing, but as a local resident have major concerns about the height of the buildings proposed for Leegate by Galliard Homes, as it seems they intend one block to reach 15 storeys. This is fifty percent higher than the other highest	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update. Leegate Shopping Centre, Sainsbury's Lee Green and Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocations amended to refer to the Old Tiger's Head Pub and/or Grade II Listed Fire Station

			nearby buildings, the flats on the Leybridge Estate, which are 10 storeys high. The current proposals are on a scale that does not fit with the local building profile. Existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Road are mostly 3 or 4 storeys, and include a Grade ll listed fire station and a locally listed Old Tigers Head. I would like to see a 10 storey maximum height limit for any single building planned for the Lee Green area and an expectation that most new housing development should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys. This would mean that the public areas provided for walking, sitting and shopping would not be overpowered by an array of high buildings, which would also block out light from these areas. There is an opportunity to develop Lee Green into the 'vibrant, more welcoming and accessible' centre as the Plan suggests on page 633 para 16.7, but to do this any development will need to respect the proportions of the local area and not create the highrise blocks of parts of Kidbrooke Village and Lewisham town centre. It is important to note that although the existing Leybridge flats are 10 storey blocks they are set well back from the road and are situated in large green spaces. This is very different to the mass of high buildings bunched closely together that appear in Galliard Homes simulated pictures of their proposed Leegate development Given the potential of up to 630 new families moving into the area it is essential that the infrastructure should be developed so it can match the number of new residents with increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a good size community centre and increased transport provision: in pre-COVID days it was often importable to get on to trains at peak times with the existing number of residents, and buses were also often full.	The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA SA 03	I am writing in response to the proposals for development at Lee Green. Clearly there is a considerable need for improvement and I respect there is a need for housing. However the provision of additional housing should not come at the cost of depressing the area with overcrowding, inadequate service provision - schools, medical facilities etc. Galliard's proposal for high density housing is not the answer to a housing crisis. Lewisham needs to provide housing of a high standard, respecting the right of the residents of such development, to a quality of life- one that is not crammed into high rise flats adjacent to busy roads. I strongly reject any proposals to develop housing above 3 - 4 storeys on the buildings detailed in the proposals. The development of Lewisham town centre is a deplorable example of poor planning, showing scant regard for quality of life. High rise flats, packed close together, doubtless with privacy issues, close to areas of high road congestion	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			causing harm to health etc. There is no sense of overall design and material use - a total eyesore, This must not be repeated in Lee. I urge the planning committee to scrutinise Galliard's proposals and put the quality of life of potential residents first. Consider the detrimental impact on road congestion - Sainsbury's and other retail outlets will undoubtedly entail higher car usage. Lewisham has some beautiful, well kept greenspaces with a phenomenal skyline visible from many areas - something many of us have come to value highly, during the last year. Don't destroy Lee with high rise development.	Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA SA 03	I have just seen the plans for developing Leegate. I have had little time to consider this in detail, but there is very little detail to study. The following points strike me immediately :- 1) This is a very large development, the projected height seems to me quite excessive and out of keeping. 2) While I understand the need for new homes the addition of some 450 seems excessive for this small area. 3) 450 homes will demand an increase in local supportive infrastructure, this will require financing and further distortion of the locality. 4) The considerable increase in local population which is planned will add, without doubt, to the pollution of an already highly polluted area with increased traffic. I am afraid that I have to record that I am highly opposed to these proposals as they stand at present.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 03	Leegate Shopping Centre I have already added my comments for the Lewisham local plan on the Commonplace website but today (just 24 hours before the closing date for comments) I understand that Galliard Homes are thinking of building a 15 storey building with over 600 homes on the Leegate Shopping Centre site. This is outrageous! How is the area supposed to cope with these extra residents and their cars especially since the LTNs have made living in Lee very difficult? I am in agreement that this land is redeveloped into a good shopping and social meeting area, with an enlarged Community Centre at street level but the current proposals being discussed/developed by Galliard Homes CANNOT be allowed to go ahead. To construct a block of 15 storeys in height, far exceeds the height of any other building in the area so the Local Plan should state that the expectation of new shops/housing developments should be in keeping with existing buildings of 3 or 4 storeys so that any public areas/green spaces for walking or sitting would not be blocked off from any sunlight. The 3 London Plane trees	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	No change.

			should remain. There needs to be respect for the proportions of the local area. A very tall building would be an eyesore and make the area unwelcoming, unattractive and deter people from using the new shops and facilities being planned for the site. Otherwise Lee Green will just become another Kidbrooke Village or Lewisham Town Centre as the new high-rise blocks in these areas have destroyed any community; they are dark, unsafe, horrible and just a wind tunnel catching the pollution. It is essential that the infrastructure should be developed so it can match the number of new residents with increased medical services, schools, green spaces, play areas, a good size community centre for people to use and sufficient parking facilities which will be especially needed by disabled and older people when shopping etc. The plan should state the importance of developing new green spaces and also improving existing ones for leisure use as more families come into the area. The infrastructure improvements needed for Lee Green's development should be explicitly outlined in Lewisham's Local Plan.	The draft Local Plan Part 2 section on Green infrastructure sets out approaches to green and open spaces. In addition, the site allocations for the district centre include provisions for new publicly accessible open space.	
	3	LEA SA 03	Leegate Centre/Galliard Homes development proposal: The proposed development of the Leegate site is not in keeping with the scale of the existing site and its surroundings. Lee Green is not a town centre but a community in which the existing buildings respect the scale and future ones should do so. The density of the proposed dwellings is too great for the area to sustain without major investment in schools and supporting services. And where would these be provided? The height of the buildings would dwarf the immediate buildings and have a major visual impact on the surrounding area. The adjacent Leybridge estate is quite imposing but at least it is in a spacious green setting with trees. The development of Leegate is an ideal opportunity for a design that is both architecturally innovative, green and ecologically pioneering, not just a replica of the architectural follies that seem to be the norm in the 21st Century	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA SA 03	I am writing regarding the Leegate proposed development. I understand that the Council is considering proposals where Leegate could be up to 15 stories high and could include over 450 new homes. Allowing a development 15 storey high in an area where the surrounding buildings are at most four-storey high is simply grotesque. I am opposed to these plans. In addition it would set a precedent for further developers to demand similar increases over existing heights. I would urge the council to oppose such plans. The new development	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.

			should be no higher than the existing 10. -storey Leybridge estate, which is already the tallest building in Lee Green		
	3	LEA SA 03	I was shocked to hear from a neighbour in SE12 that Galliard homes have proposed a new scheme and there is only until the 11th to comment. The last scheme proposed by St Modwen wasn't right, and this is even worse. Nothing should be taller than the existing site. Nor should there be more density - it should maintain an open feel. Will it include a primary school? A GP? All things that are already stretched in the area. Please consider the local environment and impact.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 03	I write to express disagreement with the proposed plan by Galliard Homes to redevelop the Leegate Centre. First of all, the only messages I have received as a local resident on Cambridge Drive have been through a local community email group, not from Lewisham council, and further only on Friday, 9th April. It is beyond absurd that a response for comments is expected by Sunday, 11th April. It feels as if there is something wrong going on here. I will point out we all feel Leegate needs to be redeveloped but the proposed plans I have seen are unworkable for local residents and should not be approved. Building height of 15 stories - no way! 630 homes - no way! There should be a limit of 4-6 stories on anything built on that site consistent with the current building (certainly no higher). 630 homes is far too many for that tiny condensed area as density is already an issue. The leegate intersection is already the worst around for miles and it could not accommodate additional traffic from residents of 630 homes. This is crazy. If even half of these houses are built, what new infrastructure will go into the area to accommodate this? The plan makes no mention of any of this so therefore cannot be approved until a full infrastructure assessment on traffic (do not say new residents won't be allowed cars!), what new schools will be built, how many more NHS surgeries will be added, what transport links will be added (we will need a new DLR stop or tube stop nearby before this building is completed as the existing train lines are not good enough to accommodate the current population in normal times. I understand Sainsbury might get knocked down in this process and if so, where is a new supermarket (will need to be larger than existing) going to be built to accommodate all the new homes? There is no other supermarket in the local Lee Green area so residents cannot afford Sainsbury's to not exist for any period of time. Strangely, given the recent emphasis on clean neighbourhoods and bike lanes, etc. All of that will have to be reversed as there is no way the area can support the	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	No change.

			increased density with all the streets blocked off. Cycling will have to be prohibited in the area as there will be a real chance with all the new residents and traffic that cyclists will get killed. It would be a real shame to unblock some of these roads as the area was just getting nice again. Oh well, the council cannot have everything. In summary, a development of the size being envisioned does not belong in this area or the Lee Green intersection. It would be better to build such a development on land out in the country where there is space and less congestion. I truly believe these plans and the little time residents have been given to respond are close to insulting. Let's get LeeGate redeveloped but with a sensible plan that fits the area and is not too large.		
	3	LEA SA 03	We are writing to voice our opposition to the new development proposed by Galliard Homes at Leegate. As residents of [text removed], we would like a solution to the Leegate area. However, the plans that were put forward by Galliard are at a significant cost to the area. 450 homes and tower blocks at 15 stories (or higher!!!) is not an appropriate development for the area. Leegate should not be turned into another Lewisham central with tall block towers and overcrowded streets. The buildings should be 5 - 10 stories in height. No higher than that. 10 stories MAX in height. The proposed structures would dwarf the surrounding areas and not to mention, there is a distinct lack of greenery in their proposal. All we see is a few scattered trees and lots of pavement. 50% of the buildings in Lee are listed buildings and the proposal does not fit with the architecture of the area. This sets a precedent that other developers would build tall towers and blight our community. Now, what about the infrastructure? Where will the children of the development go to school? Our neighbouring schools are at capacity and we would need a new school built to accommodate those children. Leybridge Estate was built and Brindishe Lee was built to educate those children. There is nothing in the plans as to where the children would go to school. Will there be more bus services to and from Lewisham to accommodate the new residents? What about a new secondary school? There is no discussion on how or what kind of infrastructure will be built. What would we like to see in the Leegate area? An area that looks similar to what was done to the Leybridge Estate. You have 1 - 2 towers of 10 stories and lots of greenery around the area. Or perhaps 4 - 5 towers	This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			of 6 stories in height? Greenery and spaces for residents and locals to enjoy. Have a look at the Conington Road area and you will see a small development that doesn't feel like it is intrusive. Housing should be adequately spaced with lots of light and greenery. Space of walking, cycling, and limit the use of cars since our area can't cope with any more cars. More local shops, not another Sainsbury's. We need a space to encourage local shops with discounted rents and revive the area with a bustling high street. We have a few great shops on Lee Road and we don't see why we can't encourage more locals to open their own businesses. Please lodge our opposition to the proposal by Galliard Homes.		
	3	LEA SA 03	I write to you in regards to the proposed development at Lee Gate, which has recently been purchased from previous developer St Mowden's by Galliard Homes. The full plans for the development have still not been made available to the wider public, despite the deadline for public consultations over the Lewisham Local Plan being two days away. The limited information which has been shared so far indicates that the development will include some 450 homes, with some towers reaching a height of 15 storeys. While Leegate has long been under-utilised and in an almost derelict state and must certainly be redeveloped, Galliard Homes' plan would significantly alter the skyline of the local area and increase the density of what is currently a largely suburban, low-density area. The local plan should state that developments in the Leegate area should not exceed the existing height of 10 storeys and, if they were to include 10-storey towers, should not be built in the density currently proposed. A density similar to that of the Leybridge estate would be more appropriate. Furthermore, public services in Leegate and the local area are already under serious strain. Traffic is a significant problem at the Leegate intersection, queues at Leegate post office regularly last for an hour or more, and trains through Lee are already filled to capacity during normal non-pandemic times. The homes in the Galliard development, as with all other newbuild developments in the area, will be marketed towards commuters working in central London. The addition of 450 new homes will therefore place huge amounts of strain on the local transport services, which could become unmanageable without the necessary public investment. The local plan should include provisions for further investment in transport links and public services in the Leegate area.	This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA SA 03	I have been made aware that plans are afoot by Galliard Homes to redevelop Leegate with new homes that will be in a development as tall as 15 storeys high…!	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to	No change.

			I also understand that the tallest buildings in the surrounding area are no more than 4 storeys high…so I think it is fair to say that this is very much out of keeping with the local area and could set a dangerous precedent. I would strongly urge not to accept such plans and instead suggest a design more in keeping with the local geography.	express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	
	3	LEA SA 03	Density Welcoming both new residents and new housing would be expected but the council has entertained proposals for Leegate Centre over the last few years that many people find unacceptable in terms of housing density. Being told that PTALs and guidance on housing units per hectare are no longer going to be used has left people at a loss as to how to discuss just what is "high density". In the confusion it appears that developers are getting greedier and greedier and that council officers and members are spinning in their race to meet targets that few local people support. The Mayor of London has said that a supplementary planning guidance will be issued to assist councils apply density policy. This guidance will not be subject to consultation and has not been published yet. The ambiguous language of the London Plan is reflected in the draft Local Plan. In the draft Local Plan we have a few words on density but it would seem that Galliard Homes are not being asked to look even at this developing policy. Part Two sections 5.6, 5.32 and 5.51 along with QD6 appear to be relevant but have been ignored. It appears that the Galliard Homes proposal is allowed to play the trump card of "1,667 new homes a year" that allows all other considerations being ignored – height, bulk, employment, heritage, density.	Noted. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The Local Plan is required to be in general conformity with the London Plan. The new London Plan 2021 has removed the 'density matrix' and development proposals must now demonstrate how they will deliver the optimal capacity of a site using the design-led approach. The draft Local Plan takes this direction, and sets out additional policies to ensure that proposals have regard to the site context, including local character and heritage.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 03	I am writing to express my concern about Galliard Homes proposed development on the Leegate site. The suggestion that the development could be up to 15 storeys high seems to be completely out of scale with other properties in the area and also sets a worrying precedent for other possible developments in the area. What extra provision is being made for local infrastructure and facilities (schools, doctors, traffic etc.) if the proposal for up to 630 new homes goes ahead? We went through all of this when St Modwen made their ever escalating proposals for the site. I realise that the site needs to be redeveloped and that it is an ideal site for new homes but not at the expense of the aesthetics and sustainability of the existing community. The changes to traffic flow in the low traffic zones have already greatly increased the traffic on Burnt Ash Road and the Tigers Head junction, such a large development on Leegate would only make this worse, with knock on	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies. The site allocations for the district centre make provisions for public realm enhancements to support this approach. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	No change.

			consequences for pollution which is already above acceptable levels. Don't destroy the character and sustainability Lee Green by waving through these proposals (which seem to have had very little public exposure or input).		
	3	LEA SA 03	I have just read about the new planned development for Leegate and was very concerned about the architects plans I saw. I have been a Hither Green/Lee resident for over twenty years and feel that the plans proposed by Galliard Homes of 450 units would be detrimental to local life. 1. From a visual viewpoint, I am concerned about the impact that modern fairly low quality building would have on an area which mostly consists of period victorian housing. It looks quite similar to the developments in Kidbrooke village and I cannot see how this would fit in in our area. I am particularly concerned about the 15 storey height of the development which would completely ruin our area. 2. This is an already populated area, with little extra space for parking. Where would the cars of future inhabitants go and local residents already struggle to find a parking space? 3. Local primary and secondary schools are already over-subscribed. The International Academy of Greenwich which had been planned in the fields opposite is now closing as the council refused planning permission. Where will the children of these families study? I therefore oppose the plans as they currently stand and would urge the council to reconsider their decision.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies. The London Plan sets more stringent parking standards, and the expectation is that new developments within the town centre will be car-free or 'car-lite'. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan	No change.
	3	LEA SA 03	LEEGATE 4.The Council will recall all too vividly the lengthy dialogue with St Modwen before they sold the site. A number of important parameters were established then than must not be lost sight of. There will clearly need to be full and effective consultation on the proposals that emerge from Galliard Homes. 5.As we recall it, the original St Modwen proposals some years ago did not offer enough housing, particularly public housing. However to go to 600+ units from the last St M. figure we saw which was 400- will surely overdevelop the site.The blocks look to be too high ,overshadowing other parts of the area. We also need to retain small scale useful retail units- pharmacists, hardware, newsagents, gyms, cafes. Some space for community provision and services would also be essential. Some of the accommodation needs to be in family houses and not just flats. Then there was agreement at an earlier stage that some public open space needed to be retained in any redevelopment. Finally, the more units, the more the problems referred to at 3. above	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.

	3	LEA SA 03	Why a Section S215 Notice under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 was never issued to St Modwen defies belief? Maybe in the light of the Fly tip that is the Council's Local Recycling Bin area on the corner of Leegate that blights the Square and Trees, one should be served on themselves? The Plane trees are pollution busting assets which have not had the TPOs restored as they should have once the ASDA fell through. They have given service for years and will continue to do so for quite a while yet. They co-exist with the splendid line at Leyland Road and are undoubted habitat for many species. These should be the starting point for a green square with the existing throughput away from pollution. I show photos of the rubbish attracting alley at Osberton Road which is now the access to Cambridge Drive as an illustration of when the Council built over the road.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals previously prepared by St Mowdens for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Both the adopted and draft Local Plan include provisions on tree retention, and where necessary replacement. The assessment of any trees lost as part of any future proposals for Leegate will be made through the Development Management process and residents will have the opportunity to express their views as part of the statutory consultation.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 03	Having seen the proposals regarding Galliard Homes for Lee Gate I am horrified. The idea of more high rise buildings in any part of Lewisham is terrible. I address the following: Housing type - firstly Lewisham lacks medium to low rise safe social housing, we do not require anymore large, imposing buildings in Lewisham. Experiencing the ongoing works near Lewisham Station has the infrastructure been taken into account, where are these tenants going to be parking, more fumes, more traffic and already we have roads closed to "make things better" but actually forcing more traffic onto the main roads, slowing all journeys. In general appointments already take forever, the occupants will need to GPs, schools all services anyone living in their borough deserves and these are already pushed to the limit. The trains at Lewisham and Hither Green (the most popular stations) are like rush hour all the time since the new blocks in Lewisham as these are the best routes home, Lee and Blackheath are two platform stations and it would mean the same for them. Stations I consider comfortable to travel from. Maximum height - if approved this should low to medium rise, the road widths are too narrow this is not the US, the path down to Deptford already has too many tall buildings, it is imposing the traffic is ridiculous and if the housing does not have enough parking, then this will cause an additional issue. This should be considered for all three sites. Lee is an area where you meet people who have lived here for over 30 years happily due to what it looks like, its proximity to services, trains. In general, intense additional is a bad idea, it is already priced people out of the market when it comes to buying with the ridiculous "Blackheath borders" tag of the last 5-6 years allowing agents to value properties ridiculously. If the idea is to attract I feel it will make the affluent leave if they are surrounded by more traffic, it is their voices that are the loudest on social media when they cannot get from A to B without driving all around all the place, if the parks are packed and they cannot get a GP appointment for	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The draft Local Plan sets a strategic target for 50% of all new homes to be genuinely affordable. Further details are set out in the Part 2 section on Housing. Planning applications will be assessed against the extant development plan policies. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			weeks due to the surgeries trying to serve their communities, will they stay. They will move out for more space and less competition for local amenities. If the idea is just income, the supply of more affordable housing would be the best option, there are a large amount of people paying too high rents who would love to stay in this area and contribute for the longer term but with this plans you chase the further afield. Any plans that encroach on the quaggy, the park or any of the views and spaces are a bad idea, which are what attract people to the area, not high rise ugly flats as those in the middle of Lewisham and enroute to Deptford. The housing in the area is already quite intense it would be nice to have space thoughtfully occupied.		
	3	LEA SA 03	Lewisham's Local Plan and Galliard Homes proposals to develop Leegate: 2. Re Height It is proposed that the height should be 15 storeys which is 37% higher than the nearest high rise block and totally out of keeping with the older buildings nearby which are at most of 3 or 4 storeys and some of which are listed. The proposed development does not fit in with the local area and furthermore appears to contravene the London Plan which provides that tall buildings should only be built where there is infrastructure and transport links to support them. As I have said earlier this is not the case here and there does not appear to be any provision for this, indeed there would be nowhere for it.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA SA 03	We would like to respond to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan as people who live in Lee Green. We are very concerned by the plans we have seen from Galliard Homes for the Leegate Shopping Centre site, and in particular by the proposed 15-storey tower which would dominate the crossroads and surrounding area. As people who walk across the crossroads at Lee Green all the time, I would not want to see the environment in that area, which already suffers from traffic and pollution, made worse by the building of a tower which is completely out of scale with surrounding buildings and would block out light. We think the Local Plan should specify a maximum height for developments in Lee Green which should not be any higher than the existing ten-storey residential blocks, which are also set back a considerable way from the road. We are equally concerned that Galliard are suggesting the site could accommodate up to 630 units. As far as we are concerned the 450 units proposed by St Modwen in its plans, which we saw at the local library, is the absolute maximum that should be allowed on the Leegate site. Again, it would be sensible to include a limit in the Local Plan so developers have a clear understanding of what would be suitable. We are disappointed that, given the comments already made about the Lee Green area in the Local Plan, that Galliard should propose a housing density	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies. The site allocations for Lee Green district centre include provisions for significant public realm enhancements to support this approach.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			that would be very damaging to our area and totally out of character. As the Local Plan states, a successful redevelopment of the Leegate centre is crucial to the future of Lee Green. The redevelopment will bring more traffic to our already crowded roads - there will be more people in our busy local parks, needing medical treatment, in our schools and on our trains. So both for their sake and for ours, it is really important that we do not sacrifice in the process the good things about Lee Green - the greener and more suburban character that you mention in the Local Plan, and I would add the attractive and friendly environment.		
	3	LEA SA 03	I am writing to you to object to the building of a 15 storey high rise block in Lee Green. Tower blocks are not the best way to house people – architects should be made to live in such blocks to see how inconvenient they are. Also they throw huge shadows and will also overlook all the houses in the surrounding area. People with families prefer to live in a house with a garden so that children can play safely under the eyes of their parents and not playing 15 storeys lower where parents cannot safely let their children play. Lee Green is supposed to be an area where it is pleasant to live and erecting such large buildings which will tower over other buildings and homes is not the way to go. I hope these thoughts will be taken into consideration at the next planning meeting and also that all Lee Green residents will be informed and enabled to attend any such planning meeting before final decisions are made.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA SA 03	We wish to register our strong objection to the plans by Galliard to build 630 new homes in Leegate. The infrastructure does not exist to support the thousands of extra people that will be living in these homes. Where are the schools, health facilities, public transport, the shops including places to eat and drink and the green spaces that will allow people to relax and unwind? The services currently available in the area will be overwhelmed. Has any major funding been allocated to this project? The Lee Ward already receives the lowest amount of funding than any other ward in Lewisham. No building should be fifteen storeys high in this area! Five storeys high at the most. It sounds as though Galliard just want to pack as many people into an area regardless of the cost to those people or the people already residing in that area. We live on Burnt Ash Road and the traffic, especially since the Low Traffic Neighbourhood scheme was implemented, has been horrendous, slightly eased since the tweaking,	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public	No change.

			but still of a very high volume. The Leegate proposal will just add more people trying to access an already polluted, high volume traffic area. The plans do not fit in with the aesthetic of the area. There will be a huge monolith of blocks of flats rising up at one end of Burnt Ash Road out of keeping with nearby buildings. Will there be balconies built into the design of these flats that will be big enough to accommodate a small table and chairs so people can have some small private outdoor space? This is vitally important for people's well-being. Balconies have been built onto every new block of flats in the centre of Lewisham and in Kidbrooke. This consultation is rushed and it is quite disgraceful that people in the local area have not been kept informed and given enough time to consider these proposals.	transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies. The site allocations for Lee Green district centre include provisions for significant public realm enhancements to support this approach. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. Details on the approaches to fund infrastructure are set out in the draft Local Plan Part 4 section on Delivery and monitoring The London Plan includes minimum internal and outdoor amenity space standards, which all development proposals must comply with. The draft Local Plan proposes to take forward these space standards.	
	3	LEA SA 03	I object to this development in the form proposed by Lewisham and Galliard. I live near the site of this proposed development at the address below. (Note: address redacted by Council). If the development materialises at the scale, density and proportions implied by the plan conceptual drawings provided, it will be a most insensitive imposition that degrades the already poor quality of the built environment around the site e.g. Leegate precincts;. It will become a blight on the area before the shine wears off its cladding panels. Evidence - the hi-density megablock structures that we have seen thrown up along the riverfront in Greenwich (destined to turn into a sterile and unpleasant ghetto, and already showing the signs). The proposed structures are gross and overbearing and charmless and of intimidating dehumanising scale, "carbuncle" etc.. Imagine huddling in those dim cold canyons between the massive buildings trying to light a fag in the wind tunnels? The only relief might be graffiti. The proposed accommodation implies an increase in local resident density that far exceeds the capacity of the local retail, health, schools, leisure and other facilities available in the area, which is already borderline in terms of its capacity in these aspects. Local school catchments (for the schools that people want to get into) are already measured in envelopes of tens of meters. If this goes ahead almost all of the people who live in it will be off to Lewisham and Catford for the shops. Why not put them in Lewisham and Catford and reduce your carbon footprint and stop particulates and NOx from all the buses?	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies. The site allocations for Lee Green district centre include provisions for significant public realm enhancements to support this approach.	No change.

			The proposal ignores the physical reality of the site. The high density blocks on the Riverfront in Greenwich etc. sit within the expansive "riverscape" which grants some relief and space around the monolithic buildings. But such towering buildings are not appropriate in a location hemmed in on all sides by roads and lower building frontages, and no surrounding open vistas/sightlines to provide perspective and scale in which the buildings might be looked at so that at least they look like aesthetically interesting objects (even if nobody really likes living in them). I suggest something more sensitive like what has been done in Kidbrooke Village? Presumably the answer is that there is not enough area on the Leegate site so you can't get the bums in beds. So the developers want to go upwards and not sideways. In this setting that is a recipe for disaster that will bestow upon Lee a bigger Leegate eyesore than what we already have. Might it be wise to attend to lessons of that failed project to avoid repeat the planning and design errors of the past?. I am in favour of a sensitive smart city sustainable green infrastructure style redevelopment of this site - and something like a Kidbrooke Village style approach to the scale, green corridors and space etc. might work well. It should not include a tower block, and it should be designed to integrate into a corridor of increasing greenness and leafiness along the axis of Burnt Ash Road - Blackheath. Keeping that in mind the tower block will be much better fitted in at the Lewisham town end of the Lee-Lewisham axis. In other words my suggestion is the very obvious one - knock Leegate down, put something of no more than four storeys on the site with some nice trees and bistro's etc. Add some smart things like tech businesses, arts, etc. Face reality - there is no room here. Keep the high density housing in the places which are the natural homes of high density accommodation - i.e. the urban centres of Lewisham and Catford where all the shops are. Then the Borough will end up with a smart clean working town centre and a low density nice leafy suburban parts. I do hope this does not get further serious consideration. If it does I think it would show that Lewisham Council has a pretty disdainful attitude to the sustainability of our community and the quality of our local environment. I have long been surprised that the Council seems to think it's acceptable for people to continue living in the Leegate complex in its current state of decrepitude. St Modwen should be ashamed of the state of the place. Perhaps they are but can't do anything. Please register my objection to this proposed development. I suggest this proposal really does need re-	As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	

			appraisal and re-design at a fundamental level. It seems so thoughtless proposal that I wonder if it has been put out as a provocative opening gambit to elicit reaction from local community members about what they really want! No doubt it will be effective in that, but will it do any good? I haven't made much comment in the past but I believe the Lee community has been telling the Council for several years what it wants in relation to the St Modwen Leegate redevelopment, but those inputs must have, largely, been ignored judging from this Galliard proposal. Presumably if there is no room to build anything the Govt will relent on its exhortations to Council to build more. Is the Council looking at it from that point of view? I am sure if you took Boris Johnson to Leegate and showed him what you are proposing to build on there he would tell you it's bonkers. Has anyone thought of that?		
	3	LEA SA 03	Leegate - new development proposals: Having briefly seen some of the proposals I am concerned about the adverse impact on the neighbourhood and the environment. Please send further details of the above proposal as I wish to comment urgently - regards - John Bevan. - I have concerns about the height of the development proposed and believe that this is a case of overdevelopment on behalf of the developers! - Does the development takes account of the urban grain and context of the site! Currently this seems most unlikely! - What studies have been carried out to ensure that the resulting traffic is not going to cause yet more pollution on surrounding roads to the detriment of those living nearby? - With the amount of homes being proposed the adverse effects on infrastructure must be very serious. What is proposed to alleviate this? Are more GP's surgeries being proposed and have local hospitals been consulted about the impacts of this proposed development and what about the impacts on existing schools? - What conservation of environment has been considered? With the current climate crisis what measures have been taken to ensure that the buildings proposed do not contribute to the detriment of environment and to ensure positive standards of insulation and the embodiment of green energy? - As regards design and planning it is important that the spaces between buildings is as important as the buildings themselves - to provide a cleaner and more healthy environment, including more open, green space. - It appears here that too many buildings have been crammed onto the site. Overdevelopment again!	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.

			- What account has been taken in planning the housing with the need for more home working and the inevitable spatial consequences for the planning of living areas? - How much consultation has been untaken with local residents and retail premises? Subsequently we all have to live with the consequences of the Councils development decisions. Please let this development be an exception to often poorly built planning and development, and to create better and more humane living and working spaces.		
	3	LEA SA 03	I object to any 15 story buildings being built in Lee green. The maximum I would be happy with is 5 stories. If more housing is built, where will these people work? They will have to travel on the already busy trains and buses. They will contribute to the already busy roads if they are car owners. I hope that local business will be able to thrive? Especially charity shops seems SWOP as they are good got the environment and this is EXACTLY what should be the main focus. I also hope that access to the river will be made.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The draft Local Plan Part 2 section on Economy and culture sets out approaches to grow the local economy, recognising that Lewisham has one of the lowest jobs to resident worker ratios in London. The revitalisation of the district centre will support this objective. The draft Local Plan makes provision for a wide range of main town centre uses within Lee Green district centre. However to support the viability of the centre with a flexible policy approach, it does not specify the nature of business activities sought. The draft Local Plan makes provisions for river restoration and improved public access to the Quaggy and other rivers.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 03	High rise developments and Leegate Leegate shopping centre has been bought by a residential developer who plan to replace the shopping centre with a high rise development completely at odds to its historic surroundings. This area fronts a junction and would completely dominate and overshadow the four other historic corners which consist of Victorian buildings if no more than four to five stories in height. The local plan should protect areas such as this from high rise development. Family apartments and family housing mixed with independent retail that aesthetically matches the other three corners would befit this area which acts as a gateway to Lee Green. A shaded, windy corridor caused by faceless high rises does not. Lewisham Gateway has already suffered from a disconnected look and feel of high rises. This is the council's opportunity to show they can work hand in hand with developers on sympathetic redevelopments that add character not take away from an area.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The London Plan, and draft Local Plan Part 2 Design section, include policies which address amenity, and in the case tall buildings, microclimate.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA SA 03	I would like to reply to the Galliards plans for Leegate. I haven't had time to look at them in detail but what stood	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for	No change.

			out was the large number of dwellings and the height of some of housing. This is a busy residual area already and the I'm not sure that for the couple of thousand extra people you propose to move here it will be a good experience. The height of the buildings is a real problem and would impinge on an already crowded area. They would dwarf the few attractive buildings around Leegate. How are these plans going to help or improve the area of Leegate? Will this number of dwellings be needed in the future? More people are leaving London and house prices in parts are already going down.	the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The latest population projections issued by the Greater London Authority indicate that whilst Covid-19 and Brexit have had short term impacts on migration patterns, London is forecast to continue growing over the long-term.	
	3	LEA SA 03	Leegate shopping centre development: I do not support current proposals being developed by Galliard Homes for the Leegate shopping centre. The area does need redevelopment but the plans put forward do not enhance the local environment or economy. Considering the past 12 months' of lockdown we've all had to live under, the proposals fail to provide these new residents with adequate green space, Blackheath, Greenwich park, sutcliffe park and manor house gardens are already very busy and attracts people from miles around. The nearby Edith Nesbit park is not an inviting or adequate space to accommodate potential 630 plus residents. The height of the development is a safety concern especially as the windows of the apartments will directly overlook pavements - this is dangerous! There is no indication how they will deal with the further drain resources in this area - i.e. impact on schooling. The new development will increase traffic and pollution in an already busy area. I hope you take my concerns into consideration.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 03	In response to the consultation period for the Lewisham Local Plan, I am very much against the Galliards proposal to build up to 15 storeys high on the Leegate site. This is inappropriate and does not appear to be in compliance with the Local Plan. It would overshadow existing historic buildings and is likely to present dangerous shadowing and glare for the Lee Green junction, already the site of recent fatal accidents. The number of residential units would also require considerable increases in local infrastructure. Nowhere does Galliards appear to wish to contribute locally to amelioration of their plans impact on the neighbourhood. Please take these points into account when looking at the planning application.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. Planning applications will be considered against the extant development plan, having regard to any material weight afforded to emerging plans and the statutory stage they are at in the plan-making process.	No change.

	3	LEA SA 03	I am horrified at the plans for a 15 storey development at Leegate. I consider a development of no more than 5 storeys more suitable to the surrounding area. Any more than that would mean that the residents would not feel part of the strong community in the area.	This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegte site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 03	I approve of building more homes, but I think we need to ensure proper provision of surrounding facilities. The traffic situation along Lee High road is worse than ever since the bus lanes were made 24/7 and more housing can only exacerbate this. I use the Sainsburys every week so want this to remain. I would not like to see buildings above around six storeys and hope there will be provision for green space and play areas. . Leegate has been an eyesore for years and it is surely time to fix it, but high rise and no neighbourhood provision is not the right solution.	Noted. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The draft Local Plan site allocation for the existing Sainsbury's site would enable the reprovision of a supermarket. The draft Local Plan site allocations for the Lee Green district centre make provisions for significant public realm improvements, including publicly accessible open space.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04 LEA SA 05	I have just been made aware of the new plans for Lee Gate redevelopment. The scale of this redevelopment is beyond what the local infrastructure can support. The local primary school is one form entry with a catchment area which does not always extend beyond Burnt Ash Road. The local GP surgeries are small and already at capacity. The local private nurseries are over subscribed. The train stations in either direction of this redevelopment are already running very busy services with no plans for more trains to run through these stations. The size and height of this redevelopment is unsympathetic to the local area and sets a president for future high rise buildings. The redevelopment of the area surrounding Lewisham station is warning of what could happen to this junction. Tall buildings overshadowing a busy road do not make very pleasant walk ways. Further to this I do not think that the Sainsbury's site or BMW garage site should be included in these plans. This redevelopment is showing a bad side to big business and town planning placing profits and targets before local	Noted. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The remaining points seem to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. It should be noted that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes it clear that Councils should	No change.

			communities. This is not what should be built here, in an area where previous attempts have been made to secure the historic nature and importance of the area. Any redevelopment should not exceed in height what is already here. A maximum of three stories would also not overshadow the local historic buildings. Any redevelopment should be sympathetic to what was here before. Developments of these kind would improve the area socially and economically as it would make the area more desirable and inspire a greater sense of community. Redevelopments which work with local communities have better long term outcomes for all involved rather than a short term goal of quick development. The fact that these talks have not been made public also illustrates an understanding of the strong ill feeling these plans will produce. Again smacking of profits over people. In a time of mayoral voting these things should be more transparent and open.	proactively enter into Pre-application discussions with developers and work proactively with developers to resolve issues prior to an application being made. This pre-application process is confidential. The Council in this regard is simply undertaking its statutory duty as per the NPPF.	
	3	LEA SA 03	I'm writing to object to the Gaillard Homes Leegate planning proposal. This plan proposes buildings that are two high and occupation that is too dense. The proposals breach guidelines from the London Plan, Lewisham's Tall Building guidance and the advice of Historic England. The buildings will completely spoil the architectural and lived-in environment, radically reducing space, dominating the listed and other local buildings and distorting the amenable, human scale that currently characterizes Lee. The practical concerns that the plan raises are no less alarming than the environmental ones. No significant infrastructure is proposed to accommodate occupants of 450 residences, whose health and education will have to be catered for by other local already-overcrowded schools and health facilities. The traffic problems that already exist in Lee will become much worse. Both new and current residents in the area will be harassed, cramped and beset with many more day-to-day privations and challenges than they currently face. I am not of course objecting to development in Lee in general, which can and should happen. Yet the Gaillard development will only significantly benefit the developers, Lewisham Council and any commercial facility that will be on the site. It obviously won't improve the quality of life of current residents or offer adequate space and facilities for new ones. Please take these considerations seriously and think about your residents as well as your financial imperatives. Consider the huge developments in the centre of Lewisham and ask yourself honestly how many residents that lived in the area beforehand think their lives have been improved by them. If you think local people are happy with these developments, then I suggest that you're either being disingenuous, or you don't know your residents well at all. Please don't make the same mistake in Lee.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 03	Regarding the Lee Gate plans. We already have a significant number of new high rise buildings due to the	Noted. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Leegreen we appreciate that	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			Kidbrooke development and do not need more in Lee Gate. These are a blight on the landscape and difficult for upper floor residents, especially during lockdowns when they are stuck inside without regular access to a green space. We do need housing but Lee Green also needs a green area for children, more trees, leisure facilities and local shops. We have a supermarket at Lee Gate and any expansion of this is unnecessary with other large supermarkets serving the area, based in Kidbrooke, Eltham, Lewisham. Lee Green could be a beautiful area. We already have established Victorian buildings which with some thoughtful landscape surrounding could transform the area.	this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The draft Local Plan site allocations for the Lee Green district centre make provisions for significant public realm improvements, including publicly accessible open space.	
	3	LEA SA 03	I am writing to submit my views on the consultation of the draft Local Plan for Lewisham. I am aware that Galliards Home's have purchased the site at Leegate, Lee Green which faces directly on to my home in Eltham Road, [text removed]. I understand Galliard Homes are in consultation with Lewisham Council with regards planning proposals on the Leegate site which involves a proposal to build up to 450 units on the Leegate site. I note that these units may well be up to 15 stories in height. Lewisham Local Plan does not include any guidance with regards height limits at the Leegate site. This is in contrast to the Lee Neighbourhood Plan which states that "building height should be in keeping with the surrounding buildings including the building design, mass, scale and detailed design and that generous set backs and public realm are included in order to build human scale".	This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA SA 03	Please do not build excessively high buildings in Leegate which would not be sustainable by local infrastructure. 15 stories is too high and the plans show a group of buildings with no green space, soulless and bleak.	This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA SA 03	I live in Lee. The proposed images of Leegate are truly awful. 15 stories within a small area is totally overbearing. This area has huge traffic problems already so the ambition to build so intensely is environmentally irresponsible. There should be a community development in line with the area and not a high build complex. It is without any consideration for the history of Lee. A community	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.

			development supports local people with facilities and shops to aid them. This looks like a money grabbing, cynical development and not in line with the values a Labour Controlled Council should support. You need to consult with your community...you're not some Tory Council who doesn't care about the hearts and minds of its community so please rework with us working with you.		
	3	LEA SA 03	I am shocked to learn that Lewisham Council might approve the plan proposed by Galliard Homes for Leegate. This plan includes 15-torey high blocks. This is a monstrous development for Lee Green, if allowed by Lewisham Council. The highest building currently in Lee Green is 10-storey. What about schools and medical services for such a development? Don't children and families in this proposed development need such services?	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA SA 03	Dear Planners, I am writing on behalf of my wife and myself - two local citizens. Due to the pandemic it has of course been impossible for gatherings like the local assemblies where local people can consider and discuss developments as those proposed for Lee Green and Leegate in particular. In the Plan the first objective is to re-establish Lee Green as a "welcoming and thriving commercial and community place." It seems that our planners have handed over control to a developer, Galliard, to decide what is going to be done. What is being proposed by the developer is way out of scale of what the local community wants and deserve. We are strongly against what is on the table right now.	Noted. The Local Plan consultation is being carried out in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04	I would like the following added to the above plan; No building on the Leegate site or Sainsbury site to be taller than 10 stories. Where new builds are next to listed buildings they must be no taller than the listed building Dwelling density to be no higher than leybridge court. More money must go in the plan for infrastructure. In particular, for schools, and for off road parking.	Noted. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

	3	LEA SA 03	I have a flat at [text removed]; could you please let me know my flat is affected by Leegate Shopping Centre development? If I lose my flat for new development I need a new flat in new development. I need a 3 bed room flat.	The Local Plan is a strategic policy document against which any future planning applications will be considered. We would recommend that you contact your landlord for further details on any emerging planning application and how this may affect your tenancy.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 03	Leegate shopping centre has been taken over by Galliard Homes, who propose to build over 400 flats, in blocks of up to 15 storeys high. This is too much for this area. The public transport is already overcrowded at peak times, and there aren't enough schools or doctors surgeries in the area to cope with so many more people. Not to mention the environmental concerns of water supply, sewage removal and refuse/recycling collections for 400+ extra homes. Earlier proposals, under the previous owners, were more agreeable: a tasteful shopping area, with independent shops, a reasonable amount of new homes, some allotments and a pedestrian seating area. Something like that would work, but not the high rise estate that has now been proposed. Also, I hope you have dropped the plans to shoehorn new houses and flats into the Effingham Road garages. This was discussed at a meeting a year ago and we, the residents, put our objections to the architects/councillors at the time.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 03	A friend has today alerted me to the proposals for Leegate. Having lived in the Borough of Lewisham for 19 years I feel it appropriate to respond to this proposal having deep knowledge of the local area around Leegate. During those 19 years I lived in Lochaber Road, Courtlands Avenue, Harland Road and now Kingsand Road. Having shopped at the Sainsbury's for most of those years (12 years total), and passed through the intersection as a pedestrian, cyclist and driver I have intimate knowledge on the multiple redesigns at this major intersection, some which were from memory replaced several years later due to the design being inadequate. I moved this year to Kingsand Road, and the traffic calming and quieter neighbourhoods implemented in 2020 with initially no consultation. So I have first hand knowledge of the extra traffic that has been pumped out onto the main roads and the intersection of Burnt Ash and Lee High Road. Moving home is time consuming and the roads I had used in my previous move from Harland Road to Ladywell, was no longer a 'legal route'. The quieter neighbourhoods meant that what should have been a 15-20 minute journey each way, became 45 minutes to 75 minutes dependant on traffic volumes. So I can say first hand that if there is limited or no infrastructure budget for the Leegate proposal - an Underground station, DLR station, additional buses (for workers NOT school children), widening of roads for dedicated cycle lanes, then an additional 450 housing units	Noted. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies. The site allocations for Lee Green district centre include provisions for significant public realm enhancements to support this approach. The remaining comments seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to	No change.

			will add more congestion to an already highly congested area. On this basis alone I object to the proposals. Part of the reason I have lived in these areas is that I like the local community feel, the low rise housing and buildings in and around the Lee / Hither Green (Blackheath Borders side) area, the style of the buildings and that it has become a conservation area. Why is the council not building low rise 4 story max in line with existing height of properties in this area? If the council has to provide local housing why not “own the land” and build on it so that it has a modern and affordable housing stock? Long term I believe this to be preferable to a house builder profiting from building high rise apartments and then arguing about how many affordable properties they have to provide. My understanding is that on every recent development in the borough the developer has successfully reduced the number of affordable housing units. 15 stories feels like other local properties adjacent to the proposed development will be dwarfed. 15 stories in height also feels out of step with the conservation area requirements and building restrictions. The building alone on this site will add additional heavy traffic vehicles to a road system that is already at capacity.	express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	
	3	LEA SA 03	I have seen the plans for Lee Green and surrounding area and would like to express my absolute objection to what is being proposed. The main objections I have is are listed below: 1.The height of the proposed buildings. There is no way that a small community area should become dominated by such huge buildings. They are obscenely high and it would totally block out the skyline and make the area so heavily overpowered by huge buildings. I understand the need for increased housing in London, but this has to be balanced with sensible developments that don’t impact negatively on people's lives. These new developments should not be higher than the current buildings. 2.Galliard plans propose 450 more housing units. How is the local area going to cope with such an increase in popluation with not enough amenities to meet the needs of all of thoe people who will then be living there? Where are the schools and doctors surgeries that will be needed to accoodate these new residents. 3. There has been no local consultation. People who live here were fully involved last time when St Modwen were propsoing new buildings for the Lee Gate space. All local residents must be consulted.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. Any major application will also assess the impact of the proposal against infrastructure requirements. It should be noted that although the Council does encourage developers to carry out pre-application consultation with residents there is no statutory	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

				requirement and this is at the discretion of the developer.	
	3	LEA SA 03	I have recently learnt about new proposal for the Lee Gate development by Galliard Homes. I am a local resident and I really enjoy living in the area. However, after reading the details I have my points of concern that I would like to share, please see below: 1. The height of the 15 storey building - does not match existing landscape, exceeds buildings around and increases population in already busy space. 2. Over 600 new houses - I don't think existing nurseries, schools and GPs and dental surgeries will be able to cope. Will this be addressed by the council? I am also concerned about additional traffic that will be added to/around Lee Green area- as you might be aware the pre-covid situation lead to enormous traffic on the connecting roads. 3. Will new proposal include/ will be required to include: green spaces, playground, communal spaces (as Lee Gate currently play big role in hosting activities run by local communities)? 4. Lewisham Council planning team will allow another towered development that will become another front runner for the Carbuncle award - where local community is not consulted and only height and the amount of sold flats count without thinking how it will all work for families that live/ will be living in the space. While I would like to see Lee Gate being developed I would hope it can be done without impacting the quality of life of existing residents. Where we still have enough schools, can see a doctor where required and are not surrounded by 15 storey towers. I appreciate making decisions like this is difficult and finding a balance and satisfying all involved parties is challenging/ not always possible but would hope the planning team can listen to our/residents voices and address our concerns.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA SA 03	Lee Green/Leegate Proposed Development: My concerns about and objections to the proposed development are the following: • Some of the buildings are too high and will dominate the area - the design seems quite ugly • The design is very unsympathetic to the existing architecture of the area • The local area does not have the infrastructure (schools, roads, parking places, GPs) to cope with such a large increase of housing and population • The Lee Green junction is very busy already and there are regular traffic jams which will be increased with higher population and private vehicles	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. The Local Plan will help give effect to the London Plan objective for 90% of journeys in inner-London to be made by walking, cycling and the use of public	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			• There are already excessive amounts of pollution on our streets and the increase of so many homes and resulting vehicles will add to that • I am not sure if there are any green spaces or community hubs? Lee Gate used to be a pleasant shopping area years ago with stores such as Boots and Woolworths as well as independent shops and planting which made it an attractive area to walk through. I hope all local residents' views will be taken into consideration.	transport. The promotion of sustainable transport modes are central to the Local Plan ambitions and policies and are set out clearly in Part 2 Transport policies. The site allocations for Lee Green district centre include provisions for significant public realm enhancements to support this approach. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	
	3	LEA SA 03	I would like to register my strong objection to the possibility of a 15 storey tower being built at Leegate by Galliard Homes. The previous St Modwen proposal was, in my view, far superior as it offered a much lower construction height as well as a mixed residential/retail development and was far more sympathetic to the local area. I supported that St Modwen proposal and was unhappy when it did not proceed due to some changes being required by Lewisham with the result that St Modwen then decided that it was no longer in their commercial interest to develop the site and so they decided to sell it instead. Now it appears that the residents (of which I am one) will end up with something far worse. This is unacceptable in my view. In my view:- a) a 15 storey height will be an eyesore to the whole area and the number of houses proposed will drastically worsen the already bad traffic in the area which has recently become even more congested by the local road closures. I consider this 15 storey height totally unacceptable; b) This risks the same height development being built on the Sainsburys and BMW garage site which would also be unacceptable; c) I would like to see something far more in line with the previous St Modwen proposal i.e. an attractive mixed residential/retail site of limited height (no more than 6 storeys) with adequate parking. I have lived in Lee for 26 years and Leegate has been a complete embarrassment to the area for far too long. This is an opportunity to greatly improve the area and a 15 story development is NOT the way to achieve that.	This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 03	I have very recently discovered there are new plans in the pipeline for Leegate. Whilst supporting a new development for this area I cannot agree with the proposals I have very recently read about. Having realised the deadline for submitting any views is in little over an hour I have decided that the email below submitted by another local resident says exactly the things that I want to say. So rather than	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			rewording it at such short notice I am copying and pasting it. Building height of 15 stories - no way! 630 homes - no way! There should be a limit of 6 stories on anything built on that site consistent with the current building. 630 homes is far too many for that tiny condensed area as density is already an issue. The Leegate intersection is already the worst around for miles and it could not accommodate additional traffic from residents of 630 homes. This is crazy. If even half of these houses are built, what new infrastructure will go into the area to accommodate this? The plan makes no mention of any of this so therefore cannot be approved until a full infrastructure assessment on traffic (do not say new residents won't be allowed cars!), what new schools will be built, how many more NHS surgeries will be added, what transport links will be added? Existing train lines are not good enough to accommodate the current population in normal times. In summary, a development of the size being envisioned does not belong in this area or the Lee Green intersection.	The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	
	3	LEA SA 03	4. With regard to the Leegate centre, which is the development nearest to our house, I should like to make the following comments: pls avoid overly high buildings (I'd suggest not more than 5 storeys); I'm not convinced there is demand for a huge amount of retail space in that area so suggest you don't build a lot or at least keep the plan flexible in this regard. It would be lovely if you could develop a hub of independent shops but I appreciate that's challenging; please include some green space amenities integrating paths and cycle routes (this works well around the new Kidbrooke station development).	Noted. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The draft Local Plan proposals for Lee Gate district centre seek to ensure provision of a wide range of main town centre uses, along with a mix of business unit typologies. However, the plan cannot prescribe the nature of end users occupiers (for example, independents as suggested by the respondent). The site allocations for the district centre make provisions for the delivery of significant public realm improvements, including new publicly accessible open space.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA SA 03	I am shocked to learn that Lewisham Council might approve the plan proposed by Galliard Homes for Leegate. 15 story high blocks would create an ugly addition to the area. Lewisham had enough of these high rise buildings with no provisional planning for new schools and creation facilities for the people of Lewisham. The centre of Lewisham has become like a jungle of high rise buildings with no green spaces. I hope that this monstrous plan will be stopped.	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process.	No change.
Lee Forum	3	LEA SA 03	The Council's online session for the East Area 16 March confirmed that the previous approved application for Leegate sets the height levels at 11 storeys, as the Council	Noted. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			is required to take account of that previous application approval. Given that Lee Green is clearly not included in figure 5.1 as an area appropriate for tall buildings and that 11 storeys was only granted to St Modwen based on the 1960's towers behind Leegate, which under the draft plan would be inadmissible as 'anomalous' to the area, we ask that site allocation 3 makes this 11 storey height a maximum in the Leegate site allocation description. The height at Leegate will act as a reference for heights at the other two site allocations at the Lee Green cross roads should they come forward for development in the future	The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	
Lee Forum	3	LEA SA 03 GR 04	The large canopy trees on north east corner which have TPOs are included in the Lee Forum's site allocation for Leegate but not the Plan's site 3 allocation. The loss of these large very old trees removes much needed breathing space and greenery at the site and the community strongly resisted their loss under the St Modwen's plans. They need to be included in the site allocation in the Plan as on p374/F states F Proposals involving the removal of protected trees (i.e. those covered by a Tree Protection Order and trees within Conservation Areas), or those that would have a detrimental impact on the health and visual amenity provided by protected trees, will be strongly resisted. The Council may identify and seek to protect trees that are of a significant amenity, heritage, ecological, or other value through the development management process. What is meant by 'will be strongly resisted'?	Noted. The approved application for Leegate has established the principal of removing the TPOs. However the assessment of any loss of trees in subsequent applications will be assessed through the Development Management process.	No change.
Lee Manor Society	3	LEA SA 03 Section 05	**Lee Green and other district centres.** The hope expressed is for these to 'retain their distinctive features,' and to be a 'focus for growth, renewal and sensitively managed change.' However, 'respecting local character and accommodating change should not be seen as mutually exclusive'. Leegate, the faded 1960s shopping centre that dominates the Lee Green crossroads, is due to be redeveloped by a new property owner, Galliard Homes. Lewisham planners and councillors failed to take community concerns into account when approving an earlier proposal for redevelopment (involving a large supermarket, very little public space and plentiful parking). We can only hope the sentiments expressed in this plan – which may not be in force when a revised planning application is made – will carry more weight. The plan does call (p91) for designs 'to understand the local and distinctive context of the site' and to include 'effective engagement with the local community.' LMS believes redevelopment should respect the proportions of the local area including 'the height, scale, mass and bulk both in the immediate vicinity and the surrounding area'. Additionally, we support 'building heights that are sensitive to the site's immediate and wider context' (p109).	Noted. This response seems to be relating to proposals currently being prepared by Galliards for the Leegate site and is not part of this Local Plan consultation. Residents will have the opportunity to express their views on the scheme through the Development Management process. Planning applications will be considered against the extant development plan, having regard to any material weight afforded to emerging plans and the statutory stage they are at in the plan-making process.	No change.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LEA SA 03 LEA SA 04	**Leegate Shopping Centre & Sainsbury's Lee Green;** In order for the Council to meet policy TR3 in the East area, Development requirements (16.26) should take into account plans for strategic cycle routes identified in the Council Transport Strategy running north-south along Burnt Ash Road as	Noted	Leegate Shopping Centre and Sainsbury's Lee Green site allocations amended by referencing the strategic cycle route along Burnt Ash Road

			integral to providing access to high quality public realm and adopting the Healthy Streets approach.		
Make Lee Green	3	LEA SA 03	We support the redevelopment of the Leegate centre in a way that enhances and serves the whole community. If commercial options are not viable, consideration should be given to turning the area back in to green space.	Noted. At the current stage in the plan process, the Council has engaged with the landowner and the site is considered to be deliverable within the plan period.	No change.
Royal Borough of Greenwich	3	LEA SA 03	Leegate Shopping Centre: We fully support the redevelopment of this site in a manner that enhances and reinforces the role of Lee Green district centre, including a range of town centre uses. While there are some existing tall and large buildings in the area, including a mid-century office block on the site itself, these generally detract from the character of the area, which is predominantly low-rise and Victorian. The allocation should include some direction on appropriate height and scale, emphasising that the site should be predominantly mid-rise and that any taller elements should be located towards the south to reduce their impact on the more historic parts of the town centre.	Noted. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document. The location of specific tall buildings on-site and the impact on the historic parts of the town centre will be considered as part of the Development Management process.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LEA SA 04	Sainsbury's Site Why is this even mentioned for redevelopment? It is the only supermarket in the area and also the closest for the residents of Blackheath. It would be a waste of money to remove the supermarket and develop this land. Don't do it. I understand there is a shortage of affordable housing but as the pandemic has shown more people are now working from home and are likely to continue to do so therefore it is important that any new affordable housing should have outside green space. No new high rise blocks need to be built as there will be plenty of office blocks empty ready to convert into homes.	Noted. The London Plan directs that Local Plans seek opportunities to facilitate the redevelopment of single-storey retail developments in order to make a more optimal use of land. The site allocation SA04 provides for main town centre uses, which allow for the re-provision of a supermarket on site.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 04	SAINSBURYS SITE 6.We do not think this site should be considered for MAJOR redevelopment for housing or anything else. Do not encourage the developers. Closure of such a useful facility for residents would be a seriously retrograde step. Residents won't want to find themselves in the situation that , from an unnecessary proposal from St M. for a second superstore, we end up with none	Noted. The London Plan directs that Local Plans seek opportunities to facilitate the redevelopment of single-storey retail developments in order to make a more optimal use of land. The site allocation SA04 provides for main town centre uses, which allow for the re-provision of a supermarket on site.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 04	p657 - Sainsbury's I wholeheartedly disagree about doing anything with this site whatsoever. We have no local medium to large supermarket anywhere in Lee let alone Lee Green (and not in Hither Green or Blackheath high street either). If you took away this supermarket provision on the land and changed it to different purpose in the future the closest supermarket I'd have would be Lewisham Tesco's (on the 273 that is a long journey for someone without a car if you're trying to decrease car usage), Eltham? Bromley? or Catford? I don't even know where. During lockdown, Sainsburys was one of the few places I could go as a single person to get some human contact apart from my social bubble (who was on one of those harder to reach surrounded by flower pot roads). Please	Noted. The London Plan directs that Local Plans seek opportunities to facilitate the redevelopment of single-storey retail developments in order to make a more optimal use of land. The site allocation SA04 provides for main town centre uses, which allow for the re-provision of a supermarket on site.	No change.

			please don't change the use of this building. It and its amazing staff has got me through lockdown. The local area depends on it and seeing it with empty shelves and the effect on those less lucky in the area was utterly heartbreaking - this site needs to stay as a supermarket so local residents can access local supermarket without cars. The Coop is not enough by any means for this large an area.		
Lee Forum	3	LEA SA 04	Site 4 Sainsbury's Lee Green includes adding to the large canopy planting along Burnt Ash Road. As Burnt ash is a Lewisham owned road it is also possible to include this improvement on the Site 3 Leegate site as part of the declared intention to improve the public realm.	Agreed.	Leegate Shopping Centre site allocation amended be referencing tree planting along Burnt Ash Road
Lee Forum	3	LEA SA 04	We would like site 4 to have a maximum height limit of 10 storeys and site 5 to have a maximum height limit of 5 stories to reflect their local contexts.	Noted. The London Plan directs that Local Plans identify locations that may be suitable for tall buildings and to set parameters for building heights. The draft Local Plan has been informed by a Tall Buildings Study. Following consultation on the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council has undertaken additional work on the Tall Buildings Study, which has informed the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended with additional details and requirements on building heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
Lee Forum	3	LEA SA 04	Improving the crossroads working with TFL is vital to changing the street scape. All efforts should be made to protect pedestrians from harmful pollutants and increase safety. All nearby bus stops should be set back to avoid the junction getting locked up and the turn into Sainsbury's refigured to avoid congestion.	Agreed. The Council will continue to work with TFL to secure street scape improvements as part of the Healthy Streets Approach.	Sainsbury's Lee Green site allocation amended by referencing a healthy streets corridor
Royal Borough of Greenwich	3	LEA SA 04	Sainsbury's Lee Green: Confusingly, the allocation recommends that taller elements be delivered away from the Grade II listed Police Station, but then encourages them in the northeast corner, which is adjacent to the police station. We would encourage any tall buildings to be directed to the southern part of the site, where they would have less impact on the historic part of the town centre.	The location of specific tall buildings on-site and the impact on the historic parts of the town centre will be considered as part of the Development Management process.	No change.
Lewisham Liberal Democrats	3	LEA SA 04	• Sites like the **Sainsbury's at Lee Green**, **Leegate** shopping centre and the **Aldi** in Catford could indeed be put to better use, by building upwards, creating large and small retail units, and additional housing. However, this involves demolishing existing buildings, and reducing substantially the number of parking spaces available. The clearly stated aim is to provide only a minimum amount of parking and new residential accommodation will not have parking associated with it. However, if Sainsbury's is rebuilt on the existing site and if there is another large shop such as Asda in the Leegate shopping centre, then these will attract customers coming by car, and this will have implications for parking and traffic in the area (see 5 above). Underground parking at Leegate should be seriously considered and no archaeological objections against it seem to exist.	Parking requirements for all future planning applications will be assessed against policy TR4 Parking.	No change

	3	LEA SA 05	Please ensure that the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigall Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all – the work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee	Noted. Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
	3	LEA SA 05	Please ensure that the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigall Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all – the work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee	Noted. Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
	3	LEA SA 05	We have the Quaggy River running through Lee and I would ask that access and regeneration of the riverside around the BMW garage site is included in the local plan	Noted. Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
	3	LEA SA 05	Please ensure that the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigal Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all.	Noted. Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
	3	LEA SA 05	would like to see the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigall Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all – the work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee.	Noted. Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
	3	LEA SA 05	BMW Garage Site Again the Local Plan should state that any new buildings on this site will not be higher that 3 or 4 storeys to fit in with existing older buildings at the Lee Green Cross Roads which include the locally listed Old & New Tiger Heads and the Grade II listed fire station. Please ensure that the River Quaggy running on one side of the BMW site and along to the back of Weigall Road playing fields is opened up with access for all – the work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening in the past with better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe Park and Manor Park). That work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee.	Noted. With regard to the indicative capacity for the site allocations within Lee Green we appreciate that this will be a step change in density from the existing character. However the Council is responding to a housing crisis and the need to respond to London Plan requirements in terms of housing targets and making best use of available land within the capital. Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
	3	LEA SA 05	Please ensure that the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigall Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all – the work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee.	Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
	3	LEA SA 05	The River Quaggy alongside the BMW site and the back of Weigall Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all as nature is very important for people's health. The work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee.	Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.

	3	LEA SA 05	The BMW site and along to the back of Weigall Road playing Fields should be opened up with access for all to The Quaggy – the work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee.	Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
	3	LEA SA 05	BMW DEALERSHIP SITE 7. No strong views about car dealerships, But it is surely not sensible to say that planning guidelines for this site as well as Sainsburys should be guided by the same principles as adopted for Leegate. If anything it should be the other way about - I. e. the more development on the Leegate site, the less the scale of the development on the others if the problems set out at points 2 and 3 above are not to become worse.	Noted. The draft Local Plan sets out clear site specific guidance on all site allocations.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 05	Please ensure that the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigall Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all – the work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee.	Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
	3	LEA SA 05	Please ensure that the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigall Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all – the work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Parks) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee.	Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
	3	LEA SA 05	Please ensure that the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigall Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all – the work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee	Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
	3	LEA SA 05	Please ensure that the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigall Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all – the work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee.	Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
	3	LEA SA 05	Please ensure that the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigall Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all – the work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe	Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy. .	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.

			and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee		
	3	LEA SA 05	Please ensure that the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigall Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all – the work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee	Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
	3	LEA SA 05	I would like to see more care and imagination with planning, for example public access to the River Quaggy on the BMW site to make Lee Green a better and healthier place for all people to live in now and in the future, alongside appropriate development.	Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
	3	LEA SA 05	Please ensure that the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigall Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all.	Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
	3	LEA SA 05	Please ensure that the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigall Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all – the work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee	Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
	3	LEA SA 05	Please ensure that the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigall Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all – the work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee	Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
	3	LEA SA 05	Please will you also ensure that the River Quaggy by the BMW site and along to the back of Weigal Road playing Fields is opened up with access for all – the work of the Friends of The Quaggy and Lewisham Council has seen some wonderful greening and better flood control (Ladywell Fields, Sutcliffe and Manor Park) and that work should continue and be of benefit now to the residents of Lee.	Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
Lee Forum	3	LEA SA 05	Site 5 Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road opening access to the River Quaggy is supported and supports the proposed new Quaggy Playing Fields park included on The Campaign for Rural England's Ten New Parks for London. We ask the council to require any development to enhance the river, its water quality and amenity for residents through access and additional riverbank greening.	Within draft Local Plan site allocation LEA SA05 a key requirement is improvements to enhance access to and visual amenity of the River Quaggy.	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended, with enhanced access and amenity of the river moved from Guidelines to a Requirement.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LEA SA 05	**Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road;** In order for the council to meet policy TR3 in the East area, Development requirements (16.34) should take into account plans for strategic cycle routes identified in the Council Transport Strategy running East West along A20 Lee High Road and north-south along Lee Road as integral to providing access to high quality public realm and adopting the Healthy Streets approach.	Agreed	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amended by referencing Healthy Streets corridor and the A20

Quaggy Waterway Action Group	3	LEA SA 05	**Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road** Pages 659-660 Site allocation 16.32 Mixed-use redevelopment of existing car dealers comprising compatible main town centre and residential uses. **Public realm enhancements including improved access to the River Quaggy.** Opportunities 16.33 This site is located within Lee Green district town centre. The western part of the site is occupied by a car dealers and its associated showroom parking. The eastern part of the site comprises a terrace of properties with a mix of residential and main town centre uses, including a public house, and is an integral feature of the townscape. The **River Quaggy runs along the back of the site**. Redevelopment and site intensification, along with the introduction of a wider range of uses, can provide a more optimal use of land to support the long-term vitality and viability of the town centre. **Redevelopment can also enable public realm enhancements, with improved access to the River Quaggy**. 16.34 Development requirements • Retention of the existing terrace of properties at the eastern part of the site, including the public house. • Postive ***(sic)*** frontages with active ground floor frontages within the Primary Shopping Area, including at Lee High Road. • Delivery of new and improved public realm, in accordance with a site-wide public realm strategy, including: **• Improvements to enhance access to and amenity value of the River Quaggy** • Along Lee High Road and Lee Road, improvements to the forecourt at the road junction 16.35 Development guidelines • The design of development should respond positively to the existing terrace at the eastern edge of the site. **• Development should be designed to enhance access to the River Quaggy which runs along the northern edge of the site, and to improve its ecological quality and amenity value.** **QWAG Comments:** Enhancing the amenity and ecological quality of the River Quaggy should be a requirement, not a guideline. There is considerable opportunity in this section to be imaginative with public access to an improved river and local amenity, including cross boundary connections.	Agreed	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road site allocation amendedto include reference to improved ecological quality and amenity value, as suggested.
Royal Borough of Greenwich	3	LEA SA 05	Land at Lee High Road and Lee Road: While we support the redevelopment of this site and the introduction of town centre uses along the high road and improvements to the public realm, the allocation should include more guidance regarding design. The eastern part of the site includes a terrace of attractive 2-3 storey Victorian shops and it faces a similar terrace on the Greenwich side of the road. The redevelopment of the site should ensure that this small-	The Local Plan is a strategic policy document and the Council needs to carefully consider the level of detail provided for each area within the site allocations. Further detailed guidance at a masterplanning level would normally be undertaken as part of a Framework Document or Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).	No change.

			scale, Victorian character is retained and that any taller or larger buildings are located far enough to the west that they do not appear within the street scene along Lee Road.		
	3	LEA SA 06	Lee Station Local Centre This is one of the most successful Local Centres in Lewisham. The almost 100% continuous occupancy rate of shops is the main evidence of this success. The addition of a small Co-op supermarket five years ago has brought new vigour. The continued industrial employment use of the Citroen garage site as part of a larger Travis Perkins operation also shows the success here. The lack of development sites is a relief as residents see the effect of new housing around other rail stations in the Borough and beyond. The small industrial site in Southbrook Road is maintaining local employment opportunities and it would be a sad reversal if this was appropriated for housing just because its rail station proximity would give a premium profit for developers and a target tick-box for members and officers.	The site is considered an appropriate site for mixed use redevelopment and the site allocation provides for employment floorspace, in addition to residential, in order to maximise the potential of the site.	No change.
Lee Manor Society	3	LEA SA 06	The Plan proposes a redevelopment of **Southbrook Mews**, a small industrial/business site at the Burnt Ash Road end of Southbrook Road. The site includes a locally listed industrial building. The suggestion is for a mix of business and residential uses on the site with buildings rising in height to the railway line. We feel it is overambitious to include housing and it would be better for the site to continue to provide small business premises/workspaces. The age of the wall fronting Southbrook Road is not known to us, but we see no need for its removal. It provides security for businesses on the site. We also see no need for the creation of a pedestrian walkway from the south-east corner of the site to Burnt Ash Road and Lee station, as suggested by the plan.	The site is considered an appropriate site for mixed use redevelopment and the site allocation provides for employment floorspace, in addition to residential, in order to maximise the potential of the site. Disagree, a more positive frontage could be created with the demolition of the wall. Disagree about the pedestrian walkway as this will help to increase connectivity with the railway station.	No change.
	3	LEA SA 07	Early Opportunity for Site Allocation action? There is currently a Planning Application in to expand the site. Previously a Cricket Field and with the John Pound 1870s former Lee Public Halls and Steam Laundry Building still in situ. As the basic structure is still there, consideration should be given to incorporating it in the Development once the modern additions are removed. As the site is currently under review, CONNECTIVITY consideration should be given to creating a walking /cycling through route to the Industrial Estate avoiding the road and narrow pavements of Holme Lacey Road and past the John Pond Building. This is in line with Lewisham's healthy streets policy.	Noted. The site now has planning consent for a builders merchants and operational yard.	Travis Perkins and Citroen Garage site allocation has been removed from the Plan
Lee Manor Society	3	LEA SA 07	Proposals here would appear to prevent the redevelopment of the **Travis Perkins/former Citroen car showroom** site as currently proposed by Travis Perkins. If the street frontage is to be made more welcoming and the building line of the Holme Lacey Road houses to be preserved Travis Perkins should not be allowed erect the large shed at the proposed location. We welcome this approach if it leads to streetscape on both Burnt Ash Hill and Holme Lacey Road that better reflects the residential and shopping character of the area. (p663).	Noted. The site now has planning consent for a builders merchants and operational yard.	Travis Perkins and Citroen Garage site allocation has been removed from the Plan

	3	LEA SA 08	P666 - the local Mayfields Hostel I have no issue with the local hostel being close to where I live on my road and often see the residents being taken for walks by their caring and professional staff. I'm not sure about the change of the use of this building at all. This seems to remove the ability of the building to home mentally ill vulnerable people and instead creating flats and a gallery. A) That sounds pretty horrible to me and upsetting for mentally ill residents having to move because Lewisham want to redevelop the area. B) This is a local plan, and I can only assume locally mentally ill people live there. I can't agree that this is a new 'optimal use of the land' or the creation of 'high quality housing' if this relocates (locally) vulnerable people. Lewisham is for everyone, not for the sole purpose of gentrification, but as a local area that should be inclusive to those with challenges as much as those without. And as I also couldn't be more local to this hostel, I wholeheartedly disagree with relocating it so the area can benefit from 'optimisation'. If this land is being used to support the vulnerable, it is already being used optimally. I would prefer it as a residential hostel supporting the community to the increased footfall from an unneeded museum, gallery or crèche on a residential road, or a building site and new-build flats on a road with predominantly older beautiful houses, it seems out of touch with the residential nature of the road.	The site is considered an appropriate site for residential redevelopment.	No change.
Lewisham Liberal Democrats	3	LEA SA 08	**Mayfields Hostel** (https://lewisham.gov.uk/organizations/mayfield). Although planning permission has already been granted for 47 residential units (DC/17/103886), it seems that the scheme is now to be 'redesigned to allow for more efficient use of the site'. Will the new plans respect the nature of the surrounding area and not go above the five-six-storey height limit? Will all the trees be retained? Will a financial contribution be made to fund the extra social services required? The limited parking proposed is unrealistic.	The residential capacity of the site allocation remains the same as the consented scheme – 47 gross / 21 net units. Optimal capacity for the site and the scale and nature of development will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach. The site allocation already emphasises to the retention of existing mature trees and trees of value. Parking requirements for all future planning applications will be assessed against policy TR4 Parking.	No change.
Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LEA SA 09	Under 16.51, Development Requirements, the policy must more explicitly state that the town centre should be 'green infrastructure-led' to provide a greener public realm that connects the proposed new district park with Chinbrook Meadows and beyond.	Agree.	Sainsbury Local and West of Grove Park Station site allocation amended to provide further clarity on links to existing green infrastructure.
Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LEA SA 09	Development requirements should be numbered, so that they are easier to refer to, rather than bullet points.	Agree that bullet points are not easy to refer to.	Bullets points in all site allocations changed to numbers for ease of future referencing
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LEA SA 09	**Sainsbury Local and West of Grove Park Station;** In order for the council to meet policy TR3 in the East area, Development requirements (16.51) should take into account plans for strategic cycle routes identified in the Council Transport Strategy running north-south along Baring Road as integral to providing access to high quality public realm and adopting the Healthy Streets approach.	Agree.	Sainsbury Local and West of Grove Park Station site allocation amended to reference Healthy Streets corridor and cycle route

	3	LNA	Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford. Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children. Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments. SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets. New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months. Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries. SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses. New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision.	No change.
	3	LNA	Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: - Polluting Industry	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away	No change.

			Please reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments. SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets. New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries. SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	
	3	LNA	Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford. Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children. Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments. SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets. New Riverside Park	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months. Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries. SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan,	No change.

			The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses. New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision.	
	3	LNA	"DNA should emphasize its "refurbish first" policy, to preserve built environment of various periods - especially 20th century that may not be listed. Deptford is very low on designated listed and protected areas, compared to other parts of the Lewisham borough. Yet it has the widest range of historical periods in the borough - detailed in the Characterization Report by Aecom commissioned by DNA. Evelyn Street 'local centre'. Historically Evelyn Street had many more shops than it presently has. Other 'feed' in streets can be encouraged, too, to have local shops and workshops once again. To encourage "Keep in Local" in leisure and work	Whilst the Council will always encourage developers to look at refurbishment options where possible this is not always feasible and not always the best use of land. Information on nominations for locally listed buildings can be found on the councils website	No change.
	3	LNA	Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford. Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children. Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months. Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is	No change.

			SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets. New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority. We also need more healthy neighbourhood road closures. Roads such as Payne Street and Idonia Street which are densely residential and used as a rat run for all kinds of vehicles including HGV'S. These roads are backed up during rush hour and have speeding cars at other times. I trust these issues will be given the attention they deserve.	therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries. SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses. New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision.	
	3	LNA	Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford. New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision.	No change.
	3	LNA	Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford. Improved Street Lighting I would recommend the upgrading of street lighting along residential roads to a more appropriate design which matches the Victorian housing. In the 'better' parts of the borough lighting is of a Victorian style to match the	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed	No change.

			housing in residential roads. Why can't we - in the poorest areas - have the same treatment? Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children. Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. There also needs to be a reduction in heavy goods traffic along Blackhorse Road SE8 (especially at night and weekends).Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments. SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets. New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	Improved Street Lighting – not in the remit of the Local Plan. Please see the Transport strategy and Local Implementation Plan. Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months. Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries. SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses. New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision.	
	3	LNA	Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford. Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy	No change.

			low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children. Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments. SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets. New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months. Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries. SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses. New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision.	
	3	LNA	Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford. Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks.	No change.

			alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children. Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments. SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets. New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months. Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries. SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses. New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision.	
	3	LNA	We are on the Boundary with Greenwich Borough and therefore greatly affected by what happens there. There is such disparity between Lewisham and Greenwich. We are also affected by TFL's actions. It is apparent that there is little cohesive thought about impacts of the separate actions by any of these bodies. At times, it feels as though we are the forgotten part of Lewisham. We have lived in our current accommodation for 45 years! You would think that we had a voice but no; constantly told what is best for us, like naughty children. I have walked and run the Borough, cycled for a long time to and from work. This was because train and bus were unhealthy crowded nightmares, (no change there)! I learnt roadcraft cycling, sadly lacking in today's new 'cyclists '. You have to take precautions, ensure that your bicycle has bell, working lights and you can be seen in the dark. The concept of Walking and Cycling requires personal responsibility and consideration as much as vehicles. If someone wants to race, do it at a Velodrome or Race Track.	Our approach to encourage sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling and public transport are outlined in Policy TR3 Healthy streets as part of healthy neighbourhoods.	No change.

			This leads me to the point that if you have a Cyclist's Charter in the Local Plan, you also need a Pedestrian one. The first mode of transport is walking and yet our pavements are in need of repair, they are obstacle courses. Signage is out of control. It is often in the wrong place. The recently installed cameras and signs restrict the pavement space even more. The plethora of signage and street furniture ranges from cabling cabinets, phone masts, CPZ posts, bollards, planters, bus shelters, five types of refuse collection bins, (including commercial bins) Estate Agent Signs protruding at head height over pavements. Add the indiscriminate dumping and vehicle parking, including 'allowable CPZs'and a Pedestrian's lot is not a happy one. This is even worse for someone with impaired sight or difficulty walking! Yet we are told this a Healthy Neighbourhood?		
	3	LNA	The Positive The main positive from the LLP is the central preservation of the Bakerloo Line Extension as it's central premise and the safeguards the area currently owned by Sainsbury's for the construction and excavation of the tunnels.	Noted	No change.
	3	LNA	The Negatives, Density – Housing over Quality and a lack of structural Environmental Concerns Delivery of the Bakerloo Line the New Cross appears include a mass housing project on top of the planned station. The LLP appears to be obsessed with an exaggerated residential development that is justified by the arrival of the BLE. There is much less emphasis retail or business opportunities. More over there is also an absence of green or public space, which is mentioned on the LLP but contradicted by the proposal to home vast number people on top of the Bakerloo Line Extension. The site cannot satisfy all needs. It cannot be a transport hub, mass housing project, retail estate and urban meeting place. Planners have to be realistic in what the site can be used for.	The site allocations in New Cross have been informed by the New Cross Area Framework which was extensively consulted on and endorsed by M&C. The indicative capacities for these site allocations reflect the areas central location within a district centre with excellent access to public transport and services.	No change.
	3	LNA	Pollution and Air Quality New Cross Road has the worst pollution London. Plans in the LLP to improve the air quality directly contradict the expansion of residential properties in the area by more than 6000 residential units that will bring their carbon footprint in extended vehicle use, services and domestic energy use. The plan cannot claim Green credentials whilst contradicting itself in its methods and aspirations for the area. SELCHP air quality and residential proximity South East London Combined Heat and Power (SEPCHP) is a processing plant for rubbish servicing much of the South East. In reality the SELCHP is an incinerator pumping toxic gasses and particulates into the air of New Cross Gate. In the Hatcham Society's response the LLP it states:	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from	No change.

			"the latest figures released by the government's Environment Agency for 2019, that SELCHP reported a release of 361,665,000 kg of Carbon Dioxide and 144,818,000 kg of Carbon Dioxide from Qualifying Renewable Fuel Sources. Meanwhile, there was 566, 632 kg of Nitrogen Oxides released last year. Nitrogen Oxides include Nitrogen Dioxide, a harmful gas which damages lungs. " It goes on to say that : "The amount of Carbon Dioxide released from SELCHP was 3.3 times more than what was released from the Edmonton Solid Waste Incinerator in 2019 and SELCHP released 2.5 times more Nitrous Oxides than the Edmonton Solid Waste Incinerator. We also do not know the amount of Carbon Dioxide released through the burning of 'biogenic Co2' - food waste - as highlighted in Channel Four's Dirty Truth About Your Rubbish: Dispatches (March 2021). A report titled 'Health Effects due to Emissions from Energy from Waste Plant in London' created for the GLA published in May 2020 found that SELCHP had the highest NOx emission rate out of London's incinerator plants. " I support the advances in rubbish recycling over the last few years however the role of SEPCHP and its relationship with the Lewisham Local Plan need to be re examined and should not, as is stated in the LLP, be safeguarded. A full enquiry should be initiated into the role of SELCHP in our community and a clear and accessible publication of all data relating to processing waste. This has to include: Any breaching of toxin levels emitted by the plant Efficiency in terms of the quantity of material that is processed there A clear indication of the weekly source of the material being processed An inability to clarify SELCHP's role in polluting the air in New Cross and the surrounding area frankly makes a mockery of any green aspirations asserted in the LLP. I cannot see how homes can be built in such close proximity to the incinerating plant. Lewisham in their North area Plan looks to "safeguard strategic waste management sites including SELCHP" while promoting the redevelopment of Millwall Football stadium adjacent to SELCHP with 2,500 new homes planned. This means that home building is ear marked by the LLP in close proximity to a known emitter of toxic gasses and hazardous particulates.	refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months. Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries. SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses. New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision.	
	3	LNA	Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan:	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in	No change.

			Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford. Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children. Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments. SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets. New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months. Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries. SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses. New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision.	
	3	LNA	Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial	No change.

			Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children. Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments. SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets. New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months. Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries. SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses. New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision.	
	3	LNA	Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford. Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed	No change.

			low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children. Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments. SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets. New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months. Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries. SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses. New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision.	
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change.
	3	LNA	Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan:	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham	No change.

			Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford. Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children. Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments. SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets. New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months. Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries. SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses. New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision.	
	3	LNA	Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of	No change.

			Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford. Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children. Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments. SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets. New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months. Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries. SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses. New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision.	
	3	LNA	Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford. Play & School Routes	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed	No change.

			Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children. Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments. SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets. New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months. Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries. SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses. New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision.	
	3	LNA	Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford. Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford	No change.

			delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children. Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments. SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets. New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months. Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries. SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses. New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision.	
	3	LNA	Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford. Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from	No change.

			Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments. SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets. New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months. Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries. SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses. New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision.	
	3	LNA	Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford. Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children. New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change.

				Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries. SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses. New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision.	
	3	LNA	**a. Additional Strategic Site Allocation | Deptford Station North Access/Egress** DNA supports an access and egress on the northern site of Deptford Station. This would improve and shorten routes to and from the station from the north where much of the growth of population and employment will take place, adding capacity by distributing people at peak times and connect with the London Quietway route Q1. This may also support Evelyn Local Centre.	At this stage we are not reviewing additional site allocations. However this could form part of the next Local Plan review	No change.
	3	LNA	"DNA should emphasize its "refurbish first" policy, to preserve built environment of various periods - especially 20th century that may not be listed. Deptford is very low on designated listed and protected areas, compared to other parts of the Lewisham borough. Yet it has the widest range of historical periods in the borough - detailed in the Characterization Report by Aecom commissioned by DNA. Site 3: The Riverside Youth Centre building is an "iconic" building of the 20th century on Pepys estate and should be refurbished first. Note: I think that this site allocation may be withdrawn, altogether. From what I heard.	Whilst the Council will always encourage developers to look at refurbishment options where possible this is not always feasible and not always the best use of land. Information on nominations for locally listed buildings can be found on the councils website The plans policy on affordable housing is clearly stated and underpinned by our evidence base. 60 – 80% socially rented will simply be unviable and therefore the plan would not conform to the National Planning Policy Framework.	No change.

			Site 12: A new covered market area, all-weather, as a high quality and aesthetically beautiful feature in the area to attract existing and new footfall. To assist in keeping Deptford High Street a viable shopping experience in the later 21st century, after the redevelopment of Convoys Wharf. New housing redevelopment needs to be at least 60% to 80% socially rented at Council levels and secured tenancies. At 100% on Council owned land. Refer to DNA housing policies. Evelyn Street 'local centre'. Historically Evelyn Street had many more shops than it presently has. Other 'feed' in streets can be encouraged, too, to have local shops and workshops once again. To encourage "Keep in Local" in leisure and work.		
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed	No change.
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority in North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change.
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
The St John's Society	3	LNA Vision Spatial Objectives	LEWISHAM'S NEIGHBOURHOODS AND PLACES: 15 LEWISHAM'S NORTH AREA St. John's, Brookmill Road or Somerset Gardens are not mentioned as heritage assets, nor in the overall 'Vision' or 'Spatial Objectives' for the North Area.	We are unable to mention all heritage assets in the plan but the council has a comprehensive list on our GIS system and on our website. Designated and Non-designated Heritage Assets also have separate policies in the Section 2 of the draft Local Plan	No change.

			Welcome the support for 'active uses' at street level. St. John's railway station suffers from poor accessibility.		
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford, and make it safe for cyclists, scooters and skaters.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality, particularly the one in Sayes Court, which has been in steady decline and play equipment removed without replacement. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change.
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change.
	3	LNA	Additionally we need additional cycle lockers for area cyclists to store their bikes safely as more people take up cycling, and place charging points for electric vehicles in sensible places, not double yellow lines or in front of kerb drops!	Please refer to policies on cycle parking and electric charging points.	No change.
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste.	No change.

			priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change.
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	RE: Lewisham Local Plan In response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Priority should be given to quality pedestrian / cycle public realm across the river front of the convoy wharf development. This closed off area is a real blight in the P / C route, forcing an awkward, uneven route around it.	The existing approved planning application does include a quality pedestrian and cycle route across the river front.	No change.
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change.
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change.
	3	LNA	Albeit, outside the realm of this plan, there should be a real push for Lewisham to encourage a sustainable river crossing. (Like the cycle/pedestrian bridge from Greenland Dock to Canary Wharf) the massive population growth in Evelyn ward especially, needs addressing. Canada Water / Surrey Quays is not enough. It is frustrating that the two tunnels that attract much traffic and associated pollution are either side of Lewisham. A bridge in between would be a great help and have huge benefits for the poorest ward, often dumped on in comparison to many other areas.	Noted. This is outside the scope of the Local Plan however we will pass your comments on to our Transport team.	No change.
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan:	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham	No change.

			Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change.
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change.
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change.
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change.
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial	No change.

			I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change.
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change.
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change.
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in	No change.

				terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change.
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change.
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change.
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change.
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change.

	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change.
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change.
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change.
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change.
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change.
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for	No change

			little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change.
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change.
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change.
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks.	No change.

			delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change.
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change.
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change.
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change.
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change.

	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change.
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change.
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford. An increase in green, quiet walking and cycling routes is beneficial in encouraging exercise and making the area a more inviting place.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change.
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children. The current Folkestone Garden playground, for example, is rusty and aged. A renovation should not be too expensive and would be welcomed by the community and users of Folkestone Gardens.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change.
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away	No change.

				from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change.
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority. Current green spaces in Deptford are small or spaced very far apart. The proposed density of new homes will increase pressure on the use of existing spaces while contributing to urban heat island effects and carbon emissions. Further, any recreational areas in new developments are typically private property and are not open to the use of the general public. Requiring the construction of a large, public green space would represent a positive step forward in ensuring equitable access to nature in the city.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change.
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land	No change

			Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we	No change

			low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change

	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e.	No change

			SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses	
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order	No change

			priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change.

	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in	No change

			consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. SELCHP and other industry cuts across a busy school walking route and cycle quietway. Traffic caused by SELCHP etc. is a huge problem and the area around it is an accident blackspot due to waste trucks from across London. Lives will be lost without a strategy to reduce heavy traffic associated with waste burning and scrap recycling. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority. This will bring revenue jobs and hope to a deprived community. Imperative!	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	In addition conserve local Victorian homes by making the area around Deptford park a conservation area. Stop the spread of houses of multiple occupation in this area as they proliferate rubbish and lack of care. Plant trees along these streets and stop neglecting SE8!!!	The nomination of conservation areas is not part of the Local Plan remit. Please see the Council website.	No change

				The Council is in the process of making an Article 4 Direction to withdraw permitted development rights from Residential to HMOs.	
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change

	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan:	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham	No change.

			Canal Approach Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, as a key strategic route for North Deptford and for much of South East London.	Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. It should not be part of the plan: it should rather be closed as soon as possible as under the Paris Climate Agreement of 2015 such facilities are contributing significantly to the UK's carbon emissions.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change.
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population in this part of London will grow dramatically in the coming years due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes in Bermondsey and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite Council documents stating the need to do so. A continuation of the Thames cycle way and footpath across the Convoys Wharf site is essential and an immediate priority. This should be integral to a new riverside park for Deptford.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change.
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is	No change

			sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away	No change

				from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan:	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham	No change

			Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial	No change

			Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in	No change

				terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents – Open Space Study published in 2010 - stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change

	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for	

			little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks.	No change

			delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from	No change

				refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3	LNA	Protect Victorian Houses around Deptford Park, Trundleys Road , Alloa Road stop giving permitted development to converting them into flats as 1000 of flats are being built but no family terraced houses protect this heritage.	The Council is currently preparing an Article 4 Direction to withdraw permitted development rights for conversions of family housing into HMOs. No change.	No change
	3	LNA	Remove speed bumps from Trundleys road and replace with 20 MPH speed camera make the road safer and make some money too.	To detailed for the Local Plan we will pass your comments on to the Council's Transport team	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land	No change

			Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we	No change

			low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change

	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Can you please send to all people who might be affected by this new plan to have a proper consultation and receive in their letter box official communication of this master plan, how can people be informed about it if you do not send communication? I request for the consultation to be postponed so that people can be properly informed and therefore they will be in a better position to respond.	The consultation was undertaken in accordance with our Statement of Community Involvement.	No change.
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change

	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. We have been having issues years after year with the smell of the local waste transport and now we are seeing our trees dying. The activity of SELCHP is 24/7 and they are burning medical waste, people are living closeby, this is not acceptable. I would like to ask for this Waste incinerator to be moved to a more appropriate location, particularly as there will be more people in the area. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Can you please Remove SELCHP as a priority and move it somewhere else so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3	LNA	Trees: Can you please plant more trees and look at the root cause of why the trees in the surrounding areas are dying and need to be recorded in a registry. (Deptford park)	The council is working in partnership with Street Trees for Living and planting hundreds of trees per year. If you would like to report a damaged or dying tree please contact Green Scene. Details can be found on the Council's website	No change.
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	Please note that TALL building are deteriorating the landscape of the city. This is absolutely not right for mental health and building not more that 4 to 5 levels should only be considered. Who will want to live in an area that is built of tall block of flat, that is horrible.	We know that tall buildings can be a decisive issue for residents. However the London Plan makes clear that tall buildings are part of the solution to tackle the acute housing shortage. The London Plan directs the Local Plan to identify suitable locations for tall buildings. We believe that tall buildings could be considered in our opportunity areas and in certain town centres that have good access to public transport, jobs and local services. We believe this is a sensible and sustainable approach.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from	No change

			alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change

	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is	No change

			sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away	No change

				from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	Canal Approach – The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. Waste incinerators are usually located in the most deprived neighbourhoods this is socially unjust. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than even landfill. Remove SELCHP as a priority and shut it down so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets.	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local	No change

				Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	And finally the walkway on the old canal street park from geeenland place towards the new development currently being built (phase one completed, and huge un occupied site next to it), please open up a walkway underneath the sloping bridge between this new development and the existing pathway that runs past the tall tower, this will be greatly appreciated and welcome by the community	This will be opened up as part of the Timberyard development.	No change.
	3 -	LNA General	RE: Lewisham Local Plan Please record my comments in response to the consultation on Lewisham's Local Plan: I understand this may be a little late, but I have only just found out about the plans, so the next sentence is paragraph is of some relevance. Can you please send to all people who might be affected by this new plan to have a proper consultation and receive in their letter box official communication of this master plan, how can people be informed about it if you do not send communication? I request for the consultation to be postponed so that people can be properly informed and therefore they will be in a better position to respond. Is this not a legal requirement?	The consultation was carried out in accordance with our statement of community involvement.	No change.
	3	LNA	Polluting Industry Reduce the number of trucks coming to the area by changing the use class of industrial and waste processing sites like scrapyards and private waste processing. Support low pollution industries that create jobs for local people in healthy environments.	Polluting Industry – There are a number of areas in the north that are designated Strategic Industrial Land which are protected by the London Plan. It is therefore difficult for planning to limit the industrial uses on these sites however wherever possible we will try and ensure that these industries move away from heavy industrial uses such as scrapyards etc. to more low pollution industries.	No change
	3	LNA	SELCHP SELCHP is proposed as an integral part of the Local Plan. We have been having issues year after year with the smell of the local waste transport and now we are seeing our trees dying. The activity of SELCHP is 24/7 and they are burning medical waste, people are living close by, this is not acceptable. I would like to ask for this Waste incinerator to be moved to a more appropriate location, particularly as there will be more people in the area. Furthermore, by 2035, incineration will be a more carbon-intensive process than	SELCHP - The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change

			even landfill. Can you please Remove SELCHP as a priority and move it somewhere else so the borough can meet its climate emergency targets. Even new double glazing does not stop the dust getting in and continuous dusting is a requirement.		
	3	LNA	Trees: Can you please plant more trees and look at the root cause of why the trees in the surrounding areas are dying and need to be recorded in a registry. (Deptford park), not to mention our own gardens.	The council is working in partnership with Street Trees for Living and planting hundreds of trees per year. If you would like to report a damaged or dying tree please contact Green Scene. Details can be found on the Council's website	No change.
	3	LNA	Play & School Routes Play does not feature as a priority North Deptford. Covid-19 has meant children in this high-density area have had little access to high quality play. Existing playgrounds are of low quality. The playground promised in 2014 alongside the £300k+ skatepark has not materialised. This should be delivered and other playgrounds across the area updates alongside safer streets and school routes. Prioritise a huge investment in playgrounds and safer streets for children and plantation of trees for them. And, of course, Lewisham Council must be more aware than most due to the ruling on the death of that little girl in your Borough.	Play & School Routes - The Local Plan is underpinned by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2020-2025 which outlines the key priorities for improvements including many within the Deptford area. Lewisham Council has announced the revamp the play equipment in four popular Deptford parks. Evelyn Green, Sayes Court, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens will all benefit from refurbishments which are due to take place in the coming months.	No change
	3 3	LNA LNA SA 01	New Riverside Park The population will grow dramatically due to 10k homes in the Evelyn Ward plus another 7k homes at Millwall and Canada Water. There is no plan to increase green space despite council documents stating the need to do so. Make delivering a new riverside park for Deptford on the protected wharf at Convoys Wharf a priority.	New Riverside Park – The provision of new open space is identified within the draft Local Plan site allocations including new open spaces at Convoys Wharf. The Local Plan recognises that as an urban borough accommodating significant growth it is unfeasible to deliver large areas of new open space and instead the focus will be on improvements to the existing provision. The existing protected Wharf is protected at the London Plan level.	No change
	3	LNA	Please note that TALL building are deteriorating the landscape of the city. this is absolutely not right for mental health and building not more that 4 to 5 levels should only be considered. Who will want to live in an area that is built of tall block of flat that is horrible. Not to mention the light deprivation so many tall building cause. This causes problems with our immune system which is rather important in these Covid times.	We know that tall buildings can be a decisive issue for residents. However the London Plan makes clear that tall buildings are part of the solution to tackle the acute housing shortage. The London Plan directs the Local Plan to identify suitable locations for tall buildings. We believe that tall buildings could be considered in our opportunity areas and in certain town centres that have good access to public transport, jobs and local services. We believe this is a sensible and sustainable approach.	No change.
Deptford Society	3	LNA	**Page 365** Local site allocations for tall buildings and increased population density in the north of the borough contradicts the strategic objectives for healthy and safe communities (G16-19 **page 51**). The identified opportunity areas mapped for the north area on **page 55** are the same areas mapped as deficient to open space on figure 10.5, **page 365**.	We do not agree that there is a contradiction.	No change.
Deptford Society	3	LNA	The plan mostly identifies sites either already with planning or known to be in public consultation but does nothing to profile sites which have the potential to be developed or where development might be encouraged - backlands behind Deptford High Street for example.	The draft Local Plan site allocations focuses on sites above 0.25ha but recognises the positive contribution smaller sites will make to the borough. In particular please refer to policy on small sites. The Local Plan will also be supported by Supplementary planning	No change

				documents, masterplans and Frameworks and in particular the Council's Small Sites SPD.	
DNA	3	LNA	**02** Most of the objectives and policies for the North sub-area section in emerging Local Plan seem to be concerned with New Cross area and we ask to make them more Deptford relevant. We propose as a starting point to the following set of Objectives from the Deptford Neighbourhood Plan. Nearly 200 people from a cross section of the community have stated their full support for them. We developed the following five policy themes to focus our planning policy initiatives: 'Living in Deptford', 'Local Economy & Employment', 'Heritage & Identities', 'Health & Wellbeing' and 'Child-friendly Deptford'.	Disagree. Many of the objectives cover Deptford	No change.
DNA	3	LNA	**03** All of Deptford is a recognised **Regeneration Area** in the London Plan. We ask the Council to develop local policy in full compliance with London Policy SD10 Strategic and local regeneration incl. clarity on how local communities are invited and enabled to engage in these matters in a meaningful way. This is in our view especially important as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan seems to be dating back from 2015. The needs of and opportunities for residents and businesses in Deptford are complex and need to be addressed on much more up-to date and hyper local data to guide a programme of priorities and areas for focused interventions in the context of unpreceded growth, the climate emergency, the economic shock and mental health shock from the pandemic and Brexit. Nearly 50% of Deptford children are living in poverty! DNA asks the Council to develop new and test all existing draft polices in regards to their child-friendliness. Other boroughs have developed SPDs and DNA feels that Lewisham needs to ensure it makes all environments child-friendly; LBL also needs to make the wellbeing of children and young people its key priority for planning and regeneration. Children and Young People are at the heart of sustainable development. We would urge the Council to use/borrow the assessment methodology from Hackney's 'GROWING UP in Child-Friendly Places; Supplementary Planning Document, October 2020'.	The draft Local Plan is supported by a revised Infrastructure delivery Plan. An Integrated Impact Assessment has been carried out on the draft plan and policies. We will review the work undertaken by Hackney	No change.
DNA	3	LNA	**05** The Map below indicates Strategic Development Sites as presented in the emerging Local Plan (2021) and shows the quantum of development and their planning status. Sites No1,2,4,5,11,13 as well as 14,15 and 16, located in the Neighbourhood Plan area amount to over 6000 new homes and approx. 90000 sqm of town-centre and employment uses. Deptford high street is currently comprised of about 30000sqm town centre uses for comparison. This highlights the fact that Convoys Wharf is a new town on the river which will change the centre of gravity in Deptford. However, there are no high capacity public transport hubs along the River. We ask the Council in the North Sub Area Objectives section and Key Diagram and Policies to fully integrate Convoys Wharf and Plot 21 into the future planning. There is a shared concern in local communities that this type and scale of private sector development - without the necessary and accessible community, social and employment infrastructures and strategies connecting the new, often relatively affluent communities, with the existing, often economically challenged communities - will lead to an erosion of	Convoys wharf has a live planning permission with an accompanying S106 agreement which outlines improvements to public transport. Convoys Wharf was approved by the then Mayor of London Boris Johnson despite the Council's concerns regarding the scale and massing of the scheme. The Council must now work proactively with the developer to secure the best possible design for each reserved matter application within the parameters of the approved application and design code.	No change.

			community cohesion, more inequalities, identity loss and ghettoisation. In our view, it is likely to lead to regeneration of the type that prices out local people from accessing already scarce amenities, services and opportunities. This concern is more widely reflected in the London Plan's clear corrective approach towards Good Growth moving community cohesion, decarbonising, urban greening and health and well-being infrastructures, improved air quality and more child-friendly environments more at the heart of growth while protecting employment land. Most of those sites included in this site allocation plan have planning consent (coloured in blue lettering), in preparation or live (yellow and orange lettering). A crude population estimate suggests between 12000 and 15000 new residents and between 3000 to 5000 jobs in the Neighbourhood Plan area accommodated on these sites alone. This does not take account of Plot 21 at Convoy's Wharf nor recent and significant new development at Plough Way and infill or retrofitting development in some of Deptford's sizeable warehouse buildings.		
DNA	3	LNA	**06** Currently, the 11 Objectives identified for the Northern Sub Area seem to ignore that there is a second Opportunity Area. The profound changes to Deptford by the building out of Convoys Wharf is not mentioned beyond employment related objectives. DNA asks the Council to change this omission and to take a more proactive approach to use planning obligations locally to improve the quality of life in Deptford. DNA does not support the scale of development at Convoys Wharf but is does support the public access and the opportunities for 'old' Deptford being much better connected with the River Thames. The 'Key Diagram' in North Sub Area section needs updating with a clear link to physically integrating Evelyn Street Local Centre with the layout consented at Convoys. DNA feels this needs much more detail overall for the benefit of Deptford as a whole - especially through directing payments made and committed under planning obligations into highly deprived communities such as Evelyn while planning ahead for needed capacity for walking and cycling (North-South especially).	Disagree. The spatial objectives for the East Area in the draft Local Plan include a footnote which clearly states that the Opportunity Areas include both the New Cross / Lewisham / Catford and Deptford Creek / Greenwich Riverside OAs. The Regulation 19 plan has been amended to provide a stronger focus on OAs at the front end of the plan in OL1, and to reduce repetition in the sub-areas. However, the spatial objectives for the sub-area, place principles and site allocations provide details on how growth and regeneration will be managed within the area, including Deptford Creekside. It is acknowledged that further details on integrating Evelyn Street Local Centre with new developments should be included.	Policy OL1 spatial strategy amended to provide more details around the Opportunity Areas. Local Plan amended with new key spatial objective and policy for Evelyn Street Local Centre.
DNA	3	LNA	**07** In addition, and as shown on the map above, the emerging Local Plan indicates new strategic site allocations for Site 3, 6, 7,12 and is also promoting small sites in the plan area. a. DNA proposes to review all 'new' Site Allocations in the neighbourhood plan areas with a clear 'secured in policy' commitment that these sites, as they are by and large under public sector control, are to become best practice, leading the way in terms of increasing walking and cycling priority, circular economy practises, especially in construction, construction material choices and operation, biodiversity, carbon neutral - fuel poverty combatting development, affordable co-working spaces and live-work units, child friendly spaces while significantly improving the services and the community offer. DNA's Refurbish, Remodel and Retrofit First policy must be at the heart of this regeneration strategy. 'Development which proactively delivers measures tackling the	Officers note that Lewisham's Mayor and Cabinet refused the application for DNA to be re-designated as a Neighbourhood Forum.	The Riverside Youth Club and 2000 Community Centre site allocation has been removed from the plan.

			climate emergency and contributes to Lewisham's carbon neutral by 2030 Action Plan commitment are strongly supported. Especially, if proposals apply a 'Refurbish, Remodel and Retrofit First' approach to dealing with existing structures on-site.' Our ask for public realm led design and development briefs with masterplan is we fully compliant with London Plan Policy D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach. Developing masterplans following Passive Solar Design principles will also be helped by increasing the red line especially if the site and surrounding land is in public ownership in our view. Site 8, 9, 10, 17 and 18 are in this context absolutely relevant and in addition to Site 1,2,4,5,11,13 as well as 14,15 and 16 when it comes to the planning for high capacity active movement corridors (walking and cycling in the main plus scooters and cargo bikes) in this part of the borough, especially when considering the new town at Convoys Wharf that emerges on Deptford Stand. The Mayor of London wants 90 per cent of all trips in the neighbourhood to be made by foot, cycle or public transport by 2041. This requires planning and some radical changes and investment in Deptford. We recognises the last tranche of new site allocations recognises the need to invest in social and community infrastructure as well as industrial land away from the allocated residential-led sites. The Riverside Youth Club and 2000 Community Centre (Site 3), the Albany Theatre (Site 12) and Sites 5,6 and 7 at the edge of Folkstone Gardens are of strategic significance and can if designed well be transformative. The sites promoting new and modernised community, social and commercial uses, supporting this staggering increase in residential and employment populations. However, we feel the site areas as indicated by the red line around site 3, site 12 should be expanded to ensure the best use of land is delivered. All sites require a much needed integration of spaces and functions to deliver better outcomes for the community. Most of the land is under public sector control and the local plan and the site allocations can guide and set a framework **b. Expanded Site Allocation | Site 3 | Grove Street Local Neighbourhood Centre** **Wider area to be included in Site Allocations** The Site Allocation Plan lists the Riverside Youth Club and 2000 Community Centre and focuses on the building only. DNA feels the site allocation should be widened so that together with the community a masterplan and planning application can be prepared addressing local needs and improving the Neighbourhood Centre as a whole, including how the buildings relate to the street, increase in community, health and wellbeing services, shops, affordable homes, especially those for the most vulnerable, making the Local Centre an exemplar for child friendly development, ensuring all are feeling safe after dark, improving connections with to the River and with Surrey Canal Linear Park and Deptford Park. DNA asks the Council to make a policy provision securing a public realm led design and development brief with		

			masterplan in close collaboration with key stakeholders and the community at large for this Local Neighbourhood Centre – This would be an ideal site for Community Collaborative planning – as would the Albany Site too. **c. Expanded Strategic Site Allocation | No 12 The Albany Theatre** DNA agrees with the proposal of the redevelopment of the Albany to fit the 21st century needs and provide more space and programmes for the local community. DNA would like to propose to include the underused market stall area next to the main building into the site allocation to provide in the future a double height covered market, space for young people and a multi-use street-level urban space all year around. DNA asks to detail the identified 5,002 sqm town centre uses as stipulated in the site allocation sheet on page 611 by securing a. the existing amount of theatre space and employment space to be re-provided; b. the existing market stall space to be re-provided in a covered market building at affordable cost to the traders; c. affordable workspace is combined with live-work provision where possible; d. at least 10% of the new homes are for people in need of 'Supported and Specialised Accommodation'; those most in need; e. the current amount of green space on site and all mature trees are retained; f. a green link with Margaret MacMillan Park is delivered; DNA asks the Council to develop a design and development brief or mini-masterplan in close collaboration with key stakeholders and the community in the form of a community collaborative plan.		
DNA	3	LNA	**a. More join-up and integration at Strategic Sites | 5,6,7** DNA supports the site allocations for employment at this location. It is a key link between north and south at the confluence of two parks and a primary school and strategic cycle and walking routes. DNA asks the Council to include about 1000 sq m of town centre uses for site 6 and 7 to allow for uses that may support the employment population, significant footfall and illuminate the public realm after dark. The use of the site 6 and 7 for housing is not supported. Noise and air quality are key reasons for objecting to this use at those two sites. This even before Site 8, Surrey Canal Triangle with over 3600 homes and 47000sqm of non-residential use is constructed and operational. DNA asks the Council to make a policy provision securing a public realm led design and development brief with masterplan in close collaboration with key stakeholders and the community at large using community collaborative planning for the 3 sites.	Site allocations 6 and 7 are former Strategic Industrial Land Sites and are required to reprovide the existing employment space as a minimum. The indicative capacities of employment floorspace will provide significant local jobs.	No change
DNA	3	LNA	**a. Additional Strategic Site Allocation Evelyn Street Local Centre** We support the Local Plan proposal to designate the Evelyn Street Shops as a 'Local Centre'. Investment in this	We are not adding site allocations at this stage of the plan process. This site may be considered through a plan review in due course.	No change.

			part of Deptford is supported because it sits within an area of very highest deprivation, has a number of poorly performing open spaces, poor pedestrian and cycling environments, and provides land and green spaces with social infrastructure that could be improved. DNA asks the Council to make a policy provision securing a public realm led design and development brief with masterplan in close collaboration with key stakeholders and the community at large – using community collaborative planning. The redline area to include Evelyn Green, Evelyn Local Centre and Sayes Court Park with a commitment to increasing accessible green space and a high quality walking and cycling environment as well as improved community services, affordable work space and shops. A priority should be providing improved walking and cycling at this location will link Deptford high street, Deptford Station and New Cross Station with Convoys Wharf town centre, school, jobs, river front and riverbus. Improvements to Evelyn Street Junction via the Cycleway No 4 programme and planning obligation payments from Convoys Wharf should make a start of this investment programme. TfL's proposals, as shown below, are worrying as they do not facilitate a direct crossing between Sayes Court Street and Arbinger Grove, not for pedestrians nor for cyclists traveling north to south.		
DNA	3	LNA	**08** The Neighbourhood Plan has detailed the concept of the North Lewisham Links and promotes this through the **Deptford Green Links policy** and further growth and strengthening of green and social infrastructures at the **Health and Wellbeing Hub Zones** and as well as clusters of affordable co-working space in the creative, green and health and wellbeing sectors, what we call **Deptford Work Anchors.** (See Attached an extract of our draft Regulation 16 policies for your assistance). We would like to discuss with the council to what extent the next version of Local Plan could expand on our work and identity those areas and policy themes as part of a regeneration framework and strategy for Deptford. See attached Deptford Plan draft policy extracts.	DNA are no longer a designated Forum	No change
DNA	3	LNA	**10** In Deptford there are not one but two London Opportunity Areas and a Local Regeneration area designation. And as evidenced in the map above much of the private sector led development is already consented. **The current lack of up-to date social, environmental and economic Opportunity Area evidence base makes it almost impossible to tailor a focused plan-led policy framework allowing the public sector to set priorities, lead and guide development and improve the health and wellbeing and prosperity in Deptford. This is fundamental to make best use of land and the planning obligations in our view**. While a piecemeal private-sector led neighbourhood development might be acceptable in a low growth and/or affluent places with great infrastructures already supporting residents and businesses to operate at their optimum - it is, we feel entirely unacceptable for Deptford – **especially taking account of the need to collectively respond to Climate Emergency and Pandemic**	Noted. The Local Plan is subject to an Integrated Impact Assessment which tests the spatial strategy and detailed polices. Please refer to this document for further details.	Policy OL1 spatial strategy amended to provide additional information on Deptford, Creekside Opportunity Area.

			at all scales urgently-. Deptford is already the most densely part of the borough (120000+ people per km2) and with many of the Super Output Areas in the top 5% most deprived areas in all of England. DNA wants the Local Plan to recognise that nearly 50% of our children live in poverty, after housing cost (pre-pandemic data) and so many of our elderly living in poverty too. The Local Plan and Infrastructure Plan absolutely must addresses this unacceptable situation pro-actively, as priority and adequately with a focused area specific land-use planning and infrastructure plan. **About 60ha of the Deptford Neighbourhood Plan area is public estate land and taking the streets and parks into account we feel the level of public control should lead to a set of policies specifically working with these assets to maximise the local benefits that can be generated from a post-carbon economy, a circular economy and a drive and need for more healthy urban environments in an area which will double in population.** We therefore ask the Council to test and direct policies so they address the needs of the most vulnerable and develop focused strategies and policy framework for Deptford, especially focused on the land and assets they and other public sector agencies have control over. Leading by example will be critical in Deptford where much of the development is already consented and a spatial strategy identifying where already secured and forth coming planning obligations and Section 106 monies should be invested maximising public good: Consultation from our Reg 14 Survey will help the Council to establish the community's priorities for S106 community projects within the DNA Neighbourhood Plan Area. The Sub Area approach in the current version of the Local Plan could facilitate this more fully and taking Convoys'. It does not do that sufficiently in its current form.		
DNA	3	LNA	**CHILD-FRIENDLY DEPTFORD – other comments:** www.allianceforchildhood.org. I've attached the calculation for Convoys Wharf plots 8 and 15. The calculator they used has been revised because it underestimated the number of children, for example by assuming that people in 2 bedroom accommodation tend not to have children. Because of overcrowding arising from the lack of affordable property families do move into 2 bedroom units. The calculator was revised in 2019. Here is a link to the GLA population yield calculator: https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/population-yield-calculator Some boroughs have adapted it to suit their own population distribution. It would be good if Lewisham could do the same. DNA has a plan which will show the green routes, which would also be playable space for children. Both the minimum 10 sqm space and playable routes are important. Linked to the importance of involving children in the design, especially of public spaces, green spaces and	Convoys wharf has a live planning approval. Details of green space and play space provision can be found in the design documents associated. The Local Plans policies on affordable housing are in broad conformity with the London Plan and have been thorough tested through the SHMA and Viability Review.	No change.

			streets that DNA is putting forward – here is a further comment from Marion: is it possible to extend the policy to include involving children more generally in the design process not just in major developments? DNA would like LBL to come back to us regarding assumptions made and being used for the education and school provisions and section 106 contributions on the Convoys Wharf site – we know from our own Reg 14 consultation process that there is a strong need for secondary school provision on the Convoys Wharf Site which also includes Special Education Needs provision within it. DNA COMMENTS ON 'SO-CALLED AFFORDABLE HOUSING CATEGORY OF SHARED OWNERSHIP': DNA's Neighbourhood Plan focuses on the need for truly affordable housing – which is LBL Social Rent or Affordable rent (if this is still 60% of market rent for people in Lewisham?). London Affordable rents are on average up to 50% higher than council social rent, and 30% higher than Housing Association rents. Excellent recent article demonstrating why Shared Ownership should not be seen as genuinely affordable: https://www.sharedownershipresources.org/an-expert-on/shared-ownership-and-the-impossible-dream/		
DNA	3	LNA	Evelyn Street 'local centre'. Historically Evelyn Street had many more shops than it presently has. Other 'feed' in streets can be encouraged, too, to have local shops and workshops once again. To encourage "Keep in Local" in leisure and work.	Evelyn Street is identified as a local parade in the Local Plan	No change.
Environment Agency	3	LNA Site allocations	**North Area feedback** Some of the sites in this area are also close to a number of permitted waste management sites and also in neighbouring boroughs. For the latest list of permitted waste sites with an Environment Agency permit visit our public register in the link below and search by site address or local authority https://environment.data.gov.uk/public-register/view/search-waste-operations This area has some ongoing issues with fly tipping so it is essential proposed development and any vacant sites/buildings have strong security measures to protect development sites from trespass and illegal waste deposits. *LB Lewisham officer note: Table of sites with water management information included in original representation.*	Noted.	The Local Plan Part 2 waste management policies have been updated to reflect that there are existing sites with EA waste permits that require safeguarding in accordance with London Plan. The Local Plan has been updated with additional policy points dealing with amenity in terms of waste management.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LNA	Page 561 Key Spatial Objective 8 in the main document refers to "transform the A2 into a Healthy Street". We	Noted.	Local Plan amended by referencing the Healthy Streets Approach.

		Key spatial objectives	would suggest the wording of this is altered to “adopt the healthy streets approach along the A2 corridor” and encourage the planning team to follow TfL guidance on this which is clear and unequivocal. This should also form part of the strategic planning document for the whole corridor, and form conditions of planning along the corridor, including CIL contributions to part fund improvements.		
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA	Key spatial objective 1 : We are significantly concerned over the intent behind the reference to “a new modern station at New Cross”. We assume, firstly, that this means New Cross Gate and not New Cross. On that assumption, as we have stated in all previous submissions, we believe that, whilst new station buildings would be required to the north of the existing building and underground, it is important for the heritage of the area that the existing station building on the New Cross Road – which is a distinctive feature of the area – should be retained. We note that § 15.59 states that the “creation of a new Bakerloo Line station should integrate with the existing station” which, contrary to KSO 1, implies the retention of the existing station buildings. The “a new modern station at New Cross” in KSO 1 could best be omitted or, if not, reworded to say “with station improvements at New Cross Gate”.	Noted – yes this means New Cross Gate. A new modern station could be developed which integrates the old. This will be thoroughly tested at the Development Management stage when proposals are brought forward.	Text amended to New Cross Gate
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA	Key spatial objective 8 is not acceptable as worded. The A2 is a major arterial network taking traffic from the whole of Kent and much of Sussex into central London and back out again. Any attempt to make it “into a ‘healthy street’ with public realm improvements that make walking, cycling and use of public transport safer and more convenient” is likely to push traffic onto residential roads, particularly across Telegraph Hill (see also paragraph 211) but also through the streets to the north of New Cross in order to gain access to the A200 as an alternative route. Static and congested traffic creates pollution. Spreading traffic across residential roads adds to the pollution on those roads, creates additional hazards for pedestrians, and adds to noise disturbance to residents of those streets. In short, making the A2 a “healthy” street risks making large proportions of the rest of the area less healthy. The policy should be reworded to include a proviso that this will only be done provided that no traffic is displaced onto residential roads and, as suggested under paragraph 211 that this will be established in advance by robust and transparent modelling and monitored thereafter.	We acknowledge that the A2 is a key arterial route and will continue to accommodate large volumes of traffic. However we still believe that improvements can be made to improve walking, cycling and public transport in line with TFL’s heathy street guidance. This will not impact on adjacent residential streets and any proposals will be tested thoroughly.	No change
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA	An alternative key spatial objective, which should be pursued, is to accept that the A2 is a major arterial road, to move cycling provision on to routes parallel to the A2 and to move, over time, the key shopping provision from the main road onto other sites (see our comments on shopping in paragraphs 169-171 above and on cycling- and pedestrian-friendly routes in paragraphs 238 and 250 below.)	We acknowledge that the A2 is a key arterial route and will continue to accommodate large volumes of traffic. However we still believe that improvements can be made to improve walking, cycling and public transport in line with TFL’s heathy street guidance. This will not impact on adjacent residential streets and any proposals will be tested thoroughly.	No change.
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA	As regards the statement in § 15.5, whilst we agree that the high street in Deptford may offer a “rich and vibrant mix of shops” it is hard to see that New Cross/New Cross	This is subjective	No change

			Gate does so. The retail take is, in our view, poor being mainly confined to food provision, off licences and a couple of dry cleaners (again refer to our comments on the shopping offer (paragraph 169) above.)		
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA	The Development Requirements (**§ 15.59**) need specifically to reference a requirement for a cycle/pedestrian route as an extension across the railway line from Hatcham Park Road to Batavia Road. This route is critical in that it will allow access to Fordham Park open space from any new development and will provide a safe route for cyclists without restricting traffic flow on the A2 and thereby prevent the need for measures that would increase traffic on residential side roads (see paragraphs 238 and 239 above)	This is captured within the site allocations.	No change
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA	Any Development Requirements (**§ 15.59**) and Development Guidelines (**§ 15.60**) for the site should include a specific reference back to the need for new green infrastructure and social infrastructure. Major objections to the previously proposed Hatcham Works developments from local residents included the impact of additional units on already crowded local parks and medical facilities (see Appendix 2). There should therefore be the requirement that any new development must not reduce the amount of available green recreational space on a per capita basis for the surrounding area and, given the identified lack of such existing space in the area, must increase it if possible.	The former Hatcham Works site is a highly accessible site in a District Centre and is suitable for high-density development. Whilst the site will accommodate open space and amenity space appropriate for a mixed-use town centre development it is not a development requirement to have a large public park. The site is within walking distance to Fordham Park.	No change.
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA	Any Development Requirements (**§ 15.59**) and Development Guidelines (**§ 15.60**) should further require that any redevelopment of the site should include a supermarket provision.	The indicative site capacity for the former Hatcham Works Site includes 17,550m2 of non-residential uses – which is more than adequate to accommodate a supermarket.	No change.
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA	The Development Guidelines (§ 15.60) should be reworded to require that the development includes no buildings that would dominate the Hatcham Park Conservation Area and should generally be limited to no more than six to eight stories (please refer to both Appendix 1 and Appendix 2). Designs should reflect the local character rather than merely and ambiguously "respond positively to the local character".	The indicative capacities for the Former Hatcham Works site has been informed by the New Cross Gate Area Framework. This provides an indicative layout and massing for the site which is deemed appropriate by the Council. The former Hatcham Works site is a highly accessible site in a District Centre and is suitable for high-density development.	No change.
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA	The Development Guidelines (§ 15.60) need to ensure that adequate consideration is given to traffic flows such that they do not impact adversely on the Telegraph Hill and Hatcham Conservation Areas. We were deeply concerned about the Council proposals and the Sainsbury's/Mount Anvil withdrawn proposals for the "Hatcham Works" site which, we believe, would have directed considerably more traffic through Telegraph Hill on a North-South route. We note § 15.59 which states that the integration of the site "will require a hierarchy of routes with clearly articulated east-west and north-south corridors". We would like the policy to make clear that this refers only to walking and cycling connections and not road connections. There is no north-south road corridor at present and, indeed, in the 1990s the junction between Jerningham Road and the New Cross Road at New Cross Gate Station was specifically re-	Sites within the New Cross Gate Area will be car-free as per the London Plan parking requirements. A Transport Assessment will accompany any planning application for the site which will assess traffic flows through the area.	No change

			designed after lobbying by the Telegraph Hill Society, with huge community support, to minimise the impact of north-south traffic generated by the development of the Sainsbury's supermarket and other retail outlets (there had been no significant traffic prior to that point). Given the residential nature of Telegraph Hill and the location of the Haberdashers' Askes' two schools at the north and south ends of Jerningham Road, we will strongly resist any proposal that would facilitate an increase in traffic along this road and through Telegraph Hill.		
The Hatcham Society	3 3	LNA Key Strategic Objectives LNA SA 08	We find it very troubling that Lewisham in their North area Plan looks to "safeguard strategic waste management sites including SELCHP" while promoting the redevelopment of Millwall Football stadium adjacent to SELCHP with 2,500 new homes planned. According to the aforementioned GLA commissioned report, "Emissions from the five EfW facilities within Greater London are predicted to be associated with 15 deaths of London residents per year." With this in mind, we do not believe it is ethical to both safeguard SELCHP and build more homes so close to the incinerator.	The London Plan sets out the strategic approach to achieve net waste self-sufficiency (i.e. the equivalent of 100 per cent of London's waste should be managed within London by 2026). It requires that the Council, through the Local Plan, identifies and safeguards waste sites/facilities in order to meet the borough's apportioned tonnage of waste. SELCHP plays an important role in helping the borough to meet its London Plan waste apportionment figure. For the time being, the Local Plan must therefore continue to safeguard the site for waste management uses.	No change
Transport for London	3	LNA Key Spatial Objectives	While we recognise that this local plan is generally supportive of cycle hire, we specifically recommend including cycle hire expansion in the Lewisham North Area which is both realistic and desirable, given the current cycle hire strategy to reach Greenwich Park, in line with CS4 expansion. However, with the success of cycle hire, TfL would also hope to work with the Borough to see if it might be possible to extend to other places. This would require land and funding to be secured e.g. through developer obligations. '8. Transform New Cross Road (A2) into a 'healthy street' with public realm improvements that make walking, cycling and use of public transport safer **and more convenient, and which support any expansion of cycle hire to the area'.** '9. Maximise the recreational and amenity value of the River Thames and Deptford Creekside by transforming the riverside area into a vibrant neighbourhood and visitor destination. Enhance public access to the river, including by repairing breaks in the Thames Path and Waterlink Way, as well as enabling river bus services at Convoys Wharf **and by providing opportunities for cycle hire expansion into this area'.** '10. Protect and enhance open and green spaces, including waterways. Continue to deliver and expand the North Lewisham Links, a connected network of high quality walking and cycle routes that link these spaces**, including supporting the potential for any cycle hire expansion along these routes.** Ensure these routes address existing barriers to movement, such as those caused by the tangle of railways and major roads'.	Noted.	Local Plan amended to incorporate stronger direction for expansion of cycle hire in North Area.

London Wildlife Trust	3	LNA 01	We support this principles, especially in respect of Part F.	Support noted.	No change.
Port of London Authority	3	LNA 01	**11. Policy LNA1: North Area Place Principles** Figure 15.2 must be updated to highlight the safeguarded wharf boundary for Convoys Wharf, and also must highlight the proposed riverbus stop at Convoys wharf, to the east of the safeguarded wharf boundary, as part of the public transport improvements for the area. Support the reference within the Transport and Connectivity section of the Local Plan and this policy on the support to enable riverbus services at Convoys Wharf. As part of part A(e), on 'land safeguarded to secure the delivery of strategic transport infrastructure', it is recommended that the Safeguarded Convoys Wharf is also highlighted here, which as noted elsewhere in this response is safeguarded for waterborne freight cargo handling which will help to achieve the councils objectives to facilitate good growth and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes. In addition, support the reference to riverbus services within key spatial objectives no 9 for this area which proposes to maximise the recreational and amenity value of the River Thames and Deptford Creekside by transforming the riverside area into a vibrant neighbourhood and visitor destination, by enhancing public access to the river, including by as enabling river bus services at Convoys Wharf.	The Safeguarded Wharf is outlined in Fig 11.4 within Part Two relating to Policy SD9 Water Management and referenced within the Convoys Wharf Site allocation. The sub are map depicts strategic features and designations. The riverbus stop is too detailed to be shown on the map.	No change.
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA 01	As stated in the preceding paragraphs, we have considerable concerns as to whether this policy is either achievable or, indeed, desirable. We agree that the A2 is a strategic movement corridor, but are deeply concerned that giving "priority to safe and convenient movement by walking and cycling" as set out in LNA2A.C and LNA2.D will push traffic onto residential roads, in particular across Telegraph Hill but also through the streets to the north of New Cross to gain access to the A200 as an alternative route. The A2 is the primary traffic route and must remain so. Issues around cycling can be dealt with by parallel cycle routes avoiding the A2 and shopping can be encouraged off the main road by the re-imagination of the shopping centre utilising vacant land to the north of the A2. This policy as it presently stands, is not acceptable and will be strongly opposed by residents.	We acknowledge that the A2 is a key arterial route and will continue to accommodate large volumes of traffic. However we still believe that improvements can be made to improve walking, cycling and public transport in line with TFL's heathy street guidance. This will not impact on adjacent residential streets and any proposals will be tested thoroughly.	No change
	3	LNA 02	New Cross Road has the worst pollution London. Plans in the LLP to improve the air quality directly contradict the expansion of residential properties in the area by more than 6000 residential units that will bring their carbon footprint in extended vehicle use, services and domestic energy use. The plan cannot claim Green credentials whilst contradicting itself in its methods and aspirations for the area.	Lewisham must plan for the growth required to meet its London Plan target of 1,667 new homes per year. Our view is that these homes are best located in areas which have good access to public transport, services and job opportunities to reduce the need for car use. New Cross is one of a number of areas where the draft plan promotes significant development. The draft Local Plan also sets out policies to reduce car use, insisting on car free development in accessible locations, promoting the use of sustainable forms of transport and identifying significant improvements to public transport.	No change

Lewisham Cyclists	3	LNA 02	LNA2 New Cross Road / A2 corridor Section A; as per point above. In addition, Section D includes “Interventions to support a rebalancing of New Cross Road to prioritise movement by walking and cycling, including by widening pavements and reducing pinch-points”. Lewisham Cyclists expect any public realm scheme involving the removal of the Amersham Vale Gyratory to provide a high quality cycle route to facilitate the future cycling route 11 as per the Transport for London Cycling Action Plan from Deptford along New Cross Road connecting to Old Kent Road on the borough boundary.	Noted. We will pass this on to our Transport and Highways team.	No change
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA 02	At a minimum LNA2 should make it clear that the Council will only support proposals for change and will only itself make changes that do not result in an escalation of traffic onto primarily residential roads.	Agreed.	Policy LNA2 amended to address vehicle volume and movements.
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA 02	Policy LNA2.B.a should specifically include the need to respond sympathetically to the Hatcham Park, St James and Telegraph Hill Conservation Areas.	The policy states that proposals should respond positively to heritage assets – this includes conservation areas – this is outlined in Policy HE2	No change.
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA 02	In respect of policy LNA.D.a, please see our response to Key spatial objective 8 above - whilst we agree that the station will need upgrading to cater for the BLE, the original station buildings contribute to the heritage of the New Cross Road. A new station interchange (as stated here) is acceptable but a new station or an interchange which involves the destruction of the existing station building is not.	A new modern station could be developed which integrates the old. This will be thoroughly tested at the development management stage when proposals are brought forward.	No change
The Hatcham Society	3 3 2	LNA 02 LNA SA 08 GR 05	Bridgehouse Meadows There is currently a section of Bridgehouse Meadows nature conservation area which is gated and hardly used by residents apart from by itinerant dog-walkers. We would love to see that space opened up and turned into allotments and a community wildlife garden for local residents. This area is highly deficient in greenspace and this section is currently under-utilised. With the backing of the council, we would like to open it up and turn it into a positive community space which aims to benefit the residents of Manley Court Care Home and beyond.	We will pass this on to our Parks team	No change
The Hatcham Society	3 3	LNA 02 LNA SA 09	Hatcham Works What we welcome The main positive from the Plan is the protection of the Bakerloo Line Extension as it aims to safeguard the area currently owned by Sainsbury’s for the construction and excavation of the tunnels. We approve of the changes between the draft New Cross Gate SPD and what is now proposed in the Lewisham Local Plan when it comes to proposed reopening of Hatcham’s residential streets to traffic from the New Cross Road. The draft SPD saw the recommendation of creating a "new circular route via Harts Lane" [Point 9, Page 52 of the draft SPD] and the recommendation of creating a "secondary access to Hart [Sic] Lane via Hatcham Park Road - suitable	Support Noted.	Policy LNA2 amended to address vehicle volume and movements.

			for Bus traffic' [Point 4, Page 43. We opposed these changes and 87 residents signed a petition against the reopening of Hatcham to traffic from the New Cross Road. We were pleased to see in the Plan that it now says “The layout of the site should incorporate sufficient space to accommodate interchange between bus, tube, rail, cycling and walking.” [Lewisham's North Area, pg 49] We need this section to be more robustly phrased to completely rule out the re-opening of residential roads to vehicle traffic from New Cross Road to the Hatcham Works site and the proposed Surrey Canal triangle site. If the roads are reopened, this will go directly against the Mayor of London's Healthy Streets Approach which seeks to create streets which are "pleasant, safe and attractive". We also welcome the proposal of a “New walking and cycle access through the site from Hatcham Park Road / Hart’s Lane. This must include a clearly articulated east-west route within the site, also enabling a link from Hatcham Park Road to Batavia Road via a bridge over the railway.” We urge Lewisham Council to push for this new route - in line with policy LNA2 - before the delivery of the Bakerloo Line Extension which may take decades given the dire state of TFL’s finances following the pandemic. We believe this will bring an immeasurable benefit to the residents in the North of the borough who may start cycling more. So many are discouraged from going on their bike in Hatcham because of the prospect of cycling on the hostile New Cross Road.		
London Wildlife Trust	3	LNA 04	We support this policy in respect of Part B.	Support noted.	No change.
	3	LNA 04	it is my hope that your Local Plan for the ongoing development of Deptford Creekside and surrounding areas is carried out with respectful acknowledgement and celebration of the beautiful diversity of life and culture that exists in this spectacular borough and that the upcoming (delayed due to Covid) London Borough of Culture award be positively integrated with the local community which is comprised of many extremely talented and creative individuals and groups. Why not employ local graffiti artists to spray hoarding boards rather than have the constant task of painting over rushed tags of pent up frustration? Why not experiment with tiny house build projects and eco-friendly building schemes such as air-crete, cob, earthbag and strawbale to name but a few options that can bring community groups together to co-learn and co-create whilst instigating and promoting a greener way to thrive even within city lives? The damning process of Tidemill left many folk heartbroken and downtrodden. There is a local resident	The Local Plan provides strategic policies that support the culture and creative industries within the borough.	No change.

			who saved a seed from the Indian Bean Tree and it's growing so well along with some other saplings. (I think that is it's name, forgive me as I've left this to the last minute due to a number of reasons regarding mental health, depression and general connection with the www) Why not plant this to grow in all its majesty on a public site for all to enjoy for generations to come? I heard comparisons that Tidemill wasn't the Hanging Gardens of Babylon or Kew so it didn't matter. How utterly short-sighted and narrow-minded. How about making a Knew Garden? Inviting folk to contribute plants and tips, etc. from around the world? I have faith in the funghi and would love to experiment with its many uses and forms. Plus edible flowers and other wholesome products...I wonder why the polytunnels and greenhouse on the Lewisham College site are still left unused after all this time? Vertical gardening, etc. How about letting us so many artists produce positively without an inherent capitalist start point but from an altruistic foundation? I dream of sound-healing domes and peace memorables, green and parkour spaces for people to meet and integrate and initiate well-being and positive social collaborations and idea-harvesting. Why not implement and encourage positive creativity and collective community actions that can benefit not only the locale but the whole world too?		
Port of London Authority	3	LNA 04	**12. Policy LNA4: Thames Policy Area.** Policy LNA4 must give a specific reference on the need for developments situated alongside Deptford Creek to ensure they are designed in line with the Agent of Change principle. On the Royal Borough of Greenwich side on Deptford Creek there is an operational wharf situated at Brewery wharf, safeguarded by ministerial direction, which can operate for up to 24 hours a day in line with tidal movements. In line with London Plan policy SI15 it must be ensured as part of any future development located in close proximity that any proposals are designed to minimise the potential for conflicts of use and disturbance, including during day and night time periods, to ensure operations at the safeguarded wharf are not constrained. Support the reference in the policy on the need for development proposals to enhance physical connections to the river or creek, including walking and cycle routes that enable access to the waterfront. This is in line with the PLA's Thames Vision which includes the goal to join up the Thames Path from source to sea, including enhancing access to riverside areas. Also support the references in part B (e & f) on the need to resist encroachment into the creek or river and foreshore and the promotion of river-related and marine uses, where appropriate. As part of the aim of the policy to activate the river or creek as an important part of the public realm and	Support noted.	Changed incorporated within policy LNA 4 and other water management policies amended to refer to the Agent of Change.

			contributing to the liveliness of the waterfront, the PLA would support the promotion for increased recreational opportunities at appropriate parts of the river and Deptford Creek within the policy. This is supported by the Thames Vision which includes the goal to see greater participation in sports and recreation on and alongside the river.		
	3	LNA 2	The 'Route 1' Cycle and Pedestrian Bridge A strong positive in the plan is the retention of the plan to build a bridge over the railway. This was a huge plus in the design for Hatcham Works and was even included in the Sainsbury's Mount Anvil plan although they described the bridge as an "aspiration" rather than a concrete realization in their plans. Keeping the bridge and the green 'Route 1' cycle and pedestrian route (including the pedestrian bridge) parallel to the New Cross road is an immense plus as part of the LLP and would link New cross Gate to Fordham Park. New Cross Gate chronically lacks green space to the bridge would provide a significant enhancement to the lives of New Cross Gate residents. Crucially would be transformational to the lives of the children in this area their journey to the local school of Deptford Green infinitely more safe and enjoyable. They would be walking safely away from the polluted noisy New Cross Road or the very narrow and dangerous underpass on Cold Blow Lane. The retention of the 'Route 1' bridge in the New LLP is a significant plus for the future of New Cross.	Noted.	No change.
Transport for London	3	LNA 2	C Development proposals must reinforce the role of New Cross Road as a strategic movement corridor, giving priority to the safe and convenient movement by walking and cycling, as well as the use of public transport. This principal east-west route should be supported by a complementary network of legible, safe and accessible routes, including cycle routes, that link with it to enhance connections between neighbourhoods and places**, providing opportunities for any expansion of cycle hire'.**	Agreed this is addressed in Policy LNA2 New Cross Road / A2 corridor and also within the New Cross Area Framework endorsed by the Council.	Local Plan amended to incorporate stronger direction for expansion of cycle hire in North Area.
Greater London Authority	3	LNA SA 01	In addition, the corresponding Site Allocation for the comprehensive redevelopment of the site should refer more prominently to the role and long-term protection of the safeguarded wharf within the scheme. Safeguarded wharves are important to facilitate sustainable water freight (London Plan para 15.9.4), in particular in close proximity to central London.	The site allocation already mentions Appropriate safeguarding and re-activation of the existing wharf and associated vessel moorings, including for river based passenger transport. It should also acknowledge that the range of uses on the wharf will be restricted to those specified in the S106 agreement	Convoys Wharf MEL site allocation amended to mention long-term protection and to restrict the type of uses on the safeguarded wharf to those specified in the S106 agreement, to ensure compatibility with nearby residential use.
Royal Borough of Greenwich	3	LNA SA 01	Convoy's Wharf: We support the redevelopment of this site and its role in enhancing connectivity and reinstating the Thames Path, as well as the need to have regard to impacts on protected views and the setting of the World Heritage Site in establishing building heights and scale. This site is in close proximity to the Grade II* listed Church of St Nicholas, and the allocation should acknowledge that heritage asset and ensure that development respects its setting.	Noted	Convoys Wharf MEL site allocation amended to include reference to the Grade II* listed Church of St Nicholas.

Port of London Authority	3	LNA SA 01	**Site 1: Convoys Wharf Mixed-Use Employment Location.** In principle support the allocation, which recognises the safeguarded wharf designation and includes reference to the need to reactivate the wharf with associated vessel moorings and up to 32,200 m² of employment floorspace (Sui Generis & Class B2). Support the reference in paragraph 15.21 (development requirements) on the need to reactivate the wharf. As part of this it is considered that specific reference is given in the site allocation on the need for the proposed residential development located in close proximity to the safeguarded wharf, to be designed to minimise the potential for conflicts of use and disturbance, including utilising the site layout, building orientation, uses and appropriate materials to design out potential conflicts in line with the Agent of Change principle. Support the reference under the development requirements, which recognises the need for the 'repair of breaks' in the Thames Path and extension of the route along the riverfront across the site, or as near as practical having regard to the safeguarded wharf. In principle this is supported and is in line with the PLAs Thames Vision, which includes the aim to join up the Thames Path from source to sea but notes that there are particular challenges in finding the best route near operational wharves and terminals. In addition, within the last bullet point of the site allocation, which refers to the need for Transport for London and the MMO to be consulted on development and design options, the PLA must be added as an additional consultee.	Support noted. The site allocation already mentions Appropriate re-activation of the existing wharf and associated vessel moorings, including for river based passenger transport. It should also acknowledge that the range of uses on the wharf will be restricted to those specified in the S106 agreement	Convoys Wharf MEL site allocation amended to mention long-term protection and to restrict the type of uses on the safeguarded wharf to those specified in the S106 agreement, to ensure compatibility with nearby residential use. Convoys Wharf MEL site allocation also amended to add Port of London Authority as a consultee.
	3	LNA SA 02	The linear park stretching form Greenland Place eastwards should be core to the timber yard development, linking communities, businesses and provisioning an alternative walking route away from Evelyn Street.	The route is seen as a key walking route and will be delivered through the Deptford Landings scheme	No change.
Port of London Authority	3	LNA SA 02	**Site 2: Timber Yard, Deptford Wharves at Oxestalls Road Mixed Use Employment Location.** As highlighted above under policy SD9, specific reference must be given in the site allocation on the need to ensure any development proposals that come forward are designed such a way to ensure there are no conflicts of use or disturbance with the safeguarded Convoys Wharf, in line with the Agent of Change principle.	Disagree. The site is not located near to the safeguarded wharf.	No change.
	3	LNA SA 03	Site 3: The Riverside Youth Centre building is an "iconic" building of the 20th century on Pepys estate and should be refurbished first.	Agree. There are now plans to refurbish parts of the building.	The Riverside Youth Centre and 2000 Community Centre site allocation has been removed from the Plan
DNA	3	LNA SA 03	Site 3: The Riverside Youth Centre building is an "iconic" building of the 20th century on Pepys estate, and should be refurbished first.	Agree. There are now plans to refurbish parts of the building.	The Riverside Youth Centre and 2000 Community Centre site allocation has been removed from the Plan
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LNA SA 04	**Evelyn Court at Surrey Canal Road Strategic Industrial Location;** This site needs to recognise the council transport strategy to deliver Cycleway 4 in making sure any development does not result in a reduction in existing footway or carriageway space. This should be detailed in	Noted	Evelyn Court LSIS site allocation amended to include a requirement for the site to facilitate the delivery of Cycleway 4.

			the development requirements as part of the public realm strategy.		
	3	LNA SA 05	Canal Approach I request that Lewisham Council prioritise reopening Canal Approach towpath, part of Deptford Parks Liveable Neighbourhood as a key strategic route for North Deptford.	The Local Plan identifies this as a key strategic route for North Deptford highlighted in fig 15.2 and underpinned by the North Lewisham Links policy. The Council have been working with local groups as part of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Project to progress the scheme. Due to the financial challenges that TFL find themselves as a result of COVID-19 the project is having to be scaled back in terms of the scope. The details of which are currently being discussed.	No change.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LNA SA 06	**Strategic Industrial Land (SIL) at Surrey Canal Road and Trundleys Road;** This site needs to recognise the council transport strategy to upgrade Cycleway 10 (previously Quietway 1) in making sure any development does not result in a reduction in existing footway or carriageway space. This should be detailed in the development requirements as part of the public realm strategy.	Noted	Surrey Canal Road and Trundleys Road site allocations amended to include a requirement for the site to facilitate the delivery of Cycleway 10.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LNA SA 07	**Strategic Industrial Land (SIL) at Apollo Business Centre;** This site needs to recognise the council transport strategy to upgrade Cycleway 10 in making sure any development does not result in a reduction in existing footway or carriageway space. This should be detailed in the development requirements as part of the public realm strategy.	Noted	Apollo Business Centre site allocation amended to include a requirement for the site to facilitate the delivery of Cycleway 10.
Sport England	3	LNA SA 08	Surrey Canal Triangle Mixed-use Employment Location Sport England would expect that existing sports facilities and playing field on this site are reprovided to a satisfactory standard; this includes any meanwhile uses. Provision of sports on this site should also be informed by Lewisham's evidence base for sport.	A new planning approval for the Surrey Canal Triangle site has now been approved. The site allocation will reflect this approval.	Surrey Canal Triangle MEL site allocation amended to reflect planning consent granted for the site.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LNA SA 08	**Surrey Canal Triangle Mixed-use Employment Location;** This site needs to recognise the council transport strategy to deliver Cycleway 10 in making sure any development does not result in a reduction in existing footway or carriageway space. This should be detailed in the development requirements as part of the public realm strategy. As part of the Surrey Canal Triangle Masterplan, development requirements must also recognise the essential need for upgrade to the Connect 2 path running from Bridgehouse Meadows to Oldfield Grove and improve connectivity between Bolina Road and Cycleway 10, all in line with London Cycle Design Standards. CIL and S106 contributions from developers would need to take this into account.	Noted	Surrey Canal Triangle MEL site allocation amended to include a requirement for the site to facilitate the delivery of Cycleway 10. Also amended to include requirement to upgrade Connect 2 path.
	3	LNA SA 08	The improvement of Millwall Stadium is good for the future, but what about within its improvements incorporating the whole structure being covered in solar panels to help provide renewable energy for the local area.	This is detailed point and does not relate to the strategic nature of the Local Plan. Any proposal coming forward for Millwall Stadium will have to address the draft sustainability policies outlined in the plan.	No change.
	3	LNA SA 09	[A] - My last endeavour regarding planning matters in my Borough of Lewisham , was my letter to the Planning Department dated 23 February 2020 . titled - Planning Application DC/19/114283 , Sainsburys SE14 , Housing Density .	Whilst the council can advise applicants through pre-application processes it is entirely up to applicants if and when they submit applications. With regard to application DC/19/114283 this was later withdrawn by the applicant and has no bearing on the Local Plan site allocation.	No change.

			My comment at the recent zoom consultation was that I feel disappointed that the Developer had apparently NOT been guided away from making the Application, by the Planning Department, as it appeared to be rather vulnerably poor. The nominal site area was drawn all over the place , including a little way up both Troutbeck Road and Jerningham Road , also the shops along the New Cross Road , A2 , were serviced from a major bus bay and there was an idiosyncratic relationship with the Hatch Conservation Area . However it may have been just a play around to establish Land Values. Whatever the local community , assume they are being served by the Lewisham Planning Officers , that appears in this case , the community was marginalised , and also there was a great waste of energy , which post pandemic must be avoided at all costs . [a] - The local community is disadvantaged, expertise / time available regarding Planning Application Assessments. [b] - Reduction in Energy, energy waste must become more of a consideration, in the age of the Climate Crisis.		
	3	LNA SA 09	Plans to redevelop the Sainsburys site at New Cross Gate faced major objections recently due to the nature of the proposed development. This included the building of several high rise towers, this would have had a huge impact on the current residents of the area. Due to overwhelming objections, these plans were abandoned. The current plan would see a return to the redevelopment of the site including high rise towers and very little if any green space. Any development of this site would need to take into account the conservation status of the area and not ignore it for high rise single flats that offer no long term value for families.	Where there are no current, advanced pre-application discussions the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Site Allocations Background Paper. Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. This has taken into account the complexities of the site including the the site's highly accessible location, suitable for high-density development as well as reflecting the site's surrounding character and Conservation area. The indicative capacity has also been tested through the New Cross Gate Area Framework that has been endorsed by the council. ~~.~~Based on these considerations, the residential units have been amended. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach.	Former Hatcham Works site allocation amended by reducing residential capacity to 800 units, increasing employment floorspace to 7,550m2 and reducing main town centre floorspace to 10,000m2, in line with the New Cross Area Framework.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LNA SA 09	**Former Hatcham Works, New Cross Road & Goodwood Road and** **New Cross Road;** Both sites need to recognise and acknowledge the future cycling route 11 as per the Transport for London Cycling Action Plan from Deptford along New Cross Road connecting to Old Kent Road on the borough boundary in making sure any development does not result in a reduction in existing footway or carriageway space. This should be detailed in the development requirements as part of the public realm strategy. Plans for a "new walking and cycle access through the site from Goodwood Road. This must include a clearly articulated east-west route within the site, also enabling a link from Hatcham Park Road to Batavia Road via a bridge over the railway" should require adequate CIL and S106 contributions from developers as a condition of planning	Noted. CIL and S106 are covered in Policy DM2 in Part 4 of the Local Plan.	Former Hatcham Works and Goodwood Road site allocations amended to include a requirement for the sites to facilitate/ contribute to the delivery of Cycle route 11.

			with any bridge design meeting the Department for Transport Local Transport Note 1/20 and London Cycle Design Standards.		
The Hatcham Society	3 2	LNA SA 09 TR 04	There is also the issue that all the extra residents of the Hatcham Works site would need parking space. As it stands in the present we have commuters driving into zone 2 and taking public transport into the centre of London. There is widespread opposition in the community to imposing controlled parking zones (CPZ) in the area so the extra cars and parking spaces generated by the new Hatcham Works would inevitably overcrowd the streets of Hatcham Conservation area with cars.	Any proposal for the Hatcham Works site will be car-free. The Council is supportive of implementing Controlled Parking Zones, only where they have support from the public.	No change.
The Hatcham Society	3	LNA SA 09	Backing the views of the Telegraph Hill Society We wholeheartedly back the majority of the views put forward by the Telegraph Hill Society in response to Lewisham's draft Local Plan. We back the Telegraph Hill Society's view that "there would be considerable merit in designating the Hatcham Works site as the Primary Shopping Area for future development as it has the capacity to create a better local shopping experience than the A2 if sensitively developed." We also believe that the Hatcham Works site is not suitable for tall buildings and believe it would be more in line with the Borough's Vision if the area was developed for retail and for creative employment alongside a new green space. We back the Telegraph Hill Society's view for the Hatcham Works site that "the Development Guidelines (§ 15.60) should be reworded to require that the development includes no buildings that would dominate the Hatcham Conservation Area and should generally be limited to no more than six to eight stories (please refer to both Appendix 1 and Appendix 2). Designs should reflect the local character rather than merely and ambiguously "respond positively to the local character"." We also back the Telegraph Hill Society's view for the Hatcham Works site that "The Development Guidelines (§ 15.60) need to ensure that adequate consideration is given to traffic flows such that they do not impact adversely on the Telegraph Hill and Hatcham Conservation Areas." We believe that the guidelines must robustly prevent any increase in traffic to both Conservation areas.	The indicative capacities for the Former Hatcham Works site has been informed by the New Cross Gate Area Framework. This provides an indicative layout and massing for the site which is deemed appropriate by the Council. The former Hatcham Works site is a highly accessible site in a District Centre and is suitable for high-density development. Any proposal that is submitted for planning will be subject to a Transport Assessment which will assess traffic flows.	No change.
The Hatcham Society	3	LNA SA 09	We also back the Telegraph Hill Society's view that at the very least, per capita green space should not be reduced and the Plan's target should be to increase it. This should be a core Lewisham strategy. We already highlighted in our response (paragraph 36) that we believe Hatcham Works is more suited for a new green space and transport interchange (alongside a Primary shopping area) to fulfil the needs of existing residents. The Hatcham Society would like to see existing green spaces such as the gated Bridgehouse Meadows nature conservation area improved and made more accessible.	The former Hatcham Works site is a highly accessible site in a District Centre and is suitable for high-density development. Whilst the site will accommodate open space and amenity space appropriate for a mixed-use town centre development it is not a development requirement to have a large public park. The site is within walking distance to Fordham Park.	No change.

Transport for London	3	LNA SA 09	This provides strong protection for use of the site as a new BLE station, which we welcome. However, the wording should be strengthened to support the use of the site for construction as well. It should also make clear that the site is identified as a worksite for the BLE and is included in the formal safeguarding directions for the scheme. As such, no prejudicial development should occur before the BLE is delivered. This should be reflected in the text and identified development capacity under the different spatial strategy options. The Borough should consider using the draft local plan for safeguarding lands surrounding the site, including that of the existing railway station (New Cross Gate). This site allocation should also require car-free development.	Noted. The Local Plan must accord with the London Plan, which sets out policy on car parking. Parking for any new development will be car free. The Secretary of State has already safeguarded all of thr land required for the construction and delivery of the BLE.	Former Hatcham Works site allocation amended to make reference to no prejudicial development taking place prior to the delivery of the BLE and to a temporary works site.
	3	LNA SA 09	Hatcham Works is simply too small to house the proposed 912 residential units. Without building skyscrapers that would not be in keeping with the area and in particular the adjacent conservation areas of Hatcham and Telegraph hill. Proximity or otherwise of the tall buildings proposed in the LLP on the land currently owned by Sainsbury's does not solve the problem that huge infrastructure in terms of schools and welfare needed to support this huge influx of residents. In an already densely populated area the LLP is planning to raise the number of residents by 912 bringing the equivalent influx of cars and service traffic for that influx into the area. There appears to be no assessment of the environmental effects of these extra residents and their needs in the LLP. Parking There is also the issue that all the extra residents of the Former Hatcham Works would need parking space. As it stands in the present we have commuters driving into zone 2 and taking public transport into the centre of London. There is widespread opposition in the community to imposing controlled parking zones (CPZ) in the area so the extra cars and parking spaces generated by the new (Former) Hatcham Works would inevitably overcrowd the streets of Hatcham Conservation area with cars. Through Traffic in Hatcham Park Conservation Area I am concerned about how the LLP proposes to connect with the Hatcham Conservation Area. The LLP refers to a "positive" relationship to the Former Hatcham Works, suggesting that – 'There should be a positive relationship with the site's western edge, including the junction of Hatcham Park Road, Harts Lane and access into the site.' (15.60 Development guidelines). This is too vague and open to interpretation. It leaves the possibility open to a potential Developer to puncture through into the former Hatcham Works site	The indicative capacity for the former Hatcham Works site was informed by the endorsed New Cross Gate Area Framework. The site is a highly accessible site and suitable for high-density development. Parking for any new development will be car free. Further details on the key design principles for the site can be found in the New Cross Gate area Framework.	No change.

			from the Hatcham Conservation Area. This was vehemently opposed in the consultation for the SPD, which wanted traffic (buses delivery vehicles and cars re entering the Hatcham Estate. This was also proposed by the Sainsbury's and Mount Anvil developments which were met with a huge amount of local opposition, especially with regard to the placing of the waste facilities of the flats and the supermarket opening out into the conservation area. Our area has become safer quieter and infinitely more pleasant place to live and any ingress of traffic to the Conservation Area of Hatcham Park would firstly go against the healthy street ethic that the LLP wishes to champion and secondly be met with huge opposition by the local community who cherish the quiet enclave created by blocking Harts Lane and Nettleton rd which was an initiative backed by councillors and Lewisham council at back in June 2003 as part of the New Deal for Communities (NDC). These through traffic prevention tools should be safeguarded in the LLP and be labelled non negotiable in the LLP.		
	3	LNA SA 9	On a separate matter: when assessing schemes for the Hatcham Works site, please could you make sure that there will be well-lit pedestrian access from New Cross Gate station back into the Brocklehurst Street and John Williams Close residential areas. At the moment, the car park in front of TK Maxx - which everyone walks through to get home - and Harts Lane, are not safe walking routes at night. Harts Lane is always deserted, because it is only overlooked by three or four houses at Brighton Grove end. Ideally could you require a safe lit route across the Hatcham Works site that approximates to the short-cut across the car park to the ramp down to Harts Lane. In the online meeting, someone suggested that the ramp location could be an entry to the future tube station. That would be good.	These matters are picked up in the site allocation and the Council's endorsed New Cross Area Framework.	No change.
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA SA 09 QD 04	For the reasons set out in more detail in our commentary on policy **QD4** (paragraphs 86 to 87) we do not believe the site is suitable for tall buildings and, as set out above, believe it would be more in line with the Borough's Vision for a welcoming borough and its policies on shopping and employment if the area was developed for retail (paragraphs 169 to 171) and for creative employment uses (paragraph 157).	The indicative capacities for the Former Hatcham Works site has been informed by the New Cross Gate Area Framework. This provides an indicative layout and massing for the site which is deemed appropriate by the Council. The former Hatcham Works site is a highly accessible site in a District Centre and is suitable for high-density development.	No change
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA SA 09	In terms of the aspiration and desires of residents for a liveable, welcoming and attractive area (which Lewisham's Vision aspires to) we would again refer you to the survey we carried out when the Sainsbury's/Mount Anvil scheme was put forward, which showed, inter alia:	The indicative capacities for the Former Hatcham Works site has been informed by the New Cross Gate Area Framework. This provides an indicative layout and massing for the site which is deemed appropriate by the Council. The former Hatcham Works site is a highly accessible site in a District Centre and is suitable for high-density development.	No change.

			(a) The development was over-dense and over-tall and the capacity for units should be reduced to no more than 7-10 storeys (b) No development should be built before the Bakerloo line is in place (c) There was insufficient provision for green space (d) There was insufficient provision for affordable homes (e) Any development should commit to funding all provision for sufficient new facilities, not just capital spend (f) No development should be built unless it incorporates adequate car parking (g) Concerns over traffic and "rat-running" (h) Concerns over the heritage impact and (I) Concerns over the impact on existing local communities. The full survey results are given in Appendix 2 to this paper. Issues (b) and (d) are addressed in the proposed Local Plan and there is scope, although involving ambiguity, for the proposed Plan to address some of the other points. It is, however, impossible for the Plan, given the current proposed number of development units, to meet the aspirations and wishes of residents as regards issues (a), (h) or (I). Even discounting a dense development and reverting back to the Council's previous (and more acceptable) plan for 200-300 units, any development is wholly inappropriate given the capacity of the current railway lines through New Cross Gate which, pre COVID-19, led to regular situations where the platforms and carriages were dangerously overcrowded, and given the additional demand which will be placed on the railway system by the Besson Street development (recently approved) and any development on the Goodwood Road site. We reiterate, no substantive redevelopment of the site should be considered before the BLE is constructed.	Whilst the site will accommodate open space and amenity space appropriate for a mixed-use town centre development it is not a development requirement to have a large public park. The site is within walking distance to Fordham Park.	
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA SA 09	The site considerations in the table on **page 603** should include "Deficiency of Open Space" and "Sensitivity to tall towers". We find the lack of the first of these particularly surprising given the deficiency of public space in the North Area (as outlined in Part Two **Section 10** of the Plan and graphically illustrated in **figures 10.2 through 10.6**). We presume this must be an error as it is clearly a key consideration in achieving a healthy borough as set out in the Vision (see our comments at paragraph 27).	Disagree. The Local Plan is a strategic document and the Council needs to carefully consider the level of detail provided for each site allocation. These matters are covered in Part 2 of the Plan which should be read as a whole.	No change.
	3	LNA SA 09	The plans to develop Hatcham Works seem to be exaggerated on the number of units. At 912 units, it would totally contradict the idea of creating spacious green spaces. Creating so many new units in such a small space would also put a huge strain on local infrastructure, i.e. schools and welfare needed to support this huge influx of residents	Lewisham must plan for the growth required to meet its London Plan target of 1,667 new homes per year. Our view is that these homes are best located in areas which have good access to public transport, services and job opportunities. The former Hatcham Works site at the heart of New Cross district centre has excellent public transport accessibility and excellent access to services and jobs. The indicative capacity	No change.

			One other problem that would be created by so many units, would be the problem of extra traffic and parking, created by residents and services needs Height of buildings is also of concern, the area is surrounded by conservation areas (Hatcham Park and Telegraph Hill) Both of which are made up of low buildings. Another concern I have is the threat of opening up Harts Lane and Hatcham Park conservation area to through traffic and access Hatcham Works. This is currently quiet safe residential area that would be hugely disrupted if through traffic was allowed in.	within the Site allocation was drawn from the Council endorsed, New Cross Area Framework which was extensively consulted on. The density proposed is deemed appropriate for the nature and context of the site.	
	3	LNA SA 09	Hatcham Works is simply too small to house the proposed 912 residential units. Without building skyscrapers that would not be in keeping with the area and in particular the adjacent conservation areas of Hatcham and Telegraph hill. Proximity or otherwise of the tall buildings proposed in the LLP on the land currently owned by Sainsbury's does not solve the problem that huge infrastructure in terms of schools and welfare needed to support this huge influx of residents. In an already densely populated area the LLP is planning to raise the number of residents by 912 bringing the equivalent influx of cars and service traffic for that influx into the area. There appears to be no assessment of the environmental effects of these extra residents and their needs in the LLP.	Lewisham must plan for the growth required to meet its London Plan target of 1,667 new homes per year. Our view is that these homes are best located in areas which have good access to public transport, services and job opportunities. The former Hatcham Works site at the heart of New Cross district centre has excellent public transport accessibility and excellent access to services and jobs. The indicative capacity within the Site allocation was drawn from the Council endorsed, New Cross Area Framework which was extensively consulted on. The density proposed is deemed appropriate for the nature and context of the site.	No change.
	3	LNA SA 09	There is also the issue that all the extra residents of the Former Hatcham Works would need parking space. As it stands in the present we have commuters driving into zone 2 and taking public transport into the centre of London. There is widespread opposition in the community to imposing controlled parking zones (CPZ) in the area so the extra cars and parking spaces generated by the new (Former) Hatcham Works would inevitably overcrowd the streets of Hatcham Conservation area with cars.	Given the excellent public transport connections and to be in conformity with London Plan and Local policies any proposal for this site would be car-free and only require the specified disabled car parking.	No change.
	3	LNA SA 09	I am concerned about how the LLP proposes to connect with the Hatcham Conservation Area. The LLP refers to a "positive" relationship to the Former Hatcham Works, suggesting that **– '**There should be a positive relationship with the site's western edge, including the junction of Hatcham Park Road, Harts Lane and access into the site.' (15.60 **Development guidelines).** This is too vague and open to interpretation. It leaves the possibility open to a potential Developer to puncture through into the former Hatcham Works site from the Hatcham Conservation Area. This was vehemently opposed in the consultation for the SPD, which wanted traffic (buses delivery vehicles and cars re-entering the Hatcham Estate. This was also proposed by the Sainsbury's and Mount Anvil developments which were met with a huge amount of local opposition, especially with regard to the placing of the waste facilities of the flats and the supermarket opening out into the conservation area. Our area has become safer quieter and infinitely more pleasant place to live and any	We feel that the wording within the Site allocation, together with other policies within Section 6 Heritage are adequate to ensure development preserves and enhances the Conservation Area.	No change.

			ingress of traffic to the Conservation Area of Hatcham Park would firstly go against the healthy street ethic that the LLP wishes to champion and secondly be met with huge opposition by the local community who cherish the quiet enclave created by blocking Harts Lane and Nettleton rd which was an initiative backed by councillors and Lewisham council at back in June 2003 as part of the New Deal for Communities (NDC). These through traffic prevention tools should be safeguarded in the LLP and be labelled non-negotiable in the LLP.		
	3	LNA SA 09	A strong positive in the plan is the retention of the plan to build a bridge over the railway. This was a huge plus in the design for Hatcham Works and was even included in the Sainsbury's Mount Anvil plan although they described the bridge as an "aspiration" rather than a concrete realization in their plans. Keeping the bridge and the green 'Route 1' cycle and pedestrian route (including the pedestrian bridge) parallel to the New Cross road is an immense plus as part of the LLP and would link New cross Gate to Fordham Park. New Cross Gate chronically lacks green space to the bridge would provide a significant enhancement to the lives of New Cross Gate residents. Crucially would be transformational to the lives of the children in this area their journey to the local school of Deptford Green infinitely more safe and enjoyable. They would be walking safely away from the polluted noisy New Cross Road or the very narrow and dangerous underpass on Cold Blow Lane. The retention of the 'Route 1' bridge in the New LLP is a significant plus for the future of New Cross. There is also the issue that all the extra residents of the Former Hatcham Works would need parking space. As it stands in the present we have commuters driving into zone 2 and taking public transport into the centre of London. There is widespread opposition in the community to imposing controlled parking zones on the area soothe extra cars and parking spaces occupied by new (Former) Hatcham Works would be detrimental to the area.	Supportive comments regarding route 1 are noted. With regard to parking, given the excellent public transport connections and to be in conformity with London Plan and Local policies any proposal for this site would be car-free and only require the specified disabled car parking.	No change.
	3	LNA SA 09	Re: Ex Railway Depot at Hatcham site/New Cross Gate, Lewisham/planning development Dear Sir/Madam With observation of further planning development of the above site which currently accommodates Sainsbury's supermarket - A very minimal showcase of Public notices have been placed upon few posts within the area of Sainsbury's - detailing the prospect of building development works within the Sainsbury's/car park area ONCE AGAIN. My concern with regards to this specific planning application, is that I, amongst my residential neighbours believed Sainsbury's had withdrawn their building application, to build three ugly extremely tall, light blocking 33 storey tower blocks, and reopen closed roads etc., in	The Local Plan consultation was carried out in accordance with our Statement of community Involvement. Much of this response relates to the Sainsbury scheme which has subsequently been withdrawn. The indicative capacities for the Former Hatcham Works site within the Local Pan has been informed by the New Cross Gate Area Framework. This provides an indicative layout and massing for the site which is deemed appropriate by the Council.	No change.

			the SE14 area. It seems to me, that since the Covid 19 Pandemic, Sainsbury's has underhandedly decided to renew and go ahead with their building application, and only place minimal public notices of the fact, and in so doing covering themselves legally, but in fact hoping that the residents who live within the Hatcham Park Conservation area are so Covid 19 exhausted, that they don't either observe the very few public notices, or have the energy to notice or even begin to repeat a fight against this building application again. Is the council able to inform me otherwise, and correct me if my suspicions are wrong? Or am I indeed correct? If so, then this is absolutely disgusting and intolerable, it totally disregards the mental wellbeing of the residents including myself, who live here, and because Hatcham Park residents have already fought against this ugly, noisy, development from happening, believing we had conquered this horrendous most negative prospect. It would then appear, that our human rights and wellbeing is being utterly ignored and yes, disregarded as insignificant. Hatcham Park, and in particular Hatcham Park Road, is an extremely peaceful and quiet area, it has been for approximately 20 years. However, prior to this peaceful time, Hatcham Park Road, was a noisy, dangerous and awful cut through road, which traffic selfishly used to avoid waiting in traffic queues on the A2. The houses shook, and trembled, the noise was horrendous, and frequently residents were unable to cross the road without fearing for their lives, owing to the constant traffic. It drove us all berserk. As a consequence of this, and as a neighbourhood, for our health and mental wellbeing, we petitioned and fought to get these roads (re: Hatcham Park Road, Nettleton Road, Harts Lane) CLOSED to traffic, for the very reasons explained. Is the council expecting us to go back 20 years, and tolerate the reopening of these roads, and be happy about it, because if this is the case, the council is mistaken? If I am correct in my suspicions, it would appear to me that the concept of reopening our peaceful and safe roads is being considered once again. How dare Lewisham council and property developers, disregard our fight for peace and sanity, especially regarding the fact that our neighbourhood succeeded in obtaining road closures for the benefit of our health and safety. I would like an explanation as to why the council and Sainsburys are prepared to act, as though Hatcham Park residents rights as a neighbourhood and in accordance with our past fight to get and achieve road closures don't matter! If building development does go ahead, then council residents such as myself, should be given the opportunity to either have double glazing installed at the front of Hatcham Park Road houses, despite the heritage tag, (heritage and conservation doesn't seem to be applicable in this Sainsbury's development case), or alternatively council residents should be given the option to move somewhere more peaceful - and to where three		

			33 storey ugly, light blocking tower blocks won't darken our days!! I hope to receive a response, that is honest and helpful and shows that residents opinions, health and wellbeing is being seriously considered and looked after. And that nothing will go ahead, without our knowledge and huge concerns being taken into account???		
	3	LNA SA 09	**Re the Hatcham Works Sainsbury's site…..this is the heart of the community made up by Telegraph Hill, Hatcham conservation estate and the traditional New Cross Gate high st.** **Raising the limit of the number of units able to be built on the site from circa 200 to circa 900 is outrageous. It would lead to the creation of another 'dormitory site' like those already blighting the borough, when what is needed is mixed use for shopping and employment, more parkland, and traditional style homes that aesthetically blend with the homes on the high st and in the 2 conservation areas it adjoins** **The height limit is set already by the relative heights around the site – with 4 to 6 floors being the maximum that would fit. (The high density, 4 floor, mansion block flats on New Cross Rd would be the ideal model to replicate to suit and provide the right look and type of large accommodation units which the locality needs.)** **Until and unless the Bakerloo line comes to New Cross Gate, it would be difficult to make a case even for 200 new residential units on the site. Step one MUST be to provide all of the infrastructure (transport and otherwise) for any new development and only after that should new strain be put on the already creaking amenities we have by the building of new homes.** **Any new 'vertical city' on the site would have the effect of gutting our community by creating a ghetto – a kind of gated community in the centre of our local life and a 'no go' area for all of us already living nearby……and would be resisted strongly by everyone I've spoken to locally. We really ask you to PROTECT our Telegraph Hill/ New Cross Gate community by setting lower development levels for the site in the Plan and restricting what can go there in future years, in order to enhance the community and borough rather than weakening the restrictions which could result in us feeling sold out in the future.**	Lewisham must plan for the growth required to meet its London Plan target of 1,667 new homes per year. Our view is that these homes are best located in areas which have good access to public transport, services and job opportunities. The former Hatcham Works site at the heart of New Cross district centre has excellent public transport accessibility and excellent access to services and jobs. The indicative capacity within the Site allocation was drawn from the Council endorsed, New Cross Area Framework which was extensively consulted on. The density proposed is deemed appropriate for the nature and context of the site.	No change.
	3	LNA SA 09	**Re the Hatcham Works Sainsbury's site…..this is the heart of the community made up by Telegraph Hill, Hatcham conservation estate and the traditional New Cross Gate high st.** **Raising the limit of the number of units able to be built on the site from circa 200 to circa 900 is outrageous. It would lead to the creation of another 'dormitory site' like**	Lewisham must plan for the growth required to meet its London Plan target of 1,667 new homes per year. Our view is that these homes are best located in areas which have good access to public transport, services and job opportunities. The former Hatcham Works site at the heart of New Cross district centre has excellent public transport accessibility and excellent access to services and jobs. The indicative capacity	No change.

			those already blighting the borough, when what is needed is mixed use for shopping and employment, more parkland, and traditional style homes that aesthetically blend with the homes on the high st and in the 2 conservation areas it adjoins **The height limit is set already by the relative heights around the site – with 4 to 6 floors being the maximum that would fit. (The high density, 4 floor, mansion block flats on New Cross Rd would be the ideal model to replicate to suit and provide the right look and type of large accommodation units which the locality needs.)** **Until and unless the Bakerloo line comes to New Cross Gate, it would be difficult to make a case even for 200 new residential units on the site. Step one MUST be to provide all of the infrastructure (transport and otherwise) for any new development and only after that should new strain be put on the already creaking amenities we have by the building of new homes.** **Any new 'vertical city' on the site would have the effect of gutting our community by creating a ghetto – a kind of gated community in the centre of our local life and a 'no go' area for all of us already living nearby……and would be resisted strongly by everyone I've spoken to locally. We really ask you to PROTECT our Telegraph Hill/ New Cross Gate community by setting lower development levels for the site in the Plan and restricting what can go there in future years, in order to enhance the community and borough rather than weakening the restrictions which could result in us feeling sold out in the future.**	within the Site allocation was drawn from the Council endorsed, New Cross Area Framework which was extensively consulted on. The density proposed is deemed appropriate for the nature and context of the site.	
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA SA 10	Our objections to densification apply less to this site as the proposed number of units is considerably smaller, although the capacity of the site will depend in part on the development capacity adopted for the Hatcham Works site. A tower on this site would not impact visually on the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area and would impact less on the Hatcham Conservation Area than any tower on the Hatcham Works site.	Any proposal which may come forward with a tall building on the site will be assessed against the tall building policy within the London Plan and Local Plan as well as policies relating to Heritage.	No change.
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LNA SA 10	We consider, however, that this site is especially appropriate for additional retail shopping, moving that shopping from the A2 into a more pedestrian friendly area and the considerations outlined in paragraphs 247 to 253 would also apply this this site. In particular, care needs to be taken that the height of any buildings does not significantly impact on the appearance of the New Cross Road and, in particular, the adjacent Victorian shopping arcade as shown in the illustration accompanying paragraph 130.	The indicative capacities for the site include a substantial amount of town centre floorspace. Any proposal which may come forward with a tall building on the site will be assessed against the tall building policy within the London Plan and Local Plan as well as policies relating to Heritage.	Goodwood Road site allocation amended to minimise impact of tall buildings on New Cross Road
	3	LNA SA 12	Site 12: A new covered market area, all-weather, as a high quality and aesthetically beautiful feature in the area to attract existing and new footfall. To assist in keeping Deptford High Street a viable shopping experience in the later 21st century, after the redevelopment of Convoys Wharf	Too detailed for the Local Plan. We will pass on your suggestion to our Market team.	No change.

	3	LNA SA 12	I have looked on the local plan website and could find no information about the proposed build out of the Albany garden with its '102 residential units' and 'main town centre use floorspace'. At this early stage of your thinking I would like to object in strong terms to the build out on the Albany garden because: a) it will block the light to every space at the back of my property b) it will eliminate a massively important green space, a green lung in the midst of our heavily built up urban area. Please, do not carry this proposal out.	The Albany theatre is identified as a site allocation in the draft Local Plan. The site allocation, which includes the specific requirement to reprovide the theatre use, is intended to secure the long-term future of the Albany. Should a planning application be submitted this will be subject to statutory consultation and you will have the opportunity to share your views on the proposal.	No change.
	3	LNA SA 12	I would like to object in strong terms to the build out on the Albany garden because: a) it will block the light to every space at the back of my property, which would have a detrimental effect to my wellbeing. b) it will eliminate a massively important green space, a green lung in the midst of our heavily built up urban area. Deptford is hugely polluted and we are losing green spaces at a fast rate. The garden is a key space that should be protected	The Albany theatre is identified as a site allocation in the draft Local Plan. The site allocation, which includes the specific requirement to reprovide the theatre use, is intended to secure the long-term future of the Albany. Should a planning application be submitted this will be subject to statutory consultation and you will have the opportunity to share your views on the proposals.	No change.
Deptford Society	3	LNA SA 12	**Page 351/611** It is not clear how the development guidelines for the allocated Albany Theatre site will enhance or improve the existing open space as stated in the green infrastructure proposals. Can a clearer requirement be added to the development guidelines for this site, given that existing green space forms part of the site allocation.	The Albany theatre is identified as a site allocation in the draft Local Plan. The site allocation, which includes the specific requirement to reprovide the theatre use, is intended to secure the long-term future of the Albany. Should a planning application be submitted this will be subject to statutory consultation and you will have the opportunity to share your views on the proposals.	No change.
Deptford Society	3	LNA SA 12	**Page 611** Albany Theatre. Any development of Albany land needs to retain mature trees and safeguard the green space, whilst ensuring the continuity of the historic street market. Development must also protect the enjoyment of public realm on Douglas Way and not create a wind tunnel effect.	Noted	Albany Theatre site allocation amended to include proposals to retain or re-provide the existing green space and mature trees and protect the operational requirements of the street market.
DNA	3	LNA SA 12	Site 12: A new covered market area, all weather, as a high quality and aesthetically beautiful feature in the area to attract existing and new footfall. To assist in keeping Deptford High Street a viable shopping experience in the later 21st century, after the redevelopment of Convoys Wharf. New housing redevelopment needs to be at least 60% to 80% socially rented at Council levels and secured tenancies. At 100% on Council owned land. Refer to DNA housing policies	Market – we will pass your suggestions on to our Market team. The draft Local Policy is for a strategic target of 50% this is has been tested through the SHMA and viability testing.	No change.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LNA SA 13	**Land north of Reginald Road and south of Frankham Street (former Tidemill School);** In addition to LNA.78**,** the Development Requirements need to explicitly acknowledge the Council's own manifesto commitment to providing protected cycle lanes along Deptford Church Street, adjacent to this site as part of the North South Corridors it describes. This route is	Noted	Land north of Reginald Road and south of Franham Street site allocation amended to include requirement to provide cycle lanes along Deptford Church Street.

			of strategic importance and has been identified in the Council's own Transport Strategy.		
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LNA SA 14	**Sun Wharf Mixed-use Employment Location;** The development requirements fail to recognise the council transport strategy to deliver Cycleway 10 (Quietway 1) which runs over Ha'penny hatch bridge as well as Cycleway 35 (Greenwich to Kent House, running along Creekside). The development requirements should include making sure any development does not result in a reduction in existing footway or carriageway space. This should be detailed in the development requirements as part of the public realm strategy and should follow London Cycle Design Standards.	Noted	Sun Wharf MEL site allocation amended to include reference to Cycleway 10 and Cycleway 35. As well as requirement added to ensure new development does not result in a reduction of the existing footway or carriageway space.
Royal Borough of Greenwich	3	LNA SA 14	Sun Wharf: This allocation should make specific reference to the potential for tall buildings to be visible from the World Heritage Site and to impact other heritage assets within Royal Greenwich. For example, the site sits behind the Grade II listed former Greenwich Town Hall and its prominent art deco tower. There is a risk that a tall building on this site could undermine the prominence of that tower when viewed from Greenwich Park and from other locations within the World Heritage Site.	Noted	Sun Wharf MEL site allocation amended to reference World Heritage Site and detrimental impact of the views of heritage assets in Greenwich.
Port of London Authority	3	LNA SA 14 LNA SA 15	**Site 14: Sun Wharf Mixed-use Employment Location & Site 15: Creekside Village East, Thanet Wharf Mixed-Use Employment Location** Welcome reference to the safeguarded Brewery Wharf in the site allocation for site 14. This must also be highlighted under site 15 as well. In addition within the development guidelines section, reference must be given to the need to ensure any proposed development at these sites are designed in such a way to ensure there are no conflicts of use or disturbance, in line with the Agent of Change principle, due to the proximity of the safeguarded Brewery Wharf. Welcome the reference in the allocations on the need to protect and seek to enhance green infrastructure, including the Deptford Creek Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), the intertidal terrace and the sand martin bank at Deptford Creek, and on ensuring the right to navigation is maintained.	Noted	Sun Wharf MEL and Creekside Village East site allocations amended to reference the safeguarded wharf, reducing conflicts of use and disturbance in line with the Agent of Change principle
Royal Borough of Greenwich	3	LNA SA 15	Creekside Village East, Thanet Wharf: The development of the site immediately to the northeast and on the opposite side of Deptford Creek with tall buildings present opportunities for this site to include tall elements that contribute to the creation of a coherent skyline. However, this requires additional guidance, including clarity regarding the site's role in the overall delivery of the skyline. The allocation should clarify that heights on this site should step down from the adjacent tall buildings to respond to the predominantly mid-rise character of the area to the south and west, and to ensure that it does not undermine the setting of the Trinity Laban Centre which, while not a designated heritage asset, has acknowledged architectural value. Consideration should also be given to the impact of tall buildings on this site on views from the World Heritage Site, and to the impact of the cumulative	Noted. The location of specific tall buildings on-site and the impact on the historic parts of the town centre will be considered as part of the Development Management process.	Creekside Village East MEL site allocationamended to reference impacts on the setting and views of grade I listed St Paul's Church, Deptford and the nearby Deptford Creek Conservation Area, Deptford High Street and St Paul's Church Conservation Area, the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site and the Trinity Laban Centre

			development of the area, including the Creekside Village development.		
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LNA SA 16	**Lower Creekside Locally Significant Industrial Site;** Lewisham Cyclists believe public realm improvements at this location should link in to providing better interconnectivity with Deptford high street, enabling active travel by reducing vehicular dominance and providing the mentioned green corridor. This should be stated in the Development Guidelines.	Noted	Lower Creekside LSIS site allocationamended to include reference to public realm improvements
Deptford Society	3	LNA SA 16	**Page 622** Lower Creekside Locally Significant Industrial Site. Land along Theatre Arm at 2 Creekside provides access for Deptford's long-term boat-dwelling community. Any development on this land should seek to protect and sustain this community as one of the important characteristics of the Creekside conservation area.	Noted	Lower Creekside LSIS site allocation amended to reference the need to protect and sustain Lewisham's boat dwelling community.
	3	LNA SA 17	I can see that there is a public consultation relating to the Besson Street Site, which to me is surprising because as far as I was aware a proposal was given planning permission for this site despite resident objections. My full objection is attached, but generally we feel that the proposed development is simply too big especially on the New Cross Road side, it specifically takes virtually 100% of the light from the rear of my house, it doesn't serve the community (the job estimates are wildly optimistic, the doctors surgery is relocating (no new jobs) and the pharmacy is not required (there are 3-4 pharmacies within walking distance and lloyds has just closed down showing that there is not a hugely viable business), the affordable rent is not actually affordable (I work for a bank and to afford these flats you need to be earning around £40k a year)… the list goes on. So all in all I think we can do better. But as I said I thought the site has planning permission so don't really understand the remit of the consultation.	The Local Plan is required to identify Lewisham's pipeline of development sites including those that have permission but have yet to be developed. Besson Street has indeed been granted permission and the site allocation reflects the approved permission.	No change.
Historic England	3	LNA SA 09 LNA SA 13 LNA SA 14 LNA SA 15 LNA SA 16	There are a number of site allocations that are located either in or adjacent to conservation areas, or that may affect the setting of listed buildings. As things stand, it does not appear that there has been any analysis of how the allocations would affect the significance of the relevant heritage assets. Indications of maximum building heights, derived from 3Dmodelling, within the design guidelines for these allocations would help provide clarity as to how to avoid harm to heritage significance. Indeed, the recently adopted London Plan policy D9 B(2) specifies that appropriate building heights should be identified in development plans. Furthermore, specifying such heights would also satisfy the requirements of para 16 of the NPPF that local plan policies should be unambiguous. Historic England has published advice on this issue, which can be found here: The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans (historicengland.org.uk). We consider that allocations 9, 13, 14, 15 and 16 in the North Area should be revisited on this basis.	Noted. Following the Regulation 18 stage public consultation, the Council has undertaken additional assessments of North Area site allocations 9,13,14,15 and 16 using the Historic England guidance. These assessments will be published as part of the evidence base and have been used to inform the Regulation 19 document.	Relevant Local Plan site allocations amended to reflect the additional heritage assessments carried out.

	3	LNA Site Allocations	I would like to draw your attention to a site for possible development, in case of future changes of use to it. It runs along next to the westernmost track into New Cross Gate, from near Surrey Canal Road down to the Cold Blow Lane arches. I have attached here a location plan with the site outlined. You have included this site within a 'locally significant industrial site' (p6 in 'North Jan 2021 LEWISHAM LOCAL PLAN_accessible.pdf'), but it does not appear within any of the 'site allocations' for which you have outline proposals. At the moment it is occupied by a builders' merchant and a skip hire firm. If these firms move away, this site would be an excellent place for some local amenities: shops, cafe, a small supermarket branch, a public garden/square. There are thousands of people on these estates, and no cafe or corner shop that is really handy. This site might also be good for small-scale business and studio spaces, as well retail and leisure. It is the other side of the railway lines to your site allocation #'6 Strategic Industrial Land (SIL) at Surrey Canal Road and Trundleys Road', so it faces a different population of residents, and need no longer be industrial. The area immediately around it has already changed: it is now a low-rise residential area: the area east of the railway is still industrial, but the area to the west is not. Adding in some local amenities there would make a big difference; not doing so would be missing an opportunity to improve the area a great deal. In figure 5.1 in Part 2 of your proposals, you have designated this site as an 'opportunity area' for tall buildings. It should not be. You have also designated it as 'low-sensitivity' on figure 5.2. It is not. Please don't allow any tall or mid-rise/taller buildings there, That would not be appropriate. This site is right next to all the low-rise residential estates behind Mercury Way and John Williams Close, and just outside the Hatcham conservation area. The view to the east is pretty industrial - but it's still a good open view, in a low-rise area. It would be possible to put in two-storey buildings without going over the height of the railway embankment; three if you dig down half a storey. Please don't just let it fill up with more flats either, with no amenities. The 'arches' building there currently might be suitable for a refurb, in a similar way to the brick-industrial buildings at Deptford station.	We are not adding site allocations to the plan at this stage. We will however review the site as part of any Local Plan review in due course.	No change.

			The Millwall crowd walks past this site along Mercury Way, so cafes or a pub with a garden would thrive, There would still have to be a place to park for the hamburger van on match days. I hope these are possibilities for if and only if the site comes up for change of ownership/occupation.		
	3	LSA	The DLLP discusses the importance of the characterisation of the South Area and refers to The Lewisham Characterisation Study (2019) as having been prepared to support the Local Plan. It identifies areas of the Borough where existing character may be reinforced, re-examined or re-imagined, as set out in Figure 3.2. The study provides an indication of opportunities where growth could be accommodated, including the London Plan Opportunity Areas and major centres such as the Bell Green / Lower Sydenham area. Regrettably, significant and important statements and observations in the DLLP are in error and do not accord with events of recent years. As an example, Bellingham Ward assemblies have not been a forum at which the DLLP has been presented or discussed. The DLLP asserts that those forums have been used for that purpose. I am a frequent attender at these assemblies, I recall no such Assembly where consultation on the DLLP took place. Furthermore, I can find no Agenda or Record or Minutes of a Bellingham Assembly on the Council web-site where the DLLP was formally proposed, discussed or debated. My recall is this. There was a truncated and noticeably short presentation by the Sydenham Society of their proposed Master Plan produced in conjunction with Discourse Architecture. Neither the 3 JGD April 2021 Sydenham Society nor our elected Councillors who were present, discussed the presentation in the context of it forming an inclusive or contributory part of the DLLP. The Sydenham Society at this presentation at the Assembly failed to stimulate any interest and gained no contributory response or input from within the Ward for their proposals. A principal reason for this failure was that the Society for the first time was engaging with Ward residents. A signal failure in the processes that Sydenham Society had deployed to develop its proposals and present a set of preliminary plans with objectives “locked-in” as a *fait accompli* without taking the essential step of consulting with any substantial number of Ward residents at any stage in their process, early or otherwise. It cannot be viewed as a satisfactory outcome that, whatever merits the Sydenham Society Master Plan may or may not have encompassed, the entire proposal lacked integrity. An absence brought about principally as a result of the Society’s decision to engage in consultation only	This response seems to be discussing several different studies. The draft Local Plan has been informed by the Characterisation Study 2019. This was prepared by the Council in collaboration and consultation with Neighbourhood Forums, Amenity and Heritage Societies and other community groups on the planning database. It was then subject to public consultation in accordance with our Statement of Community Involvement and open to all to comment. The masterplan for Bell Green and Lower Sydenham prepared by Discourse Architecture for the Sydenham Society is not a council masterplan. The visioning work prepared by the council for Lower Sydenham and Bell Green was paused and has not been endorsed by the Council. Whilst a detailed masterplan is required for the area over the last 2 years the Council has been focused on our COVID response and recovery and has not had the resources or capacity to commit to a detailed masterplan exercise which would have to involve significant technical studies as well as significant public consultation. The Council has recently received a Neighbourhood Area and Forum application for the area. The application is currently open for public consultation. The Local Plan consultation has been carried out in accordance with our Statement of Community Involvement.	No change.

			with a closed group, in the main Sydenham Society members to the exclusion of those who should have enjoyed the greater entitlement to be consulted, namely Bellingham residents. This has left an air of puzzlement within the ward about an entry in the minutes for the last Sustainable Development Select Committee on 14 January 2021, where, when addressing the Bell Green and Lower Sydenham Vision Study, the minute at 5.3 this appears, " were also noted….The importance of the work carried out by the Sydenham Society". Furthermore, as the LPA has asserted in its presentations in webinar format, the formulation of a Master Plan for the Bell Green area, developed through consultations with residents and businesses, with detailed review of characteristics produced in other studies, combined with the needs of having a clear vision for the Bellingham area over the next 20 years, is both a fundamental necessity and is vitally important. Ward residents welcome and look forward to being engaged in such a process, which until now, such opportunity has not been presented. Appropriate public consultation providing opportunity for all parts of the community, residents and businesses, to come together to shape proposals for development and growth of the area must be initiated in accordance with Lewisham policy on the conduct of public consultations . An extract from the LPA's policy has this statement about the conduct of public consultation: *The statement also aims to ensure that local communities know when, how and for what reason a consultation is to happen.* ***The key objectives for consultation on planning matters are:*** *• Consultation should be fit for purpose, meaning that the nature of the matter being considered will influence the type of consultation undertaken. This will be influenced by the resources available and the ability of the community to participate and respond.* 4 JGD April 2021 *• Consultation should commence early in the process to enable the community to influence decisions and to seek consensus on essential issues (wherever possible).* *• Consultation should encourage wide community involvement and participation should be relevant to people's experiences so as to get the community interested and involved.* *• Consultation should be continuous, with opportunities for ongoing involvement.* *• Consultation should be undertaken with clear processes and well understood ground rules. Involvement should also extend beyond those who are familiar with the system, and should extend to hard-to-reach groups.*		

			Scrutiny of these points provide clear indicators that none of these key objectives have been delivered in the consultation processes referred to in the DLLP. Nor were the objectives met during the Sydenham Society's endeavours to produce a Master Plan for Bell Green. During the preparatory phase for this submission a further Master Plan, possibly commissioned by the LPA, titled Bell Green and Lower Sydenham Vision Study came to light. It emerged that this study had been presented for consideration to the Sustainable Develop Select Committee on 14 January 2021 and that Committee resolved that the report be noted. Once more there is no evidence present in the minutes or in the two volumes of the report *that local communities know when, how and for what reason a consultation* or in this case a Study was taking place. This collective non-conformity with the LPA's own policy is of significant concern and the Council is invited to make a clear commitment to correct this position and deliver its principled key objectives in how future consultations are conducted with Bellingham Ward residents. It is desirable to see a shift in emphasis, address content of the DLLP and seek to have some elements of the plan to be more precisely articulated. It should be noted that because of the afore-mentioned errors, it is not possible to make responses that are specifically cross-referenced to the contents of Section 3. There are, however, a number of issues included in this response which are considered key and the LPA is invited to adopt in the DLLP after errors have been corrected and the draft has been reviewed and corrected. It is with a significant quantum of regret that the conclusion is reached that the contents of the Section 3 portions of the report do not reach a level of or accuracy, adequacy or integrity that deems those portions to achieve a level of clarity that is essential to this process. The Council is invited to redraft the sections affected by these errors and re-engage in a fresh consultation stage for this Area with a new timetable, suitably revised.		
	3	LSA	We are very concerned about many of the items in the Vision documents. It would seem that there is a major drive to greatly increase the number of houses/flats in the borough many at the expense of existing retail outlets e.g. Bell Green, Bromley Road Retail Park. Our feedback is don't do this. We suffer badly from low water pressure in our area and having consulted with Thames Water have been informed that a combination of too many properties being fed by an aged infrastructure means that this is very hard to fix. I	Noted. The Local Plan sets out a strategy to deliver Good Growth in line with the London Plan. It must demonstrate how the London Plan housing target for Lewisham of 1,667 per annum will be met. The London Plan provides a clear direction that out-of-centre retail parks should be considered for redevelopment to make a more optimal use of land. Following the Regulation 18 consultation the Council has commissioned a Retail Impact Assessment and Town Centre Trends Study to inform the appropriate scope for a new centre at Bell Green. The plan	Local Plan amended to clarify the position/scope of the proposed new town centre at Bell Green in the town centre hierarchy. Local Plan amended to include a new standalone policy on water supply and wastewater.

			have found nowhere in the vision documents stating how the water/sewage systems will be upgraded to accommodate this major increase in housing. The vision documents have many very positive aspects but seem very aspirational with no identified plan how it will ever be realised. Please can you supply a high level plan including timescales and costings for the vision in our area?	proposals provide for a new mixed-use redevelopment of the existing retail park(s) which would provide for a rationalisation of retail space but still enable a significant amount of commercial/town centre floorspace to be retained/re-purposed. The draft Local Plan includes policies on water management however it is recognised that further details on this could be included in the plan. The Council has consulted Thames Water during the preparation of the Local Plan and on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to ensure this type of infrastructure is appropriately planned for. The Local Plan covers a 20-year period. Where possible the plan sets out indicative timeframes for the delivery of key development sites (i.e. site allocations). The Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sits alongside the Local Plan includes details on the indicative timeframes/costings for the delivery of infrastructure and projects which will support the plan's delivery.	
	3	LSA	Looking at the South Area, I wholly support the general approach and understanding that we are dealing with what is now one of the most deprived areas in the country, where the priorities are for social, economic and environmental improvements, and improved commercial, leisure and community developments, together with vital improvement in transport and opportunities for training and employment. You may notice that I do not mention Housing in this context, not that it is unimportant, particularly in the need to strictly manage the growth in largely inappropriate and unsatisfactory Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs). However the reality is that the Downham Estate is already a vast area of primarily single story housing, built as one of the London Garden Suburbs after the 1st World War to house families from the slums of the East End and Deptford. What is missing in the area is the broad Infrastructure to encourage the area to thrive and emerge from its stigmatised reputation. The most it can absorb in terms of new housing is very 'small build' in character maintaining low height and the established character of the estate. What needs to be remembered is that Downham has actually LOST a large proportion of the infrastructure it used to have, and has often suffered downgrading within corporate replacement. It used to have a huge Cinema, 'The Splendid' on the A 21, a Pleasure Pond with boats and a miniature railway at Peter Pans Pond, the Downham Tavern, one of the largest public houses in the country, a Dance Hall next door, large enough for theatre and music events (both were on the present site of the Co-op, carpark, and the very small, dark and somewhat unappealing present Downham Tavern). There was a large library, a swimming pool, four banks in the Downham Centre, a quality Department Store I am told, plus Council	Noted. The Council has prepared an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) alongside the Local Plan. This sets out the different types of infrastructure, including social infrastructure/community facilities, required to support the levels of growth planned. The IDP has been prepared with input from officers across the Council's service areas, as well as external stakeholders and infrastructure providers. Broadly, the draft Local Plan acknowledges the issues of deprivation in the South Area and the area-based policies set out approaches to address this, including by promoting growth and new development in selected parts of the South Area as a means to generate new investment in this part of the Borough, including for new or enhanced community facilities. Separately, there will be an opportunity to fund community based infrastructure projects through the Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy (NCIL), for which the Council has set in place governance arrangements.	No change.

			Estate staff who looked after public green areas and corners and even helped residents to cut their hedges. To top it off there was a tram running through Downham Way to take early morning workers to the industrial centres along the Thames. A film was made where residents, many of them families who had never had a separate bathroom or hot water or their own toilet, a garden and several bedrooms, called Downham a 'Paradise'. As such I would like to see and hear plans and serious proposals for development of Infrastructure, which I imagine somehow connects with the phrase Public Realm? In essence Downham has lost a range of avenues for leisure, and is also limited by poor public transport, and there seems to be little corporate aim to deal with these issues holistically, to perhaps for instance provide for small live/work spaces for local entrepreneurs, and work towards providing quality sports facilities, lite tennis and football, within the Beckenham Place Park development. Although there is a more interesting and varied retail and business provision, than some have believed within the A21 Centre, including a music centre, a theatrical school, a flower shop, IT facilities, the Undertakers, Pet Shop, as well as food retailers and cafes, (which depend on space for local vehicle deliveries), many local people still primarily depend on their cars to get to larger and cheaper shopping facilities. Measures to mitigate pollution are also welcomed, but improved public transport is part of the corollary of reduction in car journeys, and improving breadth of facility within walking area.		
	3	LSA	It surprises me to hear that the Downham Centre area of the A21 can be made into a 'Healthy Street' as it is a polluting, main and busy arterial road to the South, but I am sure local residents would be more than happy if some of the wide pavements can become subject to attractive street-scaping, planting trees, fitting benches and street furniture, making the area greener and more pleasant to utilise as their neighbourhood. Grants for Improvements to Shop Fronts, would also definitely help, but there needs to be a dedicated budget for improving this area which does not just depend on inappropriate developer contributions. Attractive street-scaping would also improve the environment in the secondary area of the Downham Leisure Centre and Co-op on Moorside, leading into Downham Way.	Noted. The A21 is identified in the Local Plan as a key corridor around which growth and new development will be encouraged. New development can help to deliver and fund improvements to the public realm in accordance with the Healthy Streets principles of the London Plan. Grant funding for shop front improvements is outside the scope of the Local Plan.	No change.
	3	LSA	Then I must come to the 'Elephant in the Room', the fact that this Planning exercise left the question of the Wesley Halls, Downham Community Centre, on Shroffold Road, off the Local Plan Consultation. As a Downham Councillor, I am concerned that this has prevented local residents from making public comment within this Consultation, on the reality that the Council intends to clear the site and allow Phoenix Housing to build flats or homes, with potentially very limited Community Provision. This has apparently been on the cards for some time but only very recently confirmed by the Cabinet Member for Housing and the	As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan. We work with the relevant infrastructure providers to prepare the IDP but are reliant on these departments to provide us with all information required. If this issues are not captured in the IDP then please consult	No change

			Lewisham Mayor. I add to this the observation that an area behind Wesley Halls has actually been derelict for many years and could have had a 'small build' provision constructed on it a long time ago. It is my opinion that Downham is an area that is calling out for and to maintain leisure, community and other Infrastructure, not more infill homes, with no extra provision for daily or evening provision, for the very young, the elderly, for training or employment. Planning has to accept that the Wesley Halls facility has provided for 40 years for inexpensive community provision, for Dance, for Martial Arts, for Choirs, Day Provision for Adults with Special Needs, Adult Education, Pre-school play groups, Community lunches, wedding receptions, birthday parties, Faith Services, outdoor community events, and a performing stage within one of the three large halls. The groups providing all of these activities are quite understandably very anxious about plans which would deprive the area of services they are familiar with and enjoy. The Halls will be reopening when the difficulties of the Pandemic ease with Covid-safe arrangements, and have a short respite to potential closure, but the current position is bound to lead to considerable and justified local controversy.	the individual providers. In this case the community's team. Nevertheless, we have strong policies within the Local Plan to protect community infrastruce – see Policy CI1 Safeguarding and securing community infrastructure	
	3	LSA	You may say that my contribution is not looking at the actual sites mentioned for Downham. My comments are as follows. Most of the sites identified are privately owned and within the Local Plan, there is no indication which businesses would be prepared to come together with the Council for alternative development, and what their position is. Housing development on the Homebase/ Argos Centre could give scope for building homes, but would also remove the one large local hardware centre. Should it not revert to a greener aim of recovering the area of the Peter Pan Pond as a leisure garden and promote river naturalisation, if we are looking at environmental mitigation of the air quality effects of the A21? I think that any attempt to remove MacDonalds could be a cause for a community youth 'riot', and I also have doubts about who would be willing to live in a flat above MacDonalds. The idea of a building 'at height' by Sandpit Road, is completely inappropriate in the Downham Estate, unless it is no more than 4/5 floors, something like the development at the bottom of Whitefoot Lane. Regarding the Co-op on Moorside behind the pub, I and local residents would like to retain this as one of the few quality supermarkets in the area, and of course the Public House, Downham Tavern has to be retained or renewed. Another important area is to improve the 'unadopted' walkway on Old Bromley Road, which presents an ugly and unkempt route to the East side entrance of Beckenham Place Park. This needs to link up clearly with the exit to the Woodland Walk on Oakridge Road as part of a local Downham green corridor.	Noted. The majority of site allocations included in the draft Local Plan are in private ownership. The Council has engaged with and formally consulted landowners through the preparation of the local plan to identify whether the proposals and site allocations are deliverable. Feedback from landowners on the Regulation 18 consultation will be considered as work on the plan progresses. The Local Plan recognises and seeks to enhance the amenity/ecological value of the Peter Pan Pond. This is reflected the relevant site allocation. The Local Plan place principle Policy LSA1 sets out the aspirations and requirements for improving access to Beckenham Place Park. However it will be amended in line with suggestions.	Local Plan amended to identify improved access to Beckenham Place Park at east of Park, as suggested.
	3	LSA	What are local residents worried about, Flytipping and litter is a big one, currently a focus of Councillor and Environmental Group response, poor Transport is another one which needs liaison with Tfl and Aviva locally. Unemployment and Poverty, with many families	Noted. The enforcement of flytipping and other nuisances, such as anti-social behaviour, are outside the scope of the Local Plan. However the plan policies seek to ensure developments are designed to protect and enhance local amenity.	No change.

			still dependent on the Mutual Aid Downham Community Supermarket and Voluntary group support. This is the source of much of our casework, and issues like housing management and neighbour problems. The recovery of the area is a huge ask and the policies to make a difference are not always clear, but whatever Planning can contribute to a better, a greener and more attractive, a less deprived and more prosperous Downham, is welcomed.	The Local Plan broadly seeks to facilitate the delivery of new and improved public transport, and the Council has been liaising with the Mayor of London / Transport for London during the preparation of the Local Plan. The Local Plan identifies the South Area as a Strategic Area for Regeneration. It seeks to coordinate investment and supports targeted responses by a wide range of stakeholders to address deprivation and the social, economic and environmental barriers to opportunities experienced by communities in this area.	
Downham Dividend Society	3	LSA	5. The **participation of the local community** in prioritising the challenges Downham faces and developing solutions. Downham has been in poverty for 100 years, consultation has failed to shift the poverty and inequality. We want to recognise and strengthen the local expertise of people who live in Downham. This means local people will be trained and then paid as researchers in mapping community needs. Lewisham Pathways and Downham Dividend Society (CLT) have already developed pilot projects which are ready to be implemented. 6. Rewarding volunteering and the building of the social capital of Downham. The local Lewisham card is not used widely enough in Downham it provides an excellent infrastructure to reward the voluntary activity we wish to incentivise. In addition Downham RSL's could be encouraged to adopt the best practices of other RSL's where tenants get rent holidays or even a small slice of ownership for long term voluntary contribution to the social capital of Downham. (The Downham Dividend). Similarly if the local people are seen as assets increasing access to services through expansion of Local Lewisham card.	Noted. The Local Plan is being prepared in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan identifies the South Area, which includes Downham, as a Strategic Area for Regeneration. It seeks to coordinate investment and supports targeted responses by a wide range of stakeholders to address deprivation and the social, economic and environmental barriers to opportunities experienced by communities in this area. The use of the Lewisham Local Card is outside the scope of the Local Plan.	No change.
Downham Dividend Society	3	LSA	7. **Local employment and business strategy**. We are seeking an employment strategy that works for Downham i.e. it must set specific targets for local to Downham. E.g. Phoenix RSL builds housing in Downham but their definition of local is London wide. To date to the best of my knowledge they have failed to employ a single person from their own building training programmes on their housing schemes. We want to set a benchmark target e.g. of 20% Downham based employment (with higher target for Lewisham residents). This will expose all the barriers that hinder local people getting the work in Downham. Then we will devise tailor made solutions. The target for local employment should be increased year on year. 8. The Council recently let a contract to build a fence around the White Foot lane sports field. Once again Lewisham failed to contract with any Lewisham based business, let alone Downham based. The firm came from Sidcup. The Council has significant spending power, as	Noted. The evidence base studies indicate that Lewisham has one of London's smallest local economies. The Local Plan therefore sets out a strategy to support economic development and grow the local business base, along with providing more job opportunities for local residents and communities. Further details are included Part 2 on Economy and Culture. The Local Plan cannot prescribe that jobs/employment opportunities within Lewisham must be reserved for local residents. However, the draft local plan does seek to ensure that new major developments make provision for job and employment training opportunities, particularly during the construction phase, which may be secured by way of planning conditions or legal agreements.	No change.

			recognised in your community wealth building policy, we want it to work for Downham.	Contract tendering is outside the scope of the Local Plan.	
Downham Dividend Society	3	LSA	9. **Downham Love**- Valuing and Celebrating the Diverse communities of Downham. This includes the white working class communities of Downham, members of whom feel their history and culture has not been valued. Downham was built by working class people. There was a very strong community spirit in the 60's and 70's. However it wasn't welcoming to us newcomers. We need to undercut those who will seek to create divisions within our communities by honouring our past histories and creating a shared vision of the future we want for our children.	Noted. The Local Plan recognises Lewisham's diversity. It supports inclusive and mixed communities which is reflected in the plan's strategic objectives.	No change.
Downham Dividend Society	3	LSA	10. **Health, Sport and Well being** - we aim to build a long term alliance with the health sector to meet the physical, emotional and spiritual needs of the community. The Downham Nutrition Partnership, Downham and Catford Health Through Sport Alliance, Downham Forest School alliance are all examples of partnership working with Downham based anchor organisations.	Noted. The Local Plan broadly supports and seeks to improve the health and well-being of the population. This is set out in the plan's strategic objectives and covered in a number of policy topic areas. The Council welcomes, and where possible will support, partnership working by local community organisations.	No change.
Downham Dividend Society	3	LSA	11 A sustainable strategy for the **stewardship of the outstanding natural assets** of the area. There has been gross underinvestment in the assets that were bequeathed to the people of Downham. Examples of Coin Street https://coinstreet.org/ and Westway Trust https://www.westway.org/ and TenemBee here in Downham demonstrates the additional level of resources that can be secured to contribute to the community wealth building agenda when communities participate in the regeneration of the areas they call home. 12. We need to get the Council to adopt an asset based approach to both the regeneration of its green spaces and to the people of Downham Such an approach would use the appreciation in the value of the land to fund services and improvements in the green assets of the area. With so much open space Downham could become a model sustainable village as all new housing could be heated by ground source heat pumps and other sustainable sources. This would provide resources for the upkeep of the green spaces as energy could be sold back to the grid.	Noted. The Local Plan includes a refreshed suite of policies on green infrastructure, which provide a basis for their continued protection and enhancement. Development contributions, whether through CIL or S106, can be used to support enhancements to local green and open spaces. The Council has prepared a Parks and Open Spaces strategy to set priorities in this respect. Part 2 of the Local Plan on Sustainable Design and Infrastructure promotes a transition to more sustainable energy sources. It supports the development of decentralised energy network across the Borough. However, the Council's latest Energy Masterplan indicates that there is more limited scope for DE network development in the Downham area compared to other parts of the Borough.	No change.
Downham Dividend Society	3	LSA	13. Recent impacts we want to prevent: • The outstandingly successful £6m regen of Beckenham Place Park all took place on the 'posh side' of the Park with the 'free' swimming costing £5.50 an hour. Such pricing excludes most Downham residents. Affordable access could be provided through the Lewisham Local card to those willing to volunteer e.g. at the local social supermarket so for every 50 paying we have 10 local Lewisham card but it used to build the social capital of Downham • Also the Eastern extension plan for the park has 10 objectives which don't even mention building links with the Downham community. It could be in Hyde Park!	Noted. The specific arrangements around the management and pricing leisure facilities, including parks and open spaces, are generally outside the scope of the Local Plan. However the draft plan does make clear that where new dedicated open and play space provision is included as part of a housing scheme, this should be designed to be inclusive to all and made free to use. The Local Plan has been informed by an Integrated Impact Assessment which includes an Equalities Impacts Assessment. The Council considers that it is meeting is obligations under the Equalities Act through this process.	No change.

			• Lewisham they have brought in a non- Downham based black organisaton to provide football on the Whitefoot Lane sports field which charges £30 / month for football or £5 for 45mins for under 8's per child which excludes most of Downham. Ten Em Bee a well established black organisation rooted in Downham cross subsidises its provision through the use of its land and charges £20/ month including kit. • Similarly a New Cross based organisation was allocated the only 'community plot in the Oldstead allotments and brought in an outside black organisation to 'teach Downham black people how to grow food' We have 3 black-led organisations in Downham already doing this work. It is counterproductive and disrespectful of our struggles for officers based in Catford to carry on such practices. **Key reports**: Race and Health Inequalities: http://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/about-our-work/latest-updates-from-the-institute/build-back-fairer The local plan needs to be aligned with community wealth building approach: https://www.cumberlandlodge.ac.uk/read-watch-listen/resilient-communities-cumberland-lodge-report-july-2020 which has been adopted by Lewisham Council.		
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LSA Figure 17.2	FIgure 17.2, the map shown has a number of errors, including missing alignment for the Ringway corridor. This should be amended.	The plan has been revised to include a figure that incooperates the strategic green links and cycle infrastructure.	'Lewisham Links' maps added to each sub-area.
Sydenham Society	3	LSA	**17 LEWISHAM'S SOUTH AREA** (p673) **The Sydenham Society supports the following comments made by Discourse Architecture in their recent submission, as reproduced here.**	Noted. Responses to additional representations set out elsewhere in this Consultation Statement.	No change.
Sydenham Society	3	LSA LSA SA 01, LSA SA 02 LSA SA 03 LSA SA 04 LSA SA 05	**Lewisham's South Area PART 3 – Site Allocations** (p699) *Comments on Sites 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 are given together:* *1 Former Bell Green Gas Holders* *2 Bell Green Retail Park* *3 Sainsbury's Bell Green* *4 Stanton Square Locally Significant Industrial Site* *5 Sydenham Green Group Practice* **Comment** We strongly agree that proposals for the above sites should be made within the context of a Council-led master plan informed by the framework of proposals initiated by Discourse Architecture and the Sydenham Society. Our own community consultation at public meetings organised by the Sydenham Society (Railway Tavern 06.03.19 & Livesey Memorial Hall 12.09.19) identified a number of key areas of concern to local people that are not adequately addressed in the draft Local Plan:	Support for master-plan led approach noted. The Council acknowledges the strong local interest in a masterplan for the area and work undertaken by the community to support this. The Council will continue to take a lead role on the preparation of a masterplan to support the delivery of the Local Plan, working with and consulting a range of stakeholders including the local community and landowners. Part 4 of the Local Plan deals with delivery and monitoring. Policy DM 3 (Masterplans and comprehensive development) and provides the strategic approach for phasing and delivery of large sites. The Council will continue to work with and lobby Transport for London to improve bus services	Bell Green Retail Park and Sainsburys Bell Green Site allocations amended to reference options for the provision of a new railway station

			• The need for immediate action to improve the services and amenity in the area. There is frustration that proposals planned for the very long term may never happen and an appetite for modestly scaled interventions in the short and medium term, for example, to improve pedestrian crossings, and reduce the dominance of roads and associated air pollution. Proposals for Bell Green should recognise and facilitate the probability of incremental development as sites become available at different times. • Poor bus connectivity, particularly east-west along Southend Lane is a major complaint. We therefore argue that provision of a bus station with potential future inter-modal connections to the station for rail or Bakerloo Line services should form an integral component of the site redevelopment. • Redevelopment should not result in the loss of the hub of conveniently located retail units. It should be made clear that intensification and mixed-use redevelopment need not involve the loss of retail, but will allow the introduction of additional uses to the site We believe that the Local Plan brief for new development at Bell Green can be successfully achieved with a layout based on established urban precedents for street-based architecture. The urban model of towers and slabs with poorly characterised spaces between, that has been adopted at Deptford and Lewisham town centres, should be replaced by a more regulated approach that is focussed on creating a positive public realm and spaces between buildings**.** The enhancement of the Waterlink Way should be bolder and incorporate a new east-west branch connecting to Perry Hill. Para 17.30 • *Development must not result in a net loss of industrial capacity, or compromise the functional integrity of the employment location, in line with Policy EC 5 (Locally Significant Industrial Sites).* We support the retention of employment uses at Bell Green, but question whether the Stanton Square Locally Significant Industrial Site is an appropriate location for industrial activities, particularly the current low-intensity uses, which include a personal storage warehouse and a scaffold yard. We suggest that these activities will be a poor use of a site in close proximity to dense mixed uses and well-served by public transport. Instead, the employment emphasis at Bell Green could be related to retail, commercial, health, education, and hotel uses,	throughout the Borough, and particularly where these are needed to support levels of growth planned. The Local Plan proposals for the redevelopment of the Bell Green are likely to result in a loss of an element of existing retail floorspace. This approach is supported by the latest Retail Impact Assessment and Town Centre Trends Study, which indicates a diminishing need for retail floorspace over the long term. However, the local plan is proposing a mixed-use redevelopment a new centre within Bell Green which will provide for retail as well as a wider mix of main town centre uses. The designation and safeguarding of Stanton Square as an LSIS is supported by the Council's Employment Land Study. The local plan seeks to enable the redevelopment of this site for a wider range of uses whilst ensuring no net loss of industrial capacity. This will complement the proposals for regeneration on other sites in this area, led by the masterplan. The Local Plan supports a transition to carbon neutrality. As part of this, the delivery of a decentralised energy network is identified in the South Area key spatial objectives. Its feasibility is demonstrated by the Council's latest Energy Masterplan. The Part 2 policies on Sustainable Design and Energy support this approach. Bell Green Retail Park and Sainsbury's Bell Green site allocations already incude a requirement for improved east-west links from/to Waterlink Way.	

			combined with smaller-scale residential related uses, recognising the emerging prevalence of live-work arrangements. An appropriate response to this economic trend would be to design residential units adapted to facilitate the growth in home working, whether remote office working or smaller home-based businesses. These could range from provision of rooms or spaces within residential units that could be used as home offices, to residential units with street access to integral retail or workshop accommodation . Finally, we would argue that the aspiration to build a sustainable future should be much bolder, making Bell Green a zero-carbon development.		
Discourse Architecture	3	LSA Para 17.10	The preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document and/or Masterplan by the Council is supported, provided that the development of the masterplan involves community consultation and that the final version of the masterplan reflects community views. Para 17.10 (p696) *'…However, the level of this growth will be contingent on the delivery of strategic infrastructure necessary to support both new developments and existing neighbourhoods. This includes transport infrastructure and particularly the Bakerloo line extension…'* We do not accept that redevelopment of the area should be contingent on the Bakerloo Line extension proceeding, or even the relocation of Lower Sydenham Station to Bell Green, although we have no doubt that these would act as powerful catalysts for regeneration. We agree that the lack of access to public transport is a major contributor to local deprivation, and that sites required for critical transport infrastructure should be protected to allow future construction. The need to tackle poor amenity at Bell Green is urgent and early interventions to improve the neighbourhood, even if modest, should proceed as a priority in parallel with efforts to improve the transport infrastructure.	The Council acknowledges the strong local interest in a masterplan for the area and work undertaken by the community to support this. The Council will continue to take a lead role on the preparation of a masterplan to support the delivery of the Local Plan, working with and consulting a range of stakeholders including the local community and landowners. The Regulation 18 Local Plan document set out several spatial strategy options, recognising that some or all phases of the BLE may not be delivered in the plan period (including for reasons of funding). The preferred approach for the spatial strategy is therefore not dependent on the BLE. However the spatial strategy and the Local Plan policies aim to facilitate the delivery of the BLE, and provide flexibility to respond to it. This includes provision for an uplift in site development capacities enabled by the BLE through higher public transport access levels, particularly in the Bell Green and Lower Sydenham area – this is signposted in the plan but it is acknowledged this could be made clearer.	Local Plan amended to clarify Council's commitment to enabling the delivery of the BLE, whilst ensuring the plan is deliverable in the absence of the BLE.
	3	LSA	1) Could you inform me as to where I will be able to do my weekly food shop, not day to day shopping? I currently use Savacentre at Bell Green and Lidl on Southend lane. 2) Where will Sydenham Green Group Practice be resited?	The Local Plan proposals for Bell Green seek to enable the redevelopment the existing out of centre retail parks to deliver a new mixed-use neighbourhood. This will continue to allow for the provision of a significant amount of retail floorspace in the area, including new or re-purposed groceries or supermarkets. Elsewhere, existing district town centres and local centres will be supported for a range of main town centre uses. The site allocation for Sydenham Green Group Practice will enable the facility to be reprovided at the current site as part of a new mixed-use development. Any proposal for off-site reprovision would only be considered where other Local Plan policies on community infrastructure are satisfied.	No change.

Discourse Architecture	3	LSA LSA SA 01 LSA SA 02 LSA SA 03 LSA SA 04 LSA SA 05	***Lewisham's South Area*** *(p696)* ***Lewisham's South Area PART 3 – Site Allocations*** *(p699)* *Comments on Sites 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 are given together:* *1 Former Bell Green Gas Holders* *2 Bell Green Retail Park* *3 Sainsbury's Bell Green* *4 Stanton Square Locally Significant Industrial Site* *5 Sydenham Green Group Practice* **Comment** We strongly agree that proposals for the above sites should be made within the context of a Council-led master plan informed by the framework of proposals initiated by Discourse Architecture and the Sydenham Society. We have engaged in initial consultation with the Council and 'We Made That' on their proposals for the site and will issue our formal comment on these under separate cover. Our own community consultation at public meetings organized by the Sydenham Society (Railway Tavern 06.03.19 & Livesey Memorial Hall 12.09.19) identified a number of key areas of concern to local people that are not adequately addressed in the draft Local Plan: • The need for immediate action to improve the services and amenity in the area. There is frustration that proposals planned for the very long term may never happen and an appetite for modestly scaled interventions in the short and medium term, for example, to improve pedestrian crossings, and reduce the dominance of roads and associated air pollution. Proposals for Bell Green should recognize and facilitate the probability of incremental development as sites become available at different times. • Poor bus connectivity, particularly east-west along Southend Lane is a major complaint. We therefore argue that provision of a bus station with potential future inter-modal connections to the station for rail or Bakerloo Line services should form an integral component of the site redevelopment. • Redevelopment should not result in the loss of the hub of conveniently located retail units. It should be made clear that densification and mixed-use redevelopment need not involve the loss of retail, but will allow the introduction of additional uses to the site	Support for master-plan led approach noted. The Council acknowledges the strong local interest in a masterplan for the area and work undertaken by the community to support this. The Council will continue to take a lead role on the preparation of a masterplan to support the delivery of the Local Plan, working with and consulting a range of stakeholders including the local community and landowners. Part 4 of the Local Plan deals with delivery and monitoring. Policy DM 3 (Masterplans and comprehensive development) and provides the strategic approach for phasing and delivery of large sites. The Council will continue to work with and lobby Transport for London to improve bus services throughout the Borough, and particularly where these are needed to support levels of growth planned. The Local Plan proposals for the redevelopment of the Bell Green are likely to result in a loss of an element of existing retail floorspace. This approach is supported by the latest Retail Impact Assessment and Town Centre Trends Study, which indicates a diminishing need for retail floorspace over the long term. However, the local plan is proposing a mixed-use redevelopment a new centre within Bell Green which will provide for retail as well as a wider mix of main town centre uses. The designation and safeguarding of Stanton Square as an LSIS is supported by the Council's Employment Land Study. The local plan seeks to enable the redevelopment of this site for a wider range of uses whilst ensuring no net loss of industrial capacity. This will complement the proposals for regeneration on other sites in this area, led by the masterplan. The Local Plan supports a transition to carbon neutrality. As part of this, the delivery of a decentralised energy network is identified in the South Area key spatial objectives. Its feasibility is demonstrated by the Council's latest Energy Masterplan. The Part 2 policies on Sustainable Design and Energy support this approach. Bell Green Retail Park and Sainsbury's Bell Green site allocations already incude a requirement for improved east-west links from/to Waterlink Way.	Bell Green Retail Park and Sainsburys Bell Green Site allocations amended to reference options for the provision of a new railway station

			We believe that the Local Plan brief for new development at Bell Green can be successfully achieved with a layout based on established urban precedents for street-based architecture. The urban model of towers and slabs with poorly characterized spaces between, that has been adopted at Deptford and Lewisham town centre, should be replaced by a more regulated approach that is focussed on creating a positive public realm and spaces between buildings**.** The enhancement of the Waterlink Way should be bolder and incorporate a new east-west branch connecting to Perry Hill. Para 17.30 • *Development must not result in a net loss of industrial capacity, or compromise the functional integrity of the employment location, in line with Policy EC 5 (Locally Significant Industrial Sites).* We support the retention of employment uses at Bell Green, but question whether the Stanton Square Locally Significant Industrial Site is an appropriate location for industrial activities, particularly the current low-intensity uses, which include a personal storage warehouse and a scaffold yard. We suggest that these activities will be a poor use of a site in close proximity to dense mixed uses and well-served by public transport. Instead, the employment emphasis at Bell Green could be related to retail, commercial, health, education, and hotel uses, combined with smaller-scale residential related uses, recognizing the emerging prevalence of live-work arrangements. An appropriate response to this economic trend would be to design residential units adapted to facilitate the growth in home working, whether remote office working or smaller home-based businesses. These could range from provision of rooms or spaces within residential units that could be used as home offices, to residential units with street access to integral retail or workshop accommodation. Finally, we would argue that the aspiration to build a sustainable future should be much bolder, making Bell Green a zero-carbon development.		
	3	LSA Key spatial objectives	The absence of certainty on lead times and delivery timetables highlight an observable over-reliance on delivery of Phase 2 within the DLLP which the Council must necessarily re-assess.	The Regulation 18 Local Plan document set out several spatial strategy options, recognising that some or all phases of the BLE may not be delivered in the plan period (including for reasons of funding). The preferred approach for the spatial strategy is therefore not dependent on the BLE. However the spatial strategy and the Local Plan policies aim to facilitate the delivery of the BLE, and provide flexibility to respond to it. This includes provision for an uplift in site development capacities enabled by the BLE through higher public transport access levels, particularly in the Bell Green and Lower Sydenham	Local Plan amended to clarify Council's commitment to enabling the delivery of the BLE, whilst ensuring the plan is deliverable in the absence of the BLE.

				area – this is signposted in the plan but it is acknowledged this could be made clearer.	
	3	LSA Key spatial objectives	As an example, to set Objective 1 as the highest priority could be viewed as an unnecessary constraint on delivery of other objectives and factors that would deliver better results on the short and medium term for Bell Green.	The key spatial objectives are listed by number but this is not a reflection of their priority.	Local Plan amended to make clear that the key spatial objectives for thes sub-areas are not listed in order of priority
	3	LSA Key spatial objectives	An example of an unnecessary deferral would be the delivery of a widened and heightened bridge with improvements to pedestrian safety measures on Southend Lane. To defer those works because it has insufficient priority or it may have a design conflict with any new or relocated station on Southend Lane could not be deemed acceptable by a body of Ward residents who have waited for bridge improvement works to be delivered for 25+ years. A contribution of s106 monies that the Council has now acknowledged in writing is unspent and is being held in the Council's account would beneficially assist in direct negotiations with Network Rail over the contributory costs of renewing the bridge. The final value of these s106 monies has not been yet established by the Council, after a further year-plus delay because of the pandemic. Last correspondence confirmed it was in the order of £2.4m.	The council recognises the potential need for the widening and increase in height at Southend Lane bridge. Whilst high level feasibility studies have been prepared in the past no detailed design work has been undertaken. The Council will work with Network Rail to explore options. This is likely to come forward as part of the BLE and/or the comprehensive redevelopment of Lower Sydenham and Bell Green.	Local Plan amended to include reference to Southend Lane bridge in the LSA1 place principles.
	3	LSA Key spatial objectives	The Council is invited to acknowledge that a thorough re-examination of priorities, across short, medium and long term objectives will constitute a major confidence building exercise for a community in a geographic location where progress is observably minimal.	Noted. The Local Plan covers a 20-year period. Where possible the plan sets out indicative timeframes for the delivery of key development sites (i.e. site allocations). The Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sits alongside the Local Plan includes details on the timeframes for the delivery of infrastructure and projects which will support the plan's delivery.	No change.
	3	LSA Key spatial objectives	Engagement by the community in consultations leading to development of a Master Plan requires a restoration of confidence in that same community that their efforts and contributions are valued.	Noted. The Local Plan is being prepared in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. The Council has and will continue to engage with the local community and community groups on planning matters, including any Council-led masterplans.	No change.
	3	LSA Key spatial objectives	The arrival of BLE would improve transport accessibility and thereby enhance the attractiveness of development in the area. Plans, though, for options that include relocation or addition of a station closer to Bell Green is far from providing certainty in terms its deliverability. At the point in the timeframe for the DLLP consultation, funding for BLE Phase 1 has just been approved. Firm delivery timetables for Phase 1 remain uncertain. Approvals in principle for Phase 2 are not secure nor is funding and thereby deliverability for Phase 2 cannot be forecast with any level of confidence beyond the 50% range.	Noted. The Council acknowledges that whilst the BLE has been included in the London Plan as a key transport project, funding to secure its delivery has not yet been secured. The Regulation 18 Local Plan document set out several spatial strategy options, recognising that some or all phases of the BLE may not be delivered in the plan period (including for reasons of funding). The preferred approach for the spatial strategy is therefore not dependent on the BLE. However the spatial strategy and the Local Plan policies aim to facilitate the delivery of the BLE, and provide flexibility to respond to it.	No change.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LSA Key spatial objectives	Page 676 Key Spatial Objective 6 in the main document refers to "Transform the Ringway corridor (Southend Lane and Whitefoot Lane) and the A21 corridor (Bromley Road) into 'healthy streets'". We would suggest the wording of this is altered to "adopt the healthy streets approach along the Ringway corridor (Southend Lane and Whitefoot Lane) and the A21 corridor (Bromley Road)" and encourage the planning team to follow TfL guidance on this which is clear and unequivocal. This should also form part of the strategic	Noted. The draft Local Plan is clear that the Healthy Streets approach will be applied in line with the London Plan. Further details are set out in Part 2 Transport and Connectivity policies.	Local Plan amended to clarify objectives for transforming strategic corridors using the Healthy Streets Approach (rather than transforming corridors into Healthy Streets).

			planning document for the whole corridor, and form conditions of planning along the corridor, including CIL contributions to part fund improvements.		
Sydenham Society	3	LSA Key spatial objectives	**Key Spatial Objectives** (p678) **Comment:** These are supported	Support noted.	No change.
Discourse Architecture	3	LSA Key spatial objectives	Discourse Architecture prepared the 'Bell Green Urban Renewal' masterplan for Bell Green/Lower Sydenham in consultation with the Sydenham Society in 2019 17 LEWISHAM'S SOUTH AREA (p673) Key Spatial Objectives (p678) Comment: These are supported	Support noted.	No change.
London Wildlife Trust	3	LSA 01	We support these principles, especially in respect of Parts K and L.	Support noted.	No change.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LSA 01	Lewisham Cyclists also believe Downham way should also provide additional protected cycle lanes to connect the Downham Estate, and area with lower PTAL, to both Local Centres in Grove Park as well as A21 Bromley Road and Beckenham Place Park. This should be included in LSA1 sections G and I.	Noted	Local Plan amended by referencing cycle lanes within site allocations
Sydenham Society	3	LSA 01	**LSA1 South Area Place Principles** (p681) **Comment:** These are supported **Item M** (p683) Transport infrastructure improvements: Provision of a new bus station, with intermodal connections to the train or Bakerloo Line, should be added as item c. to a. Bakerloo Line Extension, and b. Junction improvements	Support noted.	Site allocations amended to reference potential requirement for new station.
Discourse Architecture	3	LSA 01	LSA1 South Area Place Principles (p681) Comment: These are supported	Support noted.	No change.
	3	LSA 02	The content of Lewisham Local Plan's content relating to the public realm is welcome. It is felt essential that the bridge at Southend Lane is rebuilt with a design that both widens it and permits the doubling of the width of the carriageway and increase its height to permit the flow and use of double-deck buses along Southend Lane and provides safe footpaths on both sides of the roadway. It is considered pivotal and necessary to improve traffic flow and pedestrian safety measure combined with an opportunity to improve the sense of arrival to the area. The walking and cycle environment can be compromised along with the necessary passing widths for wheelchairs and prams in case of poor placement of street furniture such as electric vehicle charging infrastructure.	The council recognises the potential need for the widening and increase in height at Southend Lane bridge. Whilst high level feasibility studies have been prepared in the past no detailed design work has been undertaken. The Council will work with Network Rail to explore options. This is likely to come forward as part of the BLE and/or the comprehensive redevelopment of Lower Sydenham and Bell Green.	Site allocation amended to include reference to Southend Lane bridge.

			In keeping with the LPA's Good Public Space Design principles, measures to ensure that public footpaths and cycleways in the area are improved upon, particularly with the introduction of good quality design for peninsula bays for charging points that avoid the placement of charging points on footpaths, are welcome. Similarly, consideration should be given to improvements of the layout and configuration of all pedestrian crossings in the Bell Green retail area.		
Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	3	LSA 02	This policy doesn't elaborate on the Grove Park neighbourhood part, therefore even more reason to ensure that policy LEA3 – Strategic Area for Regeneration, Grove Park, is further elaborated, taking elements from the neighbourhood plan.	Policy LEA3 (Strategic Area for Regeneration, Grove Park) cross-references Policy LSA2. This is considered an appropriate response to capturing the policy which covers parts of two of the plan's 'character areas'.	No change.
Sydenham Society	3	LSA 02	**LSA2 Strategic Area for Redevelopment** (p685) Item C Transport infrastructure: add bus station with intermodal connections to rail or tube lines	Noted	Former Bell Green Gas Holders and Livesey Memorial Hall, Bell Green Retail Park and Sainsbury's Bell Green site allocations amended to reference increased bus services and/or potential requirement for new station.
Discourse Architecture	3	LSA 02	Item M (p683) Transport infrastructure improvements: Provision of a new bus station, with intermodal connections to the train or Bakerloo Line, should be added as item c. to a. Bakerloo Line Extension, and b. Junction improvements LSA2 Strategic Area for Redevelopment (p685) Item C Transport infrastructure: add bus station with internodal connections to rail or tube lines	Noted	Former Bell Green Gas Holders and Livesey Memorial Hall, Bell Green Retail Park and Sainsbury's Bell Green sSite allocations amended to reference increased bus services and/or potential requirement for new station.
Transport for London	3	LSA 02	LSA3 Bell Green and Lower Sydenham 2 Bell Green Retail Park 3 Sainsbury's Bell Green The policy states in part C that land will be safeguarded for the BLE to Hayes. However, it should make clear that this is not part of the formal safeguarding for the BLE. It is also unclear what safeguarding will entail for this site/area as the BLE option beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction is only in the early design phase. TfL welcomes further dialogue on the matter so the local plan can provide greater clarity in future editions, and can be prepared with the consideration of infrastructure requirements.	Noted.	Local Plan amended as suggested, to provide clarity on safeguarding and route options for BLE.
London Wildlife Trust	3	LSA 03	We support this policy in respect of Part D)e.	Support noted.	No change.
	3	LSA 03	There could feasibly be an opportunity to extend the Linear Park into one or both of the larger development sites, and it is recommended that this option is explored, with a view to an overall biodiversity net gain, as	Noted. Bell Green Retail Park – noted.	Pool Court site allocation amended by referring to biodiversity.

			measured/calculated at an appropriate functional scale. Extending the Linear Park would also be in line with open space objectives, noting the key finding of the Lewisham Open Spaces Assessment (2019), which is that a significant amount of additional provision will be required to maintain standards (of access to open space) over the long-term. However, it is recognised that there is a need to balance wide ranging objectives when considering how best to redevelop these sites. I support the expansion of the Linear Park. Site specific policy currently states: • Bell Green Retail Park – "Development proposals must protect and seek to enhance green infrastructure, including SINC, green corridor, Metropolitan Open Land and the Pool River." • Wickes and Halfords, Catford Road – "Development should maximise opportunities to enhance the ecological quality and amenity provided by the River Ravensbourne, including by revealing the river through decluverting, repairing gaps in Waterlink Way and improving public access to it." This site specific policy is broadly in accordance with the Site Specific Design and Development Guidelines set for Wickes and Halfords, Catford Road within the adopted River Corridor Improvement Plan SPD (2015). Figure 9.1 shows one of the figures from the SPD, showing the location of the Pool River Linear Park between BGLS and Catford, also highlighting proximity of Beckenham Palace Park. • Pool Court – the site specific policy does not reference biodiversity constraints or opportunities; however, it explains: "Applicants should consult with Network Rail and Transport for London on design and development options." I would like to see the biodiversity and green space commitments explicitly included in this Local Plan and at the sites mentioned above. In Bell Green, a community masterplanning approach should be undertaken and the proposals as they stand are unacceptable. The heritage assets of the Livesey Hall, War Memorial and Grounds needs to be fully recognised in any plan for Bell Green.	Wickes and Halfords – The site allocation policy has been informed by the River Corridor Improvement Plan, which development proposals will also need to have regard to. Pool Court – Agreed, an additional policy point on biodiversity will be included. The Council acknowledges the strong local interest in a masterplan for the area and work undertaken by the community to support this. The Council will continue to take a lead role on the preparation of a masterplan to support the delivery of the Local Plan, working with and consulting a range of stakeholders including the local community and landowners. The Local Plan addresses the importance of preserving and enhancing the heritage significance of Livesey Hall, Memorial and Grounds, This includes Policy LSA3 and the Bell Green Gasholders site allocation. Bell Green Retail Park and Sainsbury's Bell Green site allocations already incude a requirement for improved east-west links from/to Waterlink Way.	
	3	LSA 03	A significant opportunity to improve visual enhancement for the Public Realm. Approaches to the Bell Green locus from three major road arteries will benefit from improvements.	Noted. The Local Plan and South Area site allocations broadly seek to improve the public realm in this area in accordance with the Healthy Streets approach and principles.	No change.
	3	LSA 03	Augment transport links for Bell Green and improve connections to town centres and nearby railway stations and include enhancement to cycle and pedestrian walking routes.	Noted. The Local Plan and South Area site allocations broadly seek to improve the public realm and transport access in this area in accordance with the Healthy Streets approach and principles. It also seeks to capitalise on the opportunities presented by the Bakerloo line extension.	No change.

	3	LSA 03	Radical redesign of the entire road system, in an area that extends to and embraces Perry Hill's junction with Selworthy Road, Perry Rise to its junction with Adamsrill Road, the entire Bell Green gyratory system, Southend Lane to its junction with Moremead Road and Sydenham Road. The design principles must be rooted in public consultation and must seek, as a primary issue to minimalize air pollution by reducing the frequency of stopping points in the flow of traffic round and through the entire system. It could be calculated that timeframes for the delivery of such a comprehensive proposal will be concomitant with the delivery of outcomes from nationally-led policies which deliver significant reduction in the use of polluting vehicles in all classes. That might be characterised as a win-win outcome.	LSA03 C.d does include reference to improving the existing network.	Policy amended to strengthen the need to significant improve the street network.
	3	LSA 03	Radically redesign the existing rail bridge at Southend Lane and enhance it with the provision of integrated pedestrian safety measures with the provision of safe footpaths on both sides of the roadway. The bridge should be rebuilt with a design that both widens it and permits, as a minimum, the doubling of the width of the carriageway and increase its height thus improving the management of traffic flows and of access of double-deck buses on Southend Lane.	LSA03 C.d does include reference to improving the existing network.	Policy amended to strengthen the need to significant improve the street network.
	3	LSA 03	Create dedicated parking to the rear of Livesey Memorial Hall for the use of patrons. In normal times regular and large attendance events such as funerals, weddings and other celebratory events are hosted there and local on-street parking for residents is overwhelmed on those occasions by patrons seeking parking space.	Parking provision will need to be carefully managed in line with the London Plan standards. Any such new provision will need to ensure there is no harm to the significance of these heritage assets. This will need to be considered through the development management process.	No change.
	3	LSA 03	Introduce the opportunity to sensitively provide an appropriate density of new housing units. It may be deemed appropriate to consider provision similar in scale to Bell Green Phase III development.	The Local Plan Part 2 policies broadly support the sensitive intensification of sites, and set detailed requirements to ensure that development proposals achieve the optimal capacity of a site.	No change.
	3	LSA 03	Reprovision and expand all necessary local services within new developments in the area that will serve the increased number of residents. Health centre care, dental care, schools and nursery provision and other social care needs must be addressed.	An Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been prepared alongside the Local Plan. This identifies the strategic infrastructure required to support the levels of growth planned in the Borough, and has informed the Local Plan policies. The Local Plan Part 2 policies also set requirements to for infrastructure provision which will be considered on a case-by-case basis.	No change.
	3	LSA 03	Introduce appropriate volumes of retail and commercial floor space.	The Local Plan seeks to makes provision for an appropriate amount of retail and commercial floorspace, informed by the latest technical evidence. Employment land and retail studies have been commissioned and prepared to inform the preparation of the Local Plan. The site allocation policies set out indicative capacities for different types of land uses.	No change.
	3	LSA 03	Introduce a policy for all car parks requiring conformance with ACPO and Home Office Scientific Development Branch standards to introduce secure car park status with good quality design, improved lighting, controlled access and CCTV coverage.	Noted. It is acknowledged that the Local Plan can provide further clarity and detail on the standards and design of car parking. For soundness, this will need to be in accordance with the London Plan.	Local Plan policy TR4 amended to better refer to and align with London Plan car parking standards.
	3	LSA 03	Introduce a policy to install rapid-charge points for EVs around this area and in publicly owned car parks.	The draft Local Plan Part 2 policy on Parking includes requirements for charging points and electric vehicles.	Local Plan policy TR4 amended to better refer to and align with London Plan car parking standards.

				The Council has also prepared a Low Emission Vehicle Charging Strategy which will address provision that is not included within new development proposals.	
	3	LSA 03	Expand the defined *Area 1 Former Bell Green Gas Holders* to add the entirety of The Livesey Memorial Hall, its grounds, former bowling green and former tennis court. The listed status of three elements, Livesey Hall War Memorial Grade II, Livesey Memorial Hall Grade II and Livesey Memorial Hall Boundary Wall Grade II on that expanded site is fully recognised. The Council is invited to accept that the non-listed areas can be sensitively reprovisioned, with or without Designation as Local Green Space, in a variety of combinations to enhance the Public Realm aspects and provide areas that can be of beneficial use to residents and visitors without compromise to the listed elements.	The draft Local Plan addresses the importance of preserving and enhancing the heritage significance of Livesey Hall, Memorial and Grounds, This includes Policy LSA3 and the Bell Green Gasholders site allocation. However it is acknowledged that this could be reinforced by ensuring these assets are considered more coherently by amending the site allocation.	Former Bell Green Gas Holders site allocation boundary amended to include the Livesey Memorial Hall and its grounds, former bowling green and former tennis court.
	3	LSA 03	The assertion at LSA.4 has this, "The Bell Green neighbourhood is known for its out-of-centre retail park, including a superstore and other large format outlets, as well as their associated surface car parking. These retail uses are adjoined by two former gas holders, which are prominent local landmarks. Some contemporary blocks of flats have been developed on the edge of these Bell Green sites however new development has generally been delivered in a piecemeal way. This creates an unfortunate and unnecessarily outdated view of the heritage of Bell Green. It adds further to the sense of inconsistency about the presence of the gas holders and lack of precision in the content of the DLLP for this area.	Noted.	Local Plan paragraph 17.4 amended to more accurately reflect on existing character of area.
	3	LSA 03	The gas-holders were demolished and the site levelled in 2020.	Noted.	Local Plan amended to make clear gas-holders have been dismantled.
	3	LSA 03	Vision and Character commentaries are positive although there is an air of over optimism on matters where the LPA had little control on delivery of objectives.	Noted. This is a vision for the area which the Local Plan policies aim to support.	No change.
Sydenham Society	3	LSA 03	**LSA3 Bell Green and Lower Sydenham** (p687) This is supported **Item B** The preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document and/or Masterplan by the Council is supported, provided that the development of the masterplan involves community consultation and that the final version of the masterplan reflects community views. Para 17.10 (p696) *'…However, the level of this growth will be contingent on the delivery of strategic infrastructure necessary to support both new developments and existing neighbourhoods. This includes transport infrastructure and particularly the Bakerloo Line Extension…'* We do not accept that redevelopment of the area should be contingent on the Bakerloo Line Extension proceeding,	Support for LSA3 noted. The Council acknowledges the strong local interest in a masterplan for the area and work undertaken by the community to support this. The Council will continue to take a lead role on the preparation of a masterplan to support the delivery of the Local Plan, working with and consulting a range of stakeholders including the local community and landowners. The Regulation 18 Local Plan document set out several spatial strategy options, recognising that some or all phases of the BLE may not be delivered in the plan period (including for reasons of funding). The preferred approach for the spatial strategy is therefore not dependent on the BLE. However the spatial strategy and the Local Plan policies aim to facilitate the delivery of the BLE, and provide flexibility to respond to it. This includes provision for an uplift in site development capacities enabled by	Local Plan amended to clarify Council's commitment to enabling the delivery of the BLE, whilst ensuring the plan is deliverable in the absence of the BLE.

			or even the relocation of Lower Sydenham Station to Bell Green, although we have no doubt that these would act as powerful catalysts for regeneration. We agree that the lack of access to public transport is a major contributor to local deprivation, and that sites required for critical transport infrastructure should be protected to allow future construction. The need to tackle poor amenity at Bell Green is urgent and early interventions to improve the neighbourhood, even if modest, should proceed as a priority in parallel with efforts to improve the transport infrastructure.	the BLE through higher public transport access levels, particularly in the Bell Green and Lower Sydenham area – this is signposted in the plan but it is acknowledged this could be made clearer.	
Discourse Architecture	3	LSA 03	LSA3 Bell Green and Lower Sydenham (p687) This is supported	Support noted.	No change.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LSA SA 01	**Former Bell Green Gas Holders & Bell Green Retail Park;** In order for the council to meet policy TR3 in the South area, Development requirements (17.19 & 17.22) should explicitly take into account plans for strategic cycle routes identified in the Council Transport Strategy running East-West through Bell Green Gyratory as integral to adopting the Healthy Streets approach as part of the public realm strategy and should follow London Cycle Design Standards.	The site allocations mention the need for enhanced walking and cycle connections between public spaces and the site's surrounding neighbourhoods. This will require a hierarchy of routes with clearly articulated east-west and north-south corridors.	No change.
	3	LSA SA 01	The first instance of significant error appears here and is replicated in both the location diagram and in the narrative. The former gas-holders are located on Alan Pegg Place not Bell Green Lane. At para 17.18 Development requirements, reference is made thus "Development must be delivered in accordance with a master plan for the Bell Green and Lower Sydenham area." Which master plan? There is no definition present – draft, existing, or proposed. Reference is also made to "Positive frontage on Bell Green Lane and other key routes". How is the author's intent to be interpreted from this statement and the mis-labelled associated diagram? Bell Green Lane is some distance away from this locus. It is within the bounds of this site that off-street car parking for patrons of the Livesey Hall should be optimally provided. An expansion to this area is proposed at **Appendix A.**	Noted. The masterplan referred is one that is endorsed by the Council and which the community has been engaged with and consulted on. The Council will continue to take a lead role on the preparation of a masterplan to support the delivery of the Local Plan, working with and consulting a range of stakeholders including the local community and landowners. Any proposal for the provision of additional car parking will be dealt with through the development management process.	Former Bell Green Gas Holders and Livesey Hall site allocation amended to accurately refer to the site location at Alan Pegg Place Former Bell Green Gas Holders site allocation boundary amended to including the Livesey Memorial Hall and its grounds, former bowling green and former tennis court.
	3	LSA SA 01	*The listed status of three elements, **Livesey Hall War Memorial Grade II, Livesey Memorial Hall Grade II and Livesey Memorial Hall Boundary Wall Grade II** on the expanded site is fully recognised. The Council is invited to accept that the non-listed areas can be sensitively reprovisioned, with or without Designation as Local Green Space, in a variety of combinations to enhance the Public Realm aspects and provide areas that can be of beneficial use to residents and visitors without compromise to the listed elements.*	Noted.	Former Bell Green Gas Holders site allocation boundary amended to including the Livesey Memorial Hall and its grounds, former bowling green and former tennis court. Former Bell Green Gas Holders and Livesey Memorial Hall site allocation amended emphasise public realm and amenity.
Southern Gas Networks	3	LSA SA 02	Southern Gas Networks (SGN) have infrastructure within the area outlined in red • A 400mm PE Medium gas main & 30" Steel Medium pressure gas main. And	Noted.	Bell Green Retail Park site allocation amended to reference existing gas infrastructure and working with utilities providers

			• 180mm PE Low pressure gas main If any/when planning application is submitted SGN, would have to object due to our strategic gas mains being in situ with in the red boundary. As a side note the retail units within the retail park have gas supplies the owner of that gas infrastructure is Fulcrum Pipelines Ltd (their ref 9010973) they would need to be notified as well.		
	3	LSA SA 02	This diagram contains another incidence of street naming error. Mis-labelled previously as Bell Green Lane in this diagram it has been labelled Southend Lane. Once more the road name should be Alan Pegg Place. The narrative contains statements that display the LPA's over-reliance on potential delivery of BLE Phase II.	Noted. As set out elsewhere in the consultation statement, the delivery of the Local Plan and proposals for Bell Green and Lower Sydenham are not contingent on the delivery of the BLE.	Diagram amended as suggested.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LSA SA 03	**Sainsbury's Bell Green;** In order for the council to meet policy TR3 in the South area, Development requirements (17.26) should explicitly take into account plans for strategic cycle routes identified in the Council Transport Strategy running East-West through Bell Green Gyratory as integral to adopting the Healthy Streets approach as part of the public realm strategy and should follow London Cycle Design Standards.	The site allocations mention the need for enhanced walking and cycle connections between public spaces and the site's surrounding neighbourhoods. This will require a hierarchy of routes with clearly articulated east-west and north-south corridors.	No change.
	3	LSA SA 03	This diagram contains another incidence of street naming error. Mis-labelled previously as Bell Green Lane in this diagram it has been labelled Southend Lane. Once more the road name should be Alan Pegg Place. The narrative contains statements that display the LPA's over-reliance on potential delivery of BLE Phase II.	Noted. As set out elsewhere in the Consultation Statement, the delivery of the Local Plan and proposals for Bell Green and Lower Sydenham are not contingent on the delivery of the BLE.	Diagram amended as suggested.
	3	LSA SA 04	For the first time in this group, the diagram contains no street naming errors. Apart from the narrative containing the usual statements that display the LPA's over-reliance on potential delivery of BLE Phase II, the contents are supported.	Noted. As set out elsewhere in the Consultation Statement, the delivery of the Local Plan and proposals for Bell Green and Lower Sydenham are not contingent on the delivery of the BLE.	No change.
on behalf of Sydenham Scheme LLP the owners of the Coventry Scaffold	3	LSA SA 04	The Stanton Square site allocation is welcome in principle. In line with the comments above regarding the masterplan this is referenced again as part of this site allocation and it should be recognised that delivery will be on a phased basis given the multiple ownership and availability of sites. As long as this is promoted in the context of an illustrative masterplan then this would achieve the comprehensive and coordinated development sought by the policy. It is noted that the development capacity is identified as 'indicative' but the range of residential units is very low for a regeneration site such as this and further engagement is sought to understand how this was arrived at with a view to increase these figures.	Noted. Where no advanced pre-application discussions have taken place, the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper. Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. This has taken into account the complexities of the site – including the need to provide co-location of uses, the ameniy of the school opposite the site and the non designated heritage assets. ~~-~~Based on these considerations, the land use mix and residential units have remained the same. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach.	Stanton Square LSIS site allocation amended to refer to partnership working, phasing, masterplans and Policy DM3.

	3	LSA SA 05	Another incidence of street name error. The street name here is Bell Green - NOT Bell Green Lane. As in previous examples the narrative for this site allocation is rendered meaningless in terms of lack of clarity, leading to difficulty and improbable interpretation and plain error. LSA.34 Development requirements propose that "Positive frontages and improved public realm along Bell Green Lane, Holmshaw Close and Kirtley Road. The locations proposed are unfeasible. The proposal that "Appropriate re-provision of the existing health care facility, in line with Policy CI 1 (Safeguarding and securing community infrastructure) is supported. Please note the response made earlier that re-provisioning must address increases in the number of patients that the Health centre will be obliged to serve as a result of increased housing provision in the area. LSA.35 Development guidelines propose that "Consideration should be given to the introduction of a new walking route connecting Kirtley Road and Bell Green Lane." What is the author's intent here – to actually have a walking route to connect Kirtley Road to Bell Green as opposed to a more improbable and less than feasible connection to the real Bell Green Lane?	Error noted. Disagree that the development guidelines are unfeasible. Support regarding reprovision of health care facility noted. The site allocation does not specify that a walking route connecting Kirtley Road and Bell Green will be delivered, but instead states that consideration should be given to this new route.	Sydenham Green Group Practice site allocation map amended to show correct road name.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LSA SA 06	**Worsley Bridge Road Locally Significant Industrial Site;** The development requirements fail to recognise the council transport strategy to deliver Cycleways running from Lower Sydenham to Bromley. The development requirements should include making sure any development does not result in a reduction in existing footway or carriageway space. This should be detailed in the development requirements as part of the public realm strategy and should follow London Cycle Design Standards.	Noted	Worsley Bridge Road LSIS site allocation amended to include reference to delivery of cycleways running from Lower Sydenham to Bromley.
	3	LSA SA 06	The narrative contains statements that display the LPA's over-reliance on potential delivery of BLE Phase II. Otherwise, the proposals are supported.	Support noted. As set out elsewhere in the Consultation Statement, the delivery of the Local Plan and proposals for Bell Green and Lower Sydenham are not contingent on the delivery of the BLE.	No change.
Historic England	3	LSA SA 08	Site allocation 8 South Area (Excalibur Estate): Please note that the buildings referred to at para 17.48 are listed Grade II on the National Heritage List for England, rather than being locally listed as drafted.	Noted.	Excalibur Estate site allocation amended to accurately reflect status of listed buildings, as suggested.
	3	LSA SA 11	I am writing to express concern about the plans contained within Lewisham's new Local Plan to develop the Co-op at 431-453 Downham Way. While I understand the need to build more housing and would generally support it, I do not support any development that would see the Co-op being demolished/ closed for a period of time. A lot of people in the area (including old and vulnerable people) depend on the Co-op for grocery shopping. It is very important for the community and getting rid of it would severely undermine the goal of the 15 minute	Noted. The site allocation provides for a mixed-use development which would allow for the re-provision of a retail unit at the ground floor level. Should any future development come forward in line with the site allocation policy, the closure or temporary re-location of the existing grocery store would be dealt with through the Development Management process.	No change.

			neighbourhood, which I know is at the heart of the Local Plan. Even if the plan is to include a food shop at the bottom of the block of flats once the development is finished, this would still entail the local area being without a decent grocery shop for, I imagine, a year. This would have a big impact on everyone in the area, especially older adults and those who do not drive. I would agree that the car park for the Co-op is too big and is not an efficient use of space. I would fully support a plan to make the car park smaller and to use that space for housing. However, I cannot support the current plan which would see the local area without a food shop for some time.		
	3	LSA SA 12	Building proposal on WV GarageSite (Avondale Road): My husband and I moved to Avondale Road in 2018 when we purchased our first house for our young family. While we are very happy to be living here, we have a number of issues with the surrounding area which we believe the housing development proposal may impact upon. The first relates to the speeding traffic on Avondale Road coming from both ends of the street. Just the other day we experienced an Audi travelling at what we believed to be around 60mph or more on a residential street. While this is shocking and rather frightening to witness, it is sadly common. The second issue concerns the number of parked vehicles on the street and surrounding our house which is on the corner with Alexandra Crescent from the Beadles garage (legally, I realise). While the thought of the garage no longer being able to park cars in front and at the side of our house (sometimes for months at a time!), we are concerned that another built-up residential area would increase the number of cars parked along the street as well as cars using the street as a speeding area. I completely understand the housing shortage problem which you will be seeking to rectify but I urge you to take these concerns into consideration when looking at the ambition of this project and the impact it could have on those of us who have recently made it our home.	Noted. The amount of car parking provision on any future redevelopment of the site would be considered having regard to the nature and scale of development, and in line with the parking standards set out in Part 2 of the Local Plan on Transport and Connectivity. In general, the Local Plan seeks to limit the amount of car parking to encourage a shift to more sustainable travel modes such as walking, cycling and public transport. Off-street parking management is dealt with by the Council's Transport service, and Controlled Parking Zones may be implemented where appropriate.	No change.
	3	LSA SA 12	Beadles garage site - draft Local Plan 1. My wife and I are residents of Avondale Road, Bromley. 2 May I comment on your proposals for Beadles Garage. This submission is split into two headings: A The context - the Beadles site as it is now; B The future which is envisaged by Lewisham Council Please could you acknowledge safe receipt?	Noted. It is considered that there is scope for the sensitive intensification of this site, which the Local Plan supports in order to help meet local needs for housing and commercial floorspace. Where no advanced pre-application discussions have taken place, the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. This	Beadles Garages site allocation amended to make reference to the A21 Healthy Streets corridor, to increase residential to 25 units and to increase employment/ main towncentre floorspace to 610m^2.

			3. We do not object to the general principle underlying your proposals. But we do consider that your planning department needs significantly to adjust the scale of ambition involved in respect of the Beadles site. We believe that both Bromley Council and the Highway Authority for the A21, Transport for London, need to be fully engaged. Part A The context - the Beadles site as it is now 4 The Beadles site is, as you describe, at the junction of Avondale Road and Bromley Hill. 5 Bromley Hill is a busy A road and a red route. There is already a serious speeding problem on the A21. There are speed cameras which seek to regulate traffic speed in the immediate vicinity of the Beadles site which is the subject of the draft local plan. There has been at least one death at this junction. 6 The speed of motor vehicles on the A21 tempts drivers to take risks as they turn into the A21 from Avondale Road or from the Bromley Court Hotel slip road opposite. As recently as two months ago, there was a damage only, but significant, collision at the junction. 7 Your planners may not realise that Avondale Road is itself dangerous, because it is a “rat run” for traffic from Bromley Hill to Burnt Ash Lane, just as Park Avenue is. Moreover, the western end of Avondale Road, where Beadles is situated, is a main artery for traffic going towards the Downham Estate. The police have been alerted and are monitoring the situation. 8 With the closure of another VW site locally, Beadles has itself created a new traffic problem on Avondale Road. We are VW owners and have bought two new cars from them in the last six years. So we are not hostile to the garage - far from it. 9 The staff at the garage park Beadles cars, as they are entitled to do, along Avondale Road. The risks from speeding traffic in Avondale Road have already been flagged. The risks are now exacerbated by the many extra cars which are parked along the road. 10 In summary, the combination of speed and heavy parking at the western end of the road, create a dual risk for residents. Part B The future envisaged by Lewisham Council 11 We recognise that, with a housing shortage in the London area, the Council will rightly want to increase housing availability.	has taken into account the complexities of the site – including the need to provide mixed use development by introducing residential units and to reflect the surrounding character of the site. The indicative capacity has also been tested through the A21 Development Framework that has been endorsed by the council. -Based on these considerations, the land use mix and residential units have been amended. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach. The Council has consulted statutory consultees on the Local Plan proposals, including Greater London Authority / Transport for London, Metropolitan Police Service and Bromley Council. Their feedback will be used to inform the Regulation 19 stage document. Speed limits are outside the scope of the Local Plan. However, the plan does advocate for Healthy Streets principles in support of sustainable travel, to reduce vehicular dominance and improve safety. The draft Local Plan proposes to apply the Healthy Streets principles to the A21 Corridor, and elsewhere, whilst also promoting growth and new development within and around it. The London Plan should be referred for further information on the Healthy Streets approach and principles. There are a wide range of interventions and projects that could support Healthy Streets, and as a strategic document the Local Plan does not go into a great level of detail on these. The Council’s Local Implementation Plan (LIP) supports the London Mayor’s Transport Strategy, and further details can be found therein. Bromley Hill cemetery – the draft Local Plan seeks to protect existing cemeteries. The Council has prepared a Parks and Open Spaces strategy which sets out priorities for managing and enhancing open spaces. Transport Assessments are required alongside any major planning application so there is no need to specify this requirement in individual site allocations.	

			12 We also recognise that provision of employment floor space is a desirable objective. 13 We think that "public realm enhancements"would improve the A21 corridor from Downham to the junction with Avondale Road. But we do consider that the local plan will need to be more specific since it is impossible for local residents to understand what is proposed, not least in the light of the rather woolly and opaque language that has been used. 14 As for the cemetery on Bromley Hill, it would improve local amenity if the Council were to create the conditions in which the site's historic and environmental importance could be enhanced. But, again, what does the Council have in mind? 15 As for the Beadles site, the proposals are not suitable. They will, as presently envisaged, create additional risks to local residents. Why do we argue that there will be additional risks? The answer is that they are likely, unless the proposals for employment space and 22 residential units are scaled back, to increase road use disproportionately on Avondale Road itself. This is likely to result in the attendant risk of more speeding, both on Avondale Road and down Alexandra Crescent towards Downham. 16 Moreover, without the imposition of safety measures in the Local Plan in respect of the junction of Avondale Road and Bromley Hill, the proposals will create additional danger at the junction by reason of the probable level of increased usage. 17 It would not be impossible to impose suitable conditions to manage both sets of risks. But the Council should not proceed to finalise the Local Plan without a plan to address the risks. 18 In a spirit of collaboration, please let us know whether we can help you.		
	3	LSA SA 12	**Lewisham's ('the Council') New Local Plan ('Plan') – Proposed Site Beadles Garage ('the Re-development or Site')** My comments are made in a personal capacity. Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to contribute to the Plan. I agree entirely with the Plan's intention to ensure that planning decisions are made in the best interests of neighbourhoods and communities. We operate an Avondale Road group, primarily for Neighbourhood Watch purposes, that is well represented by the residents and major concern has been expressed by many of us around the proposed Re-development. Whilst acknowledging that the Re-development presents a number of opportunities for Lewisham Council, not least	Noted. It is considered that there is scope for the sensitive intensification of this site, which the Local Plan supports in order to help meet local needs for housing and commercial floorspace. Where no advanced pre-application discussions have taken place, the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. This has taken into account the complexities of the site – including the need to provide mixed use development by introducing residential units and to reflect the surrounding character of the site. The indicative capacity has also been tested through the A21	Beadles Garages site allocation amended to make reference to the A21 Healthy Streets corridor, to increase residential to 25 units and to increase employment/ main town centre floorspace to 610m^2.

			new residential units, based on the existing 'Site Allocation' I have a number of concerns which primarily centre on: A) The likely greater danger at the junction (A21/Avondale Road) itself, where there have been a number of accidents over the years (most recently on the 28 February); B) The likely increase in on-street parking , especially towards the western end of Avondale Road (and which is already used by Beadle's as an effective 'overspill car park'); C) The likely increase in traffic on Avondale Road, possibly resulting in more cars exceeding the speed limit and creating additional danger (our road is already a recognised – by the Authorities -speeding 'hotspot') The current Council Notice states that its 'Site Allocation' expectations are that the Re-development will be for mixed use. It would be helpful if local residents (of both Lewisham and Bromley) could be notified as soon as possible as to the intended actual use of the Site. Whatever the Site's eventual use, parking and traffic considerations must be addressed and improve on the existing situation. It would be helpful to know if the Metropolitan Police and highway authority for the A21 (as a red route and an A road, TfL is the authority) have been approached for their input and, if so, what their feedback has been. I look forward to receiving the Council's response to my and other contributor's feedback into the Consultation/Planning invitation for comments	Development Framework that has been endorsed by the council. ~~.~~Based on these considerations, the land use mix and residential units have been amended. Optimal capacity for the site will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach. The amount of car parking provision on any future redevelopment of the site would be considered having regard to the nature and scale of development, and in line with the parking standards set out in Part 2 of the Local Plan on Transport and Connectivity. In general, the Local Plan seeks to limit the amount of car parking to encourage a shift to more sustainable travel modes such as walking, cycling and public transport. Speed limits are outside the scope of the Local Plan. However, the plan does advocate for Healthy Streets principles in support of sustainable travel, to reduce vehicular dominance and improve safety. The Council has consulted statutory consultees on the Local Plan proposals, including Greater London Authority / Transport for London, Metropolitan Police Service and Bromley Council. Their feedback will be used to inform the Regulation 19 stage document. Transport Assessments are required alongside any major planning application so there is no need to specify this requirement in individual site allocations.	
	3	LSA SA 15	6. With regard to the proposed development of a traveller site for the Borough at Pool Court (off Fordmill Road), I fail to see why such individuals should be treated as a separate case and not treated like all other citizens and integrated into the borough like all others. You only need to think back at the previous site next to Lewisham Station and how it was kept. If such individuals do not wish to associate with their average neighbour, then it is up to them to make their own arrangement and not for the council to devote resources for unnecessary favourable treatment. The sooner they integrate the better.	Noted. The National Planning Policy Framework requires the Council to identify and plan positively for the housing needs of the gypsy and traveller community through the Local Plan process. The site allocation will help to ensure these requirements are satisfied.	No change.
	3	LSA SA 15	Re: Population of Pool Court & Objection With the reference to the above, I am writing to inform you that since 2016, 100% of Sybil Phoenix House residents objected to the proposal. The population of Pool Court confirmed in 2016 that they will be adversely affected and had strongly objected to the Council planting a G&T traveller site adjacent to Pool Court. Please find attached copies of our letters sent on 28th November 2016 and 8th January 2018.	Objection noted. The Council also acknowledges that previous objections have been received from on emerging proposals for the Pool Court site. The National Planning Policy Framework requires the Council to identify and plan positively for the housing needs of the gypsy and traveller community through the Local Plan process. The site allocation will help to ensure these requirements are satisfied. Any future development proposal for the site will need to demonstrate that it will not lead to an	No change.

			We need to be safeguarded and with the COVID in the air, the vicinity at Pool Court must be particle infection-free as we all know what happens with the gypsy residential use of land and the rubbish that is left behind when they moved from place to place. A daily working camera is needed to protect the anxious habitant. After all, we pay our taxes just like everyone else in the borough of Lewisham. Therefore, we expect to be safe.	adverse impact on amenity and public health and safety, in line with other Local Plan policies.	
	3	LSA SA 15	RE: Population of Pool Court and Objection With reference to the above, I am writing to inform you that since 2016, 100% of Sbyil Phoenix House residents objected to the proposal. Please see attached Pool Court's petition from no 62-73. **<Lewisham officer note: supporting documentary evidence of signed petition provided>** The population of Pool Court confirmed in 2016 that they will be adversely affected and had strongly objected to the Council planting a G&T traveller site adjacent to Pool Court. Please find attached copies of our letters sent on 28th November 2016 and 8th January 2018. We need to be safeguarded and with COVID in the air, the vicinity of Pool Court must be particle infection-free as we all know what happens with gypsy residential use of land and rubbish that is left behind when they moved from place to place. A daily working camera is needed to protect the anxious habitant. After all, we pay our taxes just like everyone else in the borough of Lewisham. If the community is equally valid, therefore, we are expected to be safe, protected from harm. Failing to do so, you will be held responsible for any disruption that would affect the population of Pool Court.	Objection noted. The Council also acknowledges that previous objections have been received from on emerging proposals for the Pool Court site. The National Planning Policy Framework requires the Council to identify and plan positively for the housing needs of the gypsy and traveller community through the Local Plan process. The site allocation will help to ensure these requirements are satisfied. Any future development proposal for the site will need to demonstrate that it will not lead to an adverse impact on amenity and public health and safety, in line with other Local Plan policies.	No change.
London Wildlife Trust	3	LWA	We support these principles, especially in respect of Parts B and G. We particularly welcome the reference to the landscape character of the old Great North Wood (including within supporting paras 18.8, 18.9), and how this is to be best protected within the Plan.	Support noted.	No change.
	3	LWA	I consider myself to be very fortunate to live in West Lewisham, particularly over the last 40 years living in Forest Hill and Sydenham, where Public Transport links are really good for both rail and buses, and there is a wide range of excellent facilities, many parks, varied retail, diverse groceries, a swimming pool nearby, Libraries (under pressure), the Sydenham Centre, Many good Pubs, the Comedy Poodle Club, restaurants and cafes, the Horniman Museum at Forest Hill, the Undertakers, Sports, Yoga and the Arts. The feted '20 minute Neighbourhood' to meet most immediate needs, more or less exists in this area. What are the issues then, I observe that retail and local business are in crisis. I think I am correct that two banks	Noted. The Local Plan and its spatial strategy broadly support the '20-minute neighbourhood' approach. The preparation of the plan has been informed by key evidence base studies, including on employment and town centres. The Part 2 policies on Economy and Culture seek to provide flexibility for a wider range of uses to locate in town and local centres to support their long term vitality and viability. Changes to the Use Class Order however limit the scope for the plan to control the specific mix of uses within centres (for example within the new Class E category, where changes of uses between different types of activities are permitted without the need for planning consent),	No change.

			and a Building Society have closed in very recent years, we have only one bank left on Sydenham Road. Even without the Pandemic, businesses opened and closed frequently, and the same breadth of services do not re-open. A lot of shop fronts are shabby. Do we really need three Gyms, endless Pound shops and Phone shops? Change is of course inevitable and the Pandemic has not helped at all, but it is not easy to stick to Planning aims, if there is panic over empty premises and no finance to have a choice of outcomes or plans to extend potential usage.		
	3	LWA	I think the conservation area in Brockley should have a plan to develop one off houses of architectural merit. There are already residential houses on many of the mews and the blanket ban on residential in the mews, should be lifted. There are some extremely cool houses in the mews and this is something Lewisham should be proud of.	Noted. The Local Plan Part 2 Policies on Heritage broadly support sensitively designed, contemporary housing designs in Conservation Areas. The extant and emerging Local Plans do not set blanket restrictions on new developments, however the policies seek to ensure developments respond positively to local and historic character, including the significance of heritage assets and their setting.	No change.
	3	LWA	Live/work should be encouraged in the area [Brockley] too. Covid has proved that a variety of businesses benefit from purpose built live/work buildings.	Noted. It is acknowledged that there is authorised live-work development in Brockley Rise area and Local Plan will be amended to provide in principle support for this type of development in specified locations.	Local Plan amended to provide additional support for live-work accommodation in Brockley (Dragonfly Place Endwell Road and Ashby Mews).
	3	LWA	In 2016 the Council instructed a traffic survey of Drakefell Road and the immediate area. I have attached a copy (Project Centre Report Drakefell Road.pdf). The study identified a number of opportunities for improvement. None have been implemented. Local residents have long been advocating safer streets and a healthier neighbourhood. They were in active dialogue with Cllr Dacres (Cllr McGeevor's predecessor as cabinet member for transport) on the challenges faced by Drakefell Road and on the urgent need to address the issues caused by Drakefell Road being used as a rat run for drivers from outside of the borough who are trying to avoid the A2 and A20. In 2017, Will Norman, TfL's recently appointed Cycling Czar, attended the area and was very supportive of the need to address issues of pavement parking, lack of crossing points and an antisocial environment.http://www.drakefell.org/drag/12-drag-meets-mayor-s-walking-cycling-commissioner. In or around 2018, LIP3 funding had been allocated to improving the B2142 corridor and (subject to a further consultation) Sustrans was to be tasked with helping build a modified road layout that would be trialled for 6 months in a temporary form and then constructed in 2021. In particular filters were discussed which would have the effect of reducing the overall traffic volume for the whole ward, not just Drakefell Road. This funding was subsequently withdrawn. There has been a recent campaign to set up a school street outside the Haberdasher primary school on Pepys Road.	Too detailed for the Local Plan. We will pass your comments on to the Transport Team.	No change.

			The campaign and its petition was about making the journey to school safer. I am delighted that the school street seems to be going ahead but once again Drakefell Road which is crossed by a great many parents and children on their way to school seems to have been forgotten. There are a number of allocated or proposed sites for development which impact on conditions in Drakefell Road, including a proposed development on the current Sky Roofing industrial site (corner of Drakefell Road and Wallbutton Road) as well as the site at Brockley Cross. There is clearly time for action. Drakefell Road is a sorry story of the Council and our elected representatives burying their heads in the sand.		
	3	LWA	I would like the Drakefell Road and Gellatly Rd corridor to be considered for LTN status. The road is getting busier and for years now no action has been taken to address this and its consequences. There are more people living on this road than many in the surrounding vicinity and yet more and more traffic is funnelled down the road. There are regular traffic jams down the road. The east of the road is a pollution black spot. Every few minutes there is a car exceeding the speed limit on the road. The road is surrounded by schools but the crossings are poor or non existent. The mix of traffic is now noisier with more LGVs and delivery bikes. You literally cannot hear your neighbours! No one wants to spend time at the front of their house so the community is weaker because of it. We have applied for no car days but been rejected. We have highlighted the weak bridge on Avignon road which is not enforced and lorries regularly travel over it, but again nothing has been done. We continue to get HGVs using the road as a shortcut and getting stuck. The road is plagued by cars parking on pavements which was made illegal in the 1970s but still somehow continues in Lewisham even though walking is now promoted as a key mode of travel by the council. The crux of the matter is ‘car’ king or is community? An LTN status for this corridor is an important first step to begin to address these worsening problems.	Low Traffic Neighbourhoods are outside the scope of the Local Plan. However, this suggestion will be referred to colleagues in the Council’s Transport service for their consideration.	No change.
	3	LWA	**Are there any other issues and/or approaches for the area that you feel should be considered?** What happened to TFL's plans to address the queuing traffic on Waldram Crescent/London Road? There was talk of a diversion of traffic to the underpass walkway on Perry Vale which runs under the railway (which would mean no bend and a filter lane for Dartmouth Road could be introduced, reducing need for traffic lights). This should be part of the plans/be revisited - that is the only way that the A205 approaching Forest Hill could be converted to a healthy street.	Specific transport improvements such as diversions, filter lanes are beyond the scope of the Plan. Your coments will be forwarded on to the Transport team.	No change.

	3	LWA Fig 13.1	2. DIVISION OF SECTIONS- With relation to Telegraph Hill, the local plan section divisions appear to be totally arbitrary and make no sense at all. They do not take into account how the communities in those areas behave or what parts of the borough they are connected to and relate to for shopping etc. I live at the north end of Pepys Rd. I sat through zoom for 'my area' discussion from the council and realized it did not relate to me at any level. They were talking about Sydenham? Forest Hill? and goodness knows what other places, areas with which we have zero connection!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! On Telegraph Hill, we connect with the New Cross Road, Queen's Road. We shop at Sainsburys in the New Cross Road and on our own parades. We look to the Old Kent Road, Peckham, on occasion Deptford and Nunhead. But NEVER towards the areas mentioned in the discussion. I have never shopped or even visited the areas they mentioned, except for the Horniman's Museum. It is ludicrous to bang us in with them. To us, those areas are like another borough entirely. There is no logic to being unprecise and untidy with these borders for the Local Plan. They are too important to allow them to be so carelessly and messily drawn. Problems will arise down the line if these things are not ironed out properly. Telegraph Hill should be one unit. It was built as a unit in 1880, and is now a successful conservation area. The conservation area map could be considered as a guide for one of your sections, which would at least be logical as well as realistic. 3. In particular, I would like to comment that parts of our conservation area have been wrongly classified as ripe for opportunity. REALLY? This is nonsense as we are in a distinct conservation area with clearly defined border. Nothing BLURRED there. This kind of careless and clumsy mapping with its arbitrary divisions is confusing! Developers who do not know the areas might be encouraged to think they can start trying to destroy parts of conservation areas as well as others. My home falls into one of your "Opportunity areas" and I am on Telegraph Hill within the conservation area. This should not be allowed to stand. The chairman of the discussion from the council actually tried to persuade us that boundaries don't matter because the edges are blurred! What does this mean? He defended it as if it was an asset to be imprecise and ambiguous? That is very worrying. Everything is about being accurate. Otherwise everyone will think they can bend the rules at infinitum. A lack of precision invites varied interpretations. This is dangerous when you have developers snooping around. The boundaries of the local	Part 3 of the Local Plan deals with Lewisham's 5 character areas. It sets out a vision, spatial objectives and planning policies for each. The sub-area approach responds to feedback from the public for the Local Plan to set a more 'place-based strategy' with a renewed focus on Lewisham's neighbourhoods. The character areas (and neighbourhoods within them) were informed by the Lewisham Characterisation Study, which was prepared in collaboration with community groups and subject to public consultation. Whilst it is acknowledged that people may not agree with the geographical extent of the areas, the character areas provide a useful way of planning at a more localised neighbourhood level.	No change.

			plan sections MUST be very clear and precise to avoid abuse.		
	3	LWA	Telegraph Hill: Most people who live here do so because of the beauty and convenient facilities of the Victorian hill design. Yet protections for it seem to constantly be watered down when the plan should be leading the way on restoring and preserving what makes the area so wonderful. Where is the commitment for the Council to lead the efforts of preserving and restoring and policing more strongly that developments enhance rather than destroy? It's clear to anyone living here that infill construction could destroy all we value….and should be only allowed when it fits seamlessly with the traditional architecture that exists. There are wonderful examples where this has been done…and terrible examples where it hasn't. This would be easy to prescribe in the plan. We have so few family homes left that the plan should strengthen the protection of those remaining and ban further conversions of family homes to flats and HMOs. Policing and fines for those who infringe such rules should be increased, not relaxed.	Disagree. The Local Plan seeks to ensure that all new development preserves and enhances the significance of heritage assets and their setting, consistent with national planning policy. This includes conservation areas. The Local Plan sets out a strategy to deliver Good Growth that responds to the distinctive features of Lewisham's neighbourhoods. The plan recognises that infill development can help to restore and repair elements of the historic environment that have been eroded or lost. The Local Plan Part 2 policies on Housing seek to ensure that provision is made for a mix of housing types to meet local needs, including family housing. It includes policies to manage HMOs and ensure that development involving conversions does not result in the loss of family homes.	No change.
	3	LWA Fig 18.2	It is noticed that the West Lewisham link passes through Brockley & Ladywell Cemeteries. Although another map shows it as a walking route this does not mean that it will not be used by cyclists. The Cemeteries are havens for wildlife and for families to pay their respects, so such an activity is not appropriate. On the same map, Ivy Road is shown as an alternative route. This is preferable.	Map amended showing alternative route The cycle routes and quiet ways have been derived from the Lewisham cycle strategy – the Lewisham links routes are not intended to be key cycle routes.	No change.
	3	LWA	On 23rd of March I received an email from the HopCroft Neighbourhood Forum informing me that Lewisham Council had opened consultations on a range of potential developments across Crofton Park and Honor Oak. If I had not received this email, I would have been unaware of the consultations. One of the proposals is on land (car-park and garages) currently used by residents of the block that I live in. I have spoken to most of the neighbours in our block (310-316 Brockley Road) and some residents on Whitbread and Comerford Roads. None were aware of these consultations because there are no signs and we have not received any postal notifications about the plans. All confirmed that they rejected the proposal. In 2017 residents rejected a similar proposal because it would remove one of the few nearby local green spaces, block evening sunlight to residents on the lower floors of 310-316 Brockley Road and the Comerford Road block and morning sunlight to some residents on Whitbread Road. The proposal was also rejected because it would reduce amenities (including parking) to local residents. None of these issues have been addressed in the latest proposal, if	This consultation referred does not concern the Local Plan. Rather it is the Regulation 16 stage consultation on the Honor Oak and Crofton Park (HOPCROFT) Neighbourhood Plan. This plan identified a site named 'Land and Whitbread Road' as a potential development site. The neighbourhood plan is separate from the Local Plan.	No change.

			anything they are literally being buried by building over them. Whitbread Road is also full with many residents and non-residents already parking on the road so the amount of traffic and noise would increase and the lack of car-parking space would be exacerbated. At present non-residents already park in our block's car-park so there are not enough spaces. Our block's car-park could benefit from electric car charging parking facilities. I would like to confirm that I reject this proposal. However, many residents have commented and complained for years as to why the green lawn by our apartment block (off Whitbread Road) was fenced off and the gate locked. Our block and neighbouring residents would like this area to be opened up as green space for public use. This could be as a mini forest to help local biodiversity or be turned into a mini community park or play area for local kids. The COVID crisis has highlighted the importance of (public) green space and many residents in local blocks do not have gardens. Residents and Council tax payers have to pay to maintain the fenced off green lawn area which they no longer have access to. At present this land offers limited to no environmental, social or economic benefits to local residents or the Borough. Instead of being used to generate funds we waste tax payers money maintaining it for no added value and this has been the case for decades. Situations like this need to change across the Borough		
Brockley Better Streets	3	LWA TR 01	Our research shows local priorities in the Ladywell/Brockley area are: • Increase safety for everybody inside and around the Brockley Conservation Area • Prioritise cyclists, pedestrians and public transport • Reduce pollution • Emphasize the tranquil & residential nature of Brockley • Make the access points to Hilly Fields park safer for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport • Co-ordinate work across the Borough, and across London Boroughs, to reduce the through commuter traffic on residential roads from outer London to inner London. This traffic peaks during the morning and evening rush hours. The issues that need immediate attention are: • Too many accidents / near-misses • Heavy goods vehicles / buses / lorries driving through residential areas • Danger spots • Speeding • Aggressive / anti-social behaviour of motorists • High volume of cars • Use of residential roads as 'rat runs' • Cars on the pavement • Structural impact on properties • Exhaust emissions • Overcrowding	Many of these priorities are captured within draft Local Plan within the strategic objectives and/or within the policies in Part 2 and 3 of the plan.	No change.

			Possible solutions have been identified through a community design workshop covering the Brockley and Ladywell wards: • Wider pavements • Cycle lanes / designated routes • One-way systems • Bus filters • Road layout (‘Dutch roads’) • Landscaping • Road furniture • Zebra crossings / traffic islands • Parking bays • Crossing wardens during school hours The roads most affected by rat runs in the Brockley / Ladywell area identified at the workshop and through other local consultations are shown here: 		
Brockley Society	3	LWA EC 11 Policies Map	Ward Boundary Review and relationship with Lewisham Way As the result of the Local Government Boundary Commission review of 2019/2020 it is affirmed that ‘in readiness for national elections in May 2022’ Brockley Ward should embrace the residential areas of Brookmill Road and St John's Conservation Areas. This means that Lewisham Way (A20) is now to be seen as an integral part of Brockley Ward and is not to be regarded as just a boundary as indicated on the West Area Key Diagram (p736). The importance of this demands that as a major NW-SE traffic cross route it merits inclusion to be upgraded on a	Noted.	Local Plan amended to refer to Lewisham College

			par with the transformation status afforded to the South Circular and Brockley Rise/Brockley Road re becoming a 'healthy street' with public realm improvements. In further justification for this it is highlighted that Lewisham Way is uniquely bordered on the south by substantial mature landscaped strips in the form of Deptford Memorial Gardens as extending beyond Wickham Road to Breakspears Road and thence to Lewisham College* and its car park beyond Tressillian Road. As these features are complemented on the north by the recently reinstated green area fronting Ashmead Primary School (as extended to face Lewisham Way) as well as the landscaped areas of St John's Church and the Bright Horizon's Day Nursery it is suggested that a unique opportunity now exists to designate Lewisham Way as a 'roadside local centre and green way'. A strong link with Spatial Objective 9 is therefore gained (p735). It is recommended thereby that this concept should be adopted and that the proposed boundary for Lewisham Way Local Centre be adjusted accordingly in the Draft Plan (p17 of the Proposed Changes to the adopted Policies Map along with references in the text to 18 Lewisham West Area at e.g. paras 18.5, 18.7, LWA1 Ac, LWA2 B, LWA4, 18.13). * NB: the reference to Southwark College (para 18.4) is incorrect - it should be changed to 'Lewisham College'.		
Brockley Society	3	LWA TR 01	**Brockley Station Interchange** It is appreciated that the intention to secure and deliver the Brockley Station Interchange is being retained as a Key Spatial Objective (p735 and TR1 p445). Whilst this deals with the possibility of providing platforms at a higher level to permit interchange between services that crossover from Lewisham to Victoria and Blackfriars the need for a Feasibility Study on the practicalities of this is paramount. As the former street level links to Brockley Lane Station still exist decisions on protecting the delivery of this vision are required. A Statement of Intent for Brockley Cross is needed as LWA5 or similar and should build upon the Local Centre Policy Map area (shown in Lewisham Local Plan - Proposed changes to the adopted Policies Map of December 2020, p18).	Support for Brockley Station Interchange noted. The Council will continue to work with stakeholders, including GLA/TfL and Network Rail, to investigate the feasibility of delivering this infrastructure upgrade. Local Plan Policy LWA2 (Connected network of town centres) addresses Brockley Cross however it is recognised that additional details could assist with the plan's implementation.	Local Plan amended with additional details on the role of Brockley Cross in supporting the spatial strategy.
Brockley Society	3	LWA EC 03	**Live:Work Accommodation** It is noted that live:work development is focused on the Forest Hill District Centre ((LWA3, p743 and Lewisham West Area, p746, para 18.11) as the only location in the Borough. This is incorrect as Ashby Mews in Brockley is a similar location where live:work units are being successfully integrated. Reference to this therefore also needs to be linked in with the Brockley Cross document LWA5 as suggested above.	Noted. It is acknowledged that there is authorised live-work development in Brockley area and Local Plan will be amended to provide in principle support for this type of development in specified locations.	Local Plan amended to provide additional support for live-work accommodation in Brockley (Dragonfly Place and Ashby Mews).
Environment Agency	3	LWA	**Lewisham West Area feedback**		Some amendments to sites allocations have been made in line with the comments provided in the table of sites

		Site allocations	*LB Lewisham officer note: Table of sites with water management information included in original representation.*		
Forest Hill Society	3	LWA LWA SA 05 LWA SA 10	**Public Realm Issues** The Forest Hill Society fully welcomes the Lewisham Local Plan's content relating to the public realm. A. We welcome and support the consideration given to redevelopment and site intensification at the lands at Forest Hill station East and West. We consider this a pivotal and necessary opportunity to improve the sense of arrival to the area, as well as improving safety and utility for commuters and visitors. Our two concerns with this content are as follows: B. For the Station West land, the proposed 'retention or appropriate re-provision of the existing dental surgery' does not address the blocker this unit presents to greatly more meaningful transformation of the station approach and forecourt. We would contend that demolition of the existing buildings that consist of the dental surgery and bookmakers is essential to enable the redesign of this key junction and access point. Appropriate re-provisioning of the Dental Surgery, Post Office and Newsagents and other business should of course be addressed in this case in the Station redesign. C. For both Station East and West lands, we would encourage the inclusion in scope for the addition of pedestrian crossings and for improvements to the crossings on the immediate roads: ● The lands to the Station's east exit present an absence of a suitable pedestrian crossing close to the station's exit on Perry Vale that the Society considers to be a hazard. ● The Station West land's current crossings of the immediate South Circular present a sense of 'islands within traffic zones'. These crossings significantly impede the sense of arrival for pedestrians including those arriving by rail to visit the significant cultural destination of the Horniman Museum and Gardens, and the Cultural Quarter site / commercial site of Havelock Walk. D. The walking and cycle environment can be compromised along with the necessary passing widths for wheelchairs and prams in case of poor placement of street furniture such as electric vehicle charging infrastructure. We encourage measures to ensure that public footpaths and cycleways in the area are only improved upon. E. Consideration should be given to improvements of the layout and configuration of Perry Vale from its junction with Waldram Place to the South Circular, particularly to address public footpath clutter and provision of space for storage of wheelie bins. (Appendix C)	Noted. The Local Plan is a strategic policy document and the Council needs to carefully consider the level of detail provided for each area within the site allocations. It would be too detailed to refer to all existing businesses that should be re-provided within all of the site allocations. This will be determined through the Development Management process. It is worthwhile referencing the need for an enhanced pedestrian environment, without citing specific, detailed schemes. Agree that the word retention of the existing dental surgery may restrict redevelopment from taking place.	Land at Forest Hill Station West site allocation amended to make reference to improving pedestrian crossings and pavement widths within the vicinity of the site and to remove the word "retention". Land at Forest Hill Station East site allocation amended to make reference to a new pedestrian crossing and pavement widths within the vicinity of the site
Forest Hill Society	3	LWA	**Appendix A – Forest Hill Station and Town Centre Masterplan (Discourse Architecture Design Pack)**	The Local Plan sets out the Council's strategic framework to facilitate Good Growth within and around Forest Hill. Officers have reviewed the community-led masterplan, and consider that the Local Plan reflects the broad aims and principles of	No change.

			Appendix B1 Forest Hill Station and Town Centre Master Plan: Provision of Housing and Commercial Space Estimates. **Appendix B2 Forest Hill Station and Town Centre Master Plan: Provision of Housing and Commercial Space Estimates.** **Appendix C: Waldram Place and Perry Vale Road Layout Alterations** The Society considers it essential that pedestrian crossing be installed on Perry Vale in proximity to the exit for Forest Hill Station. Whilst the crossing is not indicated on the sketches, the Council is invited to add this proposal in its entirety to the Local Plan. *Officer note: Appendix submitted as formal representations.*	this. However it is recognised that there are feasibility and financial viability issues which may preclude or complicate the delivery of some elements of the masterplan (for example, those dealing with strategic infrastructure such as the A205 and Forest Hill Station / station approach), and they have not therefore been incorporated into the Local Plan. The indicative site development capacities set out in the Local Plan site allocations have been established using a standard methodology, which the Council considers is robust.	
HopCroft Neighbourhood Forum	3	LWA Figure 18.2	**Fig 18.2:** • Should mark the key nature reserves along the marked 'strategic green links' • Duncombe Hill as a London Square and Local Green Space should be marked particularly as it is of significant visual amenity value. • Malham industrial estate should be marked as a designated employment site. • The Special landscape character of the New Cross to Forest Hill cutting should be marked.	Nature reserves are not planning policy designation but are noted in the Appendices of the Local Plan. Duncombe Hill has been designated as strategic open space within the made Crofton Park and Honor Oak Neighbourhood Plan. It is designated local green space. Employment sites are indicated in Fig.81 Employment Land Hierarchy.	No change.
Residents Drakefell and Gellatly Roads	3	LWA	After many years of dedicated collaboration with councillors on the issues of Drakefell and Gellatly Roads, we fully expected to see some mention of these roads in the detailed plan for the "West Area". However, Section 8 talks about transforming the South Circular, Brockley Rise and Brockley Road into "healthy streets" and there is not so much as a mention of Drakefell and Gellatly Roads. We would like to understand on what criteria Drakefell and Gellatly Roads are ruled out of being a Low Traffic Neighbourhood, or indeed of being a Safer School Street - the Haberdasher Aske's students have to cross Drakefell many times per day to reach their sports ground.	The Local Plan does not rule out streets being part of the Low Traffic Neighbourhoods. We will pass on your comments to the Transport team.	No change.
Residents Drakefell and Gellatly Roads	3	LWA	In May 2020 we wrote to Councillor Sophie McGeevor, as Cabinet Member for Transport, about the dangerously weak bridge on Avignon Road. We recommended that a bus gate be put in place. As far as we know, no changes have been made to the structure of the bridge and heavy skip vans and lorries continue to pass over it despite being significantly heavier than the weight restrictions. This is an urgent and dangerous issue. A simple solution of a bus gate with ANPR camera could improve safety while actually generating much needed funds for our road and our ward in general. We request an urgent update on this situation.	Specific transport improvements such as bus gates are beyond the scpe of the Local Plan. Your comments have been forwarded to the Transport team.	No change.
Sydenham Society	3	LWA	**Key Spatial Objectives** (p735) **Comment:** These are supported	Support noted.	No change.
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LWA	We have little comment on this section which appears to ignore Telegraph Hill. See our comments on the North Area for our overall view that the Telegraph Hill and Hatcham	Noted. The character areas or sub-areas in the Local Plan were informed by the Lewisham Characterisation Study, and provide a helpful means of providing	No change.

			Park Conservation Areas should be brought into the West Area in order to allow for a holistic treatment of the former Haberdashers' estate development and for our comments on how, if this is not done, the two sections of the Plan should be consistently presented to protect the joint area. The key requirement would be an SPD covering the whole estate.	policies at a more granular or neighbourhood area (rather than borough-wide) level. The Local Plan must be read as a whole for planning decisions, which is clearly stated in Part 1 of the plan. The Council will consider the preparation of future SPDs to support the implementation of the Local Plan, taking into account resources available and key priorities areas to support the delivery of the spatial strategy. For Conservation Areas, the Council has and will continue to prepare a suite of Area Appraisals which provide additional guidance.	
The Hatcham Society	3	LWA	We back the Telegraph Hill Society's view that Hatcham and Telegraph Hill, as parts of the Haberdashers' Estate, and as areas negatively affected by the A2, should be treated holistically in the Plan. Hatcham has more in common with Telegraph Hill (architecturally and in terms of heritage features) than with North Deptford. We propose therefore that the Hatcham area should be included in the West Area so that New Cross Gate, Hatcham Park and Telegraph Hill can be considered holistically.	Noted. The character areas or sub-areas in the Local Plan were informed by the Lewisham Characterisation Study, and provide a helpful means of providing policies at a more granular or neighbourhood area (rather than borough-wide) level. The Local Plan must be read as a whole for planning decisions, which is clearly stated in Part 1 of the plan.	No change.
The Hatcham Society	3	LWA	We also back the Telegraph Hill Society's view that a design guide on the Haberdashers' Estate (incorporating both the Telegraph Hill and Hatcham Conservation Areas) should be produced in order to ensure that a consistent approach is not lost by virtue of the arbitrary North/West split.	The Council will consider the preparation of future SPDs to support the implementation of the Local Plan, taking into account resources available and key priorities areas to support the delivery of the spatial strategy. For Conservation Areas, the Council has and will continue to prepare a suite of Area Appraisals which provide additional guidance.	No change.
Transport for London	3	LWA	We encourage public realm improvements around Forest Hill District Centre including to and near the South Circular. As mentioned in the local plan, we are happy to discuss the detailed plans along with Network Rail, before any details get incorporated in the local plan. It will be essential that bus journey times are not worsened. As part of this site allocation, consideration should be given to development of the large car park to the east of the station and some of the much smaller one adjacent to the main western entrance, along with public realm improvements.	Support noted. The site allocations in proximity to Forest Hill station include the existing car parks, and the policies support their rationalisation to deliver new mixed-use development that optimises the capacity of sites. The Council will continue to engage with GLA/TfL and Network Rail to deliver public realm and transport improvements in this area.	No change.
Residents of Sydenham Hill	3	LWA	**2. Sydenham Ridge: Area of Special Character** We are concerned that the proposal to remove the Area of Special Character from Sydenham Hill is intended to further the infill policy which has already eroded the green spaces and views across Kent from Sydenham Hill, as well as impacting negatively on our wildlife habitats and corridors. We have noted that the development of Wells Park Place and Exeter Place at the top of Wells Park Road / Sydenham Hill has resulted in large quantities of hard landscaping at the expense of green land, the destruction of a mature and majestic oak tree and the displacement of springs which have been forced to emerge further down the hill. Token planting of non-indigenous decorative trees in formal lines is no substitute for the habitats thereby lost.	Noted. Following a review of the designations it is proposed to include Sydenham Hill Ridge as an ASLC in the Regulation 19 document. The draft Local Plan sets out a revised suite of polices on green infrastructure (Part 2 – Green Infrastructure) which seeks to provide stronger protection and enhancement green spaces, tress and biodiversity/habitats.	Local Plan amended to include Sydenham Hill Ridge as an Area of Special Local Character.
Residents of Sydenham Hill	3	LWA	The proposed change to an Area of Special Local Character would allow building close up to non-heritage assets (such as the locally-listed buildings and the 1960s award-winning	Noted. Following a review of the designations it is proposed to include Sydenham Hill Ridge as an ASLC in the Regulation 19 document.	Local Plan amended to include Sydenham Hill Ridge as an Area of Special Local Character

			housing estates). The Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) would also be jeopardised on the Hillcrest Estate. The essential characteristic of the ridge, as a landmark running across the whole of South LONDON, of unbroken tree line, has already been threatened by the permission granted at Mais House, and demonstrates that the Tall Buildings policy carries no weight.		
Residents of Sydenham Hill	3	LWA	The reason given in the Lewisham Local Plan Appendix 2, para 6.8, is not convincing, that it would simplify the system if the designation were changed from ASC to ASLC, and appears to have no basis in terms of the importance given to the ridge by Natural England and by the GLA when it designated Sydenham Ridge as an Area of Special Character, " which comprises a topographical feature where tall or bulky buildings would affect the landscape and local residential amenity " (Lewisham Core Policy 17, the protected vistas, the London panorama and local views, landmarks and panoramas 2011 version) due to its "unique contribution to London".	Noted. Following a review of the designations it is proposed to include Sydenham Hill Ridge as an ASLC in the Regulation 19 document. It is considered that the draft Local Plan Part 2 policies on Building Heights and Views, in combination with the designation of Sydenham Hill Ridge as an ASLC, will provide appropriate policy protection for the character, landscape and topographical features of the ridge.	Local Plan amended to include Sydenham Hill Ridge as an Area of Special Local Character
Residents of Sydenham Hill	3	LWA	**We strongly oppose any change to the ASC designation**. The area of this designation however could be improved to extend it, so that it covers the entire Sydenham Hill Estate, and also ideally across the Lammas Green conservation area to go as far as the Horniman sites of borough importance.	Noted. Following a review of the designations it is proposed to include Sydenham Hill Ridge as an ASLC in the Regulation 19 document. It is considered that the draft Local Plan Part 2 policies on Building Heights and Views, in combination with the designation of Sydenham Hill Ridge as an ASLC, will provide appropriate policy protection for the character, landscape and topographical features of the ridge.	Local Plan amended to include Sydenham Hill Ridge as an ASLC.
	3	LWA Key spatial objectives	I am writing in response to the Consultation on the Lewisham Local Plan (closing date April 11th 2021). Regarding the Lewisham West section of the draft plan, I note the proposal to: *"Transform the South Circular (A205) and Brockley Rise / Brockley Road (B218) into 'healthy streets' with public realm improvements that make walking, cycling and use of public transport safer and more convenient".* Feeding into the B218 is the B2142 (Drakefell Road) which seems to have been omitted from the draft local plan. Lewisham council will recall that there has been a very long standing campaign by local residents regarding Drakefell Road. It is a residential road that suffers from traffic entirely unsuitable for a road of this nature. It is used by a large number of vehicles as a rat run to avoid heavy traffic on the A2 and A20.	The Local Plan does not rule out streets being part of the Low Traffic Neighbourhoods. We will pass on your comments to the Transport team.	No change.
	3	LWA Site Allocations	**Please provide your comments on the site allocation(s) selected above.** It seems excessive to have 3 separate sites in Forest Hill so close together. This will block views, create noise pollution due to works, increase traffic on the A205/more congestion at the bend to Forest Hill station which is dangerous. This is already densely populated area of Forest Hill. Lewisham Council suggest that the sites are mainly currently retail sites; that's simply not true; Perry Vale @	The London Plan provides a general direction that new development should be focussed within and around town centres and other highly accessible locations, amongst other locations. The Local Plan helps give effect to this approach through the spatial strategy for the borough. The Local Plan Part 2 policies set out requirements on design and will help to ensure that development proposals respond positively to the site and neighbourhood context. The	No change.

			Waldram Park Road & Waldram Crescent are heavily residential already and would be surrounded by these new sites.	West Area site allocations will support the delivery of the spatial strategy along with the long-term vitality and viability of Forest Hill district centre; they include development requirements and guidelines specific to the local context.	
Brockley Society	3	LWA 01	**Brockley Road and new development/intensification** Given the declared vision (LWA1 c, p757) that new development be directed to the main corridor of Brockley Road (B218) it is highlighted that those areas lying within the Brockley CA should be exempt from this requirement. In particular, the rows of shops and commercial property situated between: ^ Brockley Cross and along Brockley Road to Harefield Road ^ Wickham Road to Adelaide Avenue (known as 'Mid-town Brockley') should be excluded and that reliance on the assessment of future development should still be made via the Brockley CA SPD and the application of Article 4 Directions.	Noted. It is considered that the presence of a Conservation Area should not preclude development from coming forward. Sensitively managed intensification can be achieved where development conserves and enhances the significance of heritage assets and their setting, in line with national planning policy. The Local Plan makes clear the importance of the historic environment, and this is set out in Policy LWA1 and Part 2 policies (Heritage). Where there are heritage assets within or along the corridor, the policies will help to ensure that any such intensification is appropriate to the local context. The Local Plan must be read as a whole. The making of Article 4 Directions is outside the scope of the Local Plan.	No change.
Brockley Society	3	LWA 01	Page 737, paragraph B: We would suggest the following amendment: *Development proposals must respond positively to the character <u>and heritage value</u> of established residential areas…*	Noted.	Local Plan amended as suggested.
Brockley Society	3	LWA 01	Page 738, paragraph E: We would suggest the following amendment: *The sensitive intensification of established residential neighbourhoods will be supported where new development responds positively to their distinctive local character, including the landscape setting <u>and any conservation area or other heritage assets</u>.*	Noted.	Local Plan amended to refer distinctive local and historic character.
Brockley Society	3	LWA 01	Page 739, additions to paragraph J on page 738: For the reasons mentioned above, please add the following: *<u>d. Lewisham Alterations and Extensions SPD (2019)</u>* *<u>e. Where applicable, conservation area Character Appraisals and SPDs</u>*	Disagree. Select SPDs are mentioned within site allocations where they are directly relevant to the site.	No change.
HopCroft Neighbourhood Forum	3	LWA 01	This policy does allude to the historic landscape character : **"***The historic landscape character, including woodland and topography, is also a defining feature of the West Area, which was once covered by the Great North Wood. Proposals will be expected to maximise opportunities to integrate urban greening to respond to and connect the remnants of the woodland, along with protecting and enhancing important views and vistas. "* However, without explicit mention and highlighting on the map, it is not clear what this clause is referring to, especially to those who do not know the area. This must be better explained and the cutting must be explicitly mentioned. (See recommended text below) Clause B must say it will not support development of the historic area of special local landscape.	Buckthorne cutting – identified as MOL and is therefore offered the highest possible protection.	No change.

			The Buckthorne Cutting in Crofton Park formed part of the hamlet of Brockley Green, a name which has since disappeared from Ordnance Survey maps. It sat immediately adjacent to the area identified as being part of the 'Great North Wood' living landscape. The Great North Woods once stretched across the high ridge of land between Deptford, Selhurst and Streatham. It forms the western green infrastructure spine, connecting to the middle spine along the Catford Loop railway corridor. Between 1805 and 1809 the Croydon Canal was built and at Brockley Green/Buckthorne Cutting it reached its highest point (reported to be at 150/160 feet above sea level). The steep hill may explain why this section of woodland (Gorne Wood as it was named in 1600, to the the arrival of the canal in 1805) remained as a remnant of the Great North Wood. It currently sits above the level of surrounding roads, houses and rail sides.		
HopCroft Neighbourhood Forum	3	LWA 01	Clause J states: "*The Council has prepared evidence base documents and planning guidance to assist with understanding of the distinctive characteristics of the neighbourhoods and places within the West Area, and to help ensure coordination in the delivery of new …*" Where is this? How does it reference the non designated heritage areas and the cutting of special local landscape character?	The Council has prepared a number of studies to inform the preparation of the Local Plan, including the Lewisham Characterisation Study, Open Space Assessment and Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) review. These are available on the Council's planning webpages.	No change.
Sydenham Society	3	LWA 01	**LWA1 West Area Place Principles** (p737) **Comment:** These are supported	Support noted.	No change.
Telegraph Hill Society	3	LWA 01	If the current the split of the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area between North and West Areas is to continue, then it is important that the policies here are consistent, as far as the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area is concerned, with those of the West Area. In particular, the following policies are equally applicable to the North Area part of Telegraph Hill as they are to the West Area part. LWA1.B "Development proposals must respond positively to the character of established residential areas. This includes the historic character of the area's neighbourhoods, and particularly their town centres which are defined by their Victorian shopping parades and make an important contribution to local distinctiveness." LWA1.J Small site guidance generally. It would be wholly illogical to apply different policies to differing parts of the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area merely because they have been arbitrarily assigned to different Areas despite identical characterisations. It should also be considered that similar policies should apply to the Hatcham Conservation Area whose characteristics are similar to those of Telegraph Hill and Brockley. 243. An SPD or design guide on the Haberdashers' Estate (incorporating both the Telegraph Hill and Hatcham Park Conservation Areas) should be produced in order to ensure that this consistency of approach is not lost by virtue of the arbitrary North/West split. We would be very happy to work with the Council on an SPD or design code covering Telegraph Hill and have details of window designs, paths,	Noted. The character areas or sub-areas in the Local Plan were informed by the Lewisham Characterisation Study, and provide a helpful means of providing policies at a more granular or neighbourhood area (rather than borough-wide) level. The Local Plan must be read as a whole for planning decisions, which is clearly stated in Part 1 of the plan. It should be noted that the Local Plan Part 2 Policies on Heritage are borough-wide policies including for Conservation Areas. These will help to ensure consistency of approach in planning decisions for CAs. The Council will consider the preparation of future SPDs to support the implementation of the Local Plan, taking into account resources available and key priorities areas to support the delivery of the spatial strategy. For Conservation Areas, the Council has and will continue to prepare a suite of Area Appraisals which provide additional guidance.	No change.

			ironwork, original ornamentation, materials and similar considerations already available. 244. For our comment on § 15.59, see paragraph 234 above.		
Tewkesbury Lodge Estate Residents Association	3	LWA 01	We welcome the recognition of the woodland heritage that is highlighted in Lewisham's Plan for its West Area (The Lewisham Plan page 733) , and we are glad that proposals for development will be expected to "integrate urban greening to respond to and to connect with the remnants of the woodland" (I.e. the Great North Wood (The Lewisham Plan p 737)	Support noted.	No change.
	3	LWA 01	**Do you have any comments on the proposed approaches for the area? Select topic(s) and comment below. (LWA1 West Area Place Principles)** The suggestion the A205 will become a 'healthy street' is just not plausible. Lewisham Council have already admitted the South Circular on the station approach @ Forest Hill will get worse in October when low emissions zone extended as it's not included. Additionally, if you do nothing to divert the traffic at the blind bend where traffic is invariably queuing due to the traffic lights, this congestion will increase & traffic pollution will get worse not better. If Perry Vale is pedestrianized, the traffic will just be pushed on to the A205. How can that be a healthy street?	Whilst recognising the extent of the current ULEZ, the Council's position is that this should be extended beyond the South Circular and it will continue to lobby the Greater London Authority and Transport for London for this. The Local Plan seeks to give effect to the London Plan Healthy Streets Approach, including on the A205, however it is recognised the wording around this could be made clearer. The Council will continue to engage with GLA/TfL to deliver improvements to the environment and access around the junction at Forest Hill station, and along the A205, taking into account the feasibility and scope for measures on the major London roads. Even smaller measures using the Healthy Streets approach can have beneficial impacts on human health and the environment.	Local Plan amended to clarify terminology on the objective and principles to transform the A205 using the Healthy Streets Approach.
Discourse Architecture	3	LWA 01	*6. Enable the delivery of new workspace and housing along with enhancements to the Forest Hill station approach through the renewal of industrial land at Perry Vale and Clyde Vale, as well as the redevelopment of sites around the station. (p737)* Comment: Forest Hill station and its environs are currently under-developed and unattractive, with poor quality public spaces. The enhancement to the Forest Hill Station approach is supported. However, the reliance on piecemeal development of the key central sites will fail to deliver the comprehensive redevelopment required to deliver a high-quality public realm and regeneration of the town centre. The fundamental problem that hinders positive urban development in Forest Hill, as well as much of the Borough, is that inherited road and rail infrastructure forms a physical barrier to movement by vehicles and pedestrians, dividing the area. The current quality of this environment is poor, and a bolder approach is required to deliver the aspirations of local people, the Mayor of London's Healthy Streets initiative and the Mayor's New Plan for London.	We understand the concern regarding piecemeal development and would require a comprehensive masterplan to be prepared as part of any application coming forward. We acknowledge the issue of traffic through Forest Hill and will work with TFL to see how improvements can be made.	No change.

			The compartmentalized nature of sites around the station is a consequence of these barriers. A masterplan has been commissioned by the Council for Bell Green and Lower Sydenham, which is comprised of neighbouring sites under different ownership or tenure. The fragmented character of the sites around Forest Hill station makes the need for a coordinated vision for redevelopment more compelling. Without a Council commissioned urban plan, the challenge of creating transformative connections across the current road and rail barriers can never be adequately met. The local plan should require that a masterplan is developed building on the vision of the Forest Hill Society and Discourse Architecture proposals. A masterplan for the town centre could capitalize on the high footfall to the station and promote mixed use densification of the site appropriate to its location. Without a governing vision for the area, piecemeal development will continue to be unsatisfactory and fail to deliver the economic and social potential that local people demand. The local plan should be ensuring that development is within a framework that benefits local people. Failing the commission of a masterplan for the town centre, the Discourse Architecture / Forest Hill Society masterplan should be adopted as Supplementary Design Guidance for the future development. Following the issue of the New Mayor's Plan for London and consultation with Lewisham Planners, TFL and Network Rail, the DA/Forest Hill Society masterplan should be updated to include increased density of development and the redevelopment of the station on its existing site, rather than on the adjoining site.		
Forest Hill Society	3	LWA 03	**Cultural Heritage Issues** Commentary on Chapter 18 – Lewisham's West Area **LWA3 – A** The Forest Hill Society supports the Lewisham Plan the following: "Development proposals should contribute to securing the long-term vitality and viability of Forest Hill district town centre by enhancing the place qualities of the centre and its surrounds, as well as reinforcing its role as a key focal point for commercial, cultural and community activity." As a district town centre within Lewisham, Forest Hill is an economic engine for growth, prosperity and jobs for the wider community. The town centre offers a mix of high street shops interspersed with a number of independent retailers, many based around both lifestyle and culture. The area attracts a range of businesses. The area's attraction extends into the evenings with a range of restaurants and pubs attracting visitors from across the Borough and neighbouring areas in Southwark and Bromley. This in turn attracts residents who benefit from this range of local business and services as well as fast access to central London.	Support noted.	No change.
Forest Hill Society	3	LWA 03	LWA – C The Forest Hill Society supports the proposal that:	Support noted.	No change.

			"Development proposals must contribute to enhancing the public realm in order to promote walking and cycling, as well as to make the town centre a significantly more accessible, safer and attractive environment." The continuing success of Forest Town Hill as a district town centre, cultural quarter and area of local significance of night-time economic activity is at risk due to poor access for pedestrians in the surrounding road layouts and with access to and from the rail station. Therefore, we would invite the Council to give immediate consideration to those movements along main routes and station approaches within the responsibility of Lewisham Council and key transport partners Network Rail and TfL. This includes: ● Improving the pedestrian crossing at the junctions of the South Circular, Dartmouth Road and Devonshire Road. ● Improving the access to Forest Hill Station on the east side/Perry Vale entrance. This is wholly unsuitable for users with mobility issues or for families with small children or infants. ● Improving accessibility to the underpass connecting the existing town centre to Perry Vale shops and parking. ● Install a suitable pedestrian crossing at, or very near to the Perry Vale entrance of the station to cross Perry Vale. ● Cycle access on north/south and east/west routes into Forest Hill town centre. ● Improving the public realm.	We will pass your more detail transport comments onto our Transport team.	
Forest Hill Society	3	LWA 03 LWA SA 05 LWA SA 06 LWA SA 10 LWA SA 11	**Forest Hill Station & Town Centre Master Plan: Objectives and Aspirations: Areas 5, 6, 10 & 11** This addresses *LWA3 Forest Hill district town centre and surrounds* and the site allocations defined for *Lewisham's West Area.* Specifically, for Site Allocations 5, 6, 10 and 11, while proposed as separate site allocations, we feel it important these should be developed with a single vision as these sites are interconnected particularly as part of the district town centre. 1. A proposal characterised by, "***We have a once in a 100 years' opportunity to shape the centre of Forest Hill, reflecting the needs and aspirations of people that live and work in the area.***" 2. A significant opportunity for Public Realm visual enhancement that enhances and highlights the approaches to Forest Hill station on both the east and west side. 3. Develop transport links for the town centre and improve connections across the existing disparate parts of the centre. This should include enhancement to cycle routes with upgrades to the existing Sydenham Park footbridge and potential for examining the feasibility of an additional footbridge that will serve as a link between the Perry Vale car park and Dartmouth Road/London Road to provide a safer, more accessible and friendly access to Forest Hill Pools and the introduction of improved bus services that will enhance the visitor access experience to the Town Centre.	Whilst the Local Plan is a strategic policy document we have included design requirements and guidelines to guide development proposals coming forward. We accept that a masterplan for Forest Hill and indeed a number of other locations within the borough which are accommodating significant levels of growth would be beneficial. The Council has limited resources and capacity at present but will continue to review this situation.	No change.

			4. Redevelop the station building and expand its footprint with reprovision of retail and commercial space and upgrade the station to step-free level access for all platforms. 5. Improve the station forecourt combined with a radical new layout of the Dartmouth Road/London Road/Devonshire Road junction and pedestrian crossing inclusive of the removal of the buildings containing WH Smiths, the bookmaker premises and the dental surgery with businesses being reprovisioned within the station redevelopment. 6. Create a new level-access entrance to the station in the Perry Vale car park. 7. Transfer dedicated parking for the station from the station forecourt to the Perry Vale car park. 8. Introduce the opportunity to provide an estimated equivalent of up to 400 new housing units that are sensitively sited and of high-quality design. These numbers align well with the LLP's estimates for the West Site Allocations 5. Station West (86), 6. Clyde Vale (15), 10. Station East (41) and 11. Perry Vale (122) which estimated close to 300 expected units. 9. Introduce an estimated 3,062 m² (sqm) commercial floor space with an equivalent volume of 9,291 m3 (cubm). 10. Upgrade the existing car park on Perry Vale to conform to ACPO and Home Office Scientific Development Branch standards for a secure car park status with good quality design, improved lighting, controlled access and CCTV coverage. 11. Introduce measures supported by policy to install rapid-charge points for EVs in Perry Vale carpark and other publicly owned car parks. 12. Develop proposals that enhance connections from the Perry Vale side of the station to the town centre redevelopment along with the introduction of significantly elevated measures for greening (trees and shrubbery in particular) in keeping with several other principles defined in the Local Plan.		
Forest Hill Society	3	LWA 03	**LWA3 – B** The Forest Hill Society fully supports the proposal to designate the town centre as a cultural quarter and as an area of local significance of night-time economic activity, in line with Policy EC18 (culture and night-time economy). While the plan focuses on the twin anchors of the Horniman Museum and Havelock Walk, the area has additional attributes that add value to this designation and should be considered towards this. ● Heritage and culture are interlinked, and the area includes several conservation areas including Forest Hill in the town centre and Perry Vale and the Christmas Estate adjacent to the town centre. ● The area includes exceptional Victorian and Edwardian architecture including on Dartmouth Road Louise House, the community-run Forest Hill Library, Forest Hill Pools and Holy Trinity Church of England Primary School (all listed buildings).	Noted. This is too detailed for the Local Plan but could feed into any Cultural strategy or masterplan for the area.	No change.

			● Efforts should be made to identify further buildings which contribute to Forest Hill's cultural heritage and support the night-time economy. This may include special designation for pubs that lie in the district town centre. ● Retail operations in Forest Hill reflect the cultural mix of Forest Hill with stores based on art, crafts, music and heritage goods (antiques). ● The town centre benefits from a wide range of restaurants and pubs, which cater for a wide range of demographics both within Forest Hill and Lewisham and to visitors who will come to the area for its cultural activities. ● Outdoor leisure activity is also offered in and adjacent to the town centre with the Forest Hill Pools, Albion Millennium Green, Horniman Gardens and Sydenham Hill Wood. All of these offers links to both the areas heritage and cultural history of Forest Hill.		
Sydenham Society	3	LWA 04	**LWA4 West Lewisham Links** (p747) **Comment:** These are supported	Support noted.	No change.
Forest Hill Society	3	LWA Key spatial objectives	The Society fully supports the above noted Spatial Objectives 2, 4, 6 and 9. Though to achieve Objective 4, there are necessary and significant alterations needed to pedestrian movement around the Town Centre. This includes improving the existing poor access for pedestrians in the surrounding road layout and to and from the rail station. Rectifying this would contribute to the areas' place as a Community Hub, plus development of commercial and employment opportunities. We invite the Council to acknowledge that adoption of the Forest Hill Station and Town Centre Master Plan (Master Plan) will constitute a major contribution to workspace and housing creation in Forest Hill. The Master Plan was created through a community consultation and carries significant community endorsement. It warrants adoption into the Lewisham Local Plan. In line with Objective 9, the Society is strongly committed to both Environment and Greening issues. We recommend the Council include additional opportunities for local engagement in the identification of designation of new Local Green Spaces. This will deliver both short and medium term successes culminating in both walking and cycling improvements that will be made more enjoyable for residents and visitors.	Support noted. The Local Plan sets out the Council's strategic framework to facilitate Good Growth within and around Forest Hill. Officers have reviewed the community-led masterplan, and consider that the Local Plan reflects the broad aims and principles of this. However it is recognised that there are feasibility and financial viability issues which may preclude or complicate the delivery of some elements of the masterplan (for example, those dealing with strategic infrastructure such as the A205 and Forest Hill Station / station approach), and they have not therefore been incorporated into the Local Plan. Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the Council has prepared additional evidence base studies on Open Space taking into account feedback received. The Local Plan also encourages Neighbourhood Forums to identify new Local Green Space in neighbourhood plans.	No change.
Lewisham Cyclists	3	LWA Key spatial objectives	Page 735 Key Spatial Objective 8 in the main document refers to "Transform the South Circular (A205) and Brockley Rise / Brockley Road (B218) into 'healthy streets'" . We would suggest the wording of this is altered to "adopt the healthy streets approach along the South Circular (A205) and Brockley Rise / Brockley Road (B218) corridor" and encourage the planning team to follow TfL guidance on this which is clear and unequivocal. This should also form part of the strategic planning document for the whole corridor, and form conditions of planning along the	Noted. Local Plan Part 4 deals with funding and delivery and signposts that S106 may be used for Healthy Streets measures.	Local Plan amended to clarify terminology on the objective and principles to transform the A205 using the Healthy Streets Approach.

			corridor, including CIL contributions to part fund improvements.		
	3	LWA Key spatial objectives	**Lewisham West Area** Do you have any comments on the proposed key objectives? Three sites at Forest Hill seems excessive. The areas around here have shops yes, but there are residential flats above all of these as well as various existing flat conversions/apartment blocks, along Waldram Park Road/Crescent. The suggestion the area will also now be a 'night-time' hub is concerning to existing residents due to noisy pub goers making their way home. Pre-pandemic, we frequently had incidents of urinating in our apartment block's bin store and individuals trying to gain access to our flats (heavily intoxicated). A night-time hub is not wanted by residents. There are enough pubs/restaurants already.	Noted. The Council has undertaken numerous studies, including a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, to identify sites suitable for development in order to meet the Borough's identified needs for housing and commercial space. The West Area of the Borough has a comparatively limited number of site allocations (potential development sites) and housing capacity when compared to other sub-areas, such as the North, Central and South. It is considered that the sites identified for Forest Hill are deliverable and will support the spatial strategy. The proposed designation of Forest Hill as an area of local significance for the evening and night-time economy both reflects and seeks to build on the town centre's existing character and function in supporting such complementary activities, and will help to support its long term vitality and viability. The Local Plan includes a refreshed suite of policies to help ensure that local amenity is protected.	No change.
Discourse Architecture	3	LWA Key spatial Objectives	Discourse Architecture prepared the 'Forest Hill Urban Renewal' masterplan for the centre of Forest Hill in consultation with the Forest Hill Society in 2017 18 LEWISHAM'S WEST AREA (p733) Key Spatial Objectives (p737) Comment: These are supported	Support noted.	No change.
Sydenham Society	3	LWA SA 09 LWA SA 12 LWA SA 13	**Site Allocations** (p751) *9 Willow Way LSIS* *12 Land at Sydenham Road and Loxley Close* *13 113-157 Sydenham Road* Development proposals for the above sites should be made within the context of a fully consulted-upon Masterplan and should conform to the design-led approach. Any future development on the site at 113-157 Sydenham Road should be very carefully considered, given the proximity of the locally listed Dolphin public house and garden. The principal current use of a car dealership affords an open aspect across this corner of Mayow Road and Sydenham Road with attractive views of the west-facing gable end of the pub. On the eastern side of the site, Berrymans Lane consists of a unique terrace of brick-built cottages which should be preserved.	The draft Local Plan sets a spatial planning framework the borough and West Area, which all development proposals on these sites will be required to respond positively to. The Regulation 18 stage consultation has provided the opportunity for the public to comment on the proposals for this spatial framework. The draft Local Plan Part 4 sets out that strategic site allocations should be accompanied by a site-wide masterplan, which supports the delivery of the spatial strategy. The Local Plan is clear that all new development must be delivered using the design-led approach. Site Allocation for 113-157 Sydenham Road includes development requirements for protecting the public house and its amenity.	113-157 Sydenham Road site allocation amended by referring to the gable end of the pub and the terrace on Berry Man's Lane.
	3	LWA SA 01	With regard to the proposals at 111-115 Endwell Road, I would repeat some of the above statements. The development of employment premises and homes on the Endwell Road/Brockley Cross Howarth Timber site should not add any traffic at all to the already congested junction at Brockley Cross. The development should be promoted as carbon neutral with access exclusively by public transport or non-carbon modes to meet the needs of the climate emergency we are now in. The buildings should	Noted. The Local Plan broadly seeks to promote modal shift away from private car use to movement by walking, cycling and use of public transport. Car parking provision on the site will be considered having regard to the maximum parking standards set by the London Plan. The Local Plan Part 2 policies on sustainable design and infrastructure set out requirements for minimising carbon emissions. The site allocation development guidelines refer to the	No change.

			be of a human scale to not greater height (2-3 storeys) to the nineteenth and twentieth century buildings on adjacent streets. Lewisham Gateway is a site of tall buildings; the Brockley Cross area must not be.	need for development to respond positively to the site surroundings, including established residential buildings.	
Forest Hill Society	3	LWA SA 03	**Site Allocation 3 Jenner Health Centre** We support the inclusion of this site as an area of opportunity, and we emphasise the need for appropriate re-provision of the existing health care facility on the same site. We also recommend that road access to parking for the health care facility be carefully considered. Current road access is inside the new ULEZ boundary. Future road access should be considered from Stanstead Road to not financially penalize patients who require vehicle transport.	Support noted. The site allocation for Health Centre will enable the facility to be reprovided at the current site as part of a new mixed-use development. Any proposal for off-site reprovision would only be considered where other Local Plan policies on community infrastructure are satisfied. Whilst recognising the extent of the current ULEZ, the Council's position is that this should be extended beyond the South Circular and it will continue to lobby the Greater London Authority and Transport for London for this. Additional requirements as suggested are considered to be inconsistent with this position. To avoid repetition and to aid implementation of Policy TR4, references to the level of car parking required have been removed.	No change.
HopCroft Neighbourhood Forum	3	LWA SA 03	We support recommendation for Jenner Health Centre development	Support noted.	No change.
NHS (HUDU)	3	LWA SA 03 LSA SA 05	We support the site allocations for Sydenham Green Group Practice and Jenner Health Centre. As the SELCCG and wide health sector review future needs in light of the challenges of the pandemic, the recently established Primary Care Networks and the South East London Integrated Care System (ISC) ongoing discussion with the Council as the local planning authority is welcomed. This will include identifying areas where additional or expanded capacity is required, and where existing facilities may need to change to provide modern affordable facilities.	Support noted. The Council has and will continue to engage with the NHS and other stakeholders to identify and plan for health care provision to meet local needs through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which sits alongside the Local Plan.	No change.
NHS Property Services	3	LWA SA 03 Call for sites	**Site Allocations** NHSPS is the freehold landowner of a number of health facilities in Lewisham. Discussions have previously taken place in support of the following draft site allocations: 3. Jenner Health Centre, 201-203 Stanstead Rd, London SE23 1HU A site submission was also made for South Lewisham Health Centre, 50 Conisborough Crescent, SE6 2SS, however no draft allocation appears for this site in the consultation document. Our representations review both sites in turn, taking account of proposed, and potential land use allocations.	We are not adding site allocations at this stage of the plan process. This site may be considered through a plan review in due course.	No change.
NHS Property Services	3	LWA SA 03	**3. Jenner Health Centre** The draft allocation for Jenner Health Centre is for a comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment of the existing health centre with residential and community uses. NHSPS support this allocation in principle and wish to make the following comments.	Support for Jenner Health Centre site allocation noted. However, it is not considered necessary to amend the policy as suggested, as development proposals involving the redevelopment and rationalisation of the existing facility would also be considered against Policy CI1, which is referred in the development guidelines.	No change.

			Jenner Health Centre is an existing operational purpose-built health facility dating from the 1970s. The existing building occupying the site comprises c. 2,000 sqm GIA of Class E health centre space, formerly D1. There have been extensions to the original building occurring in the 1990's and the existing building is considered to be of no architectural merit. The facility is outdated and in need of investment to meet the level of patient care required, now, and in the future. While the site is well used, it is currently underutilised in terms of development capacity and represents a good opportunity to improve the public realm, while providing an intensified mixed-use health led development, and housing. The site itself is in the freehold ownership of NHSPS and we have been working to understand development potential in light of health care requirements. NHSPS therefore support the proposed allocation of this site in principle and given the context, close to the surrounding centres, there is potential to increase the existing land use density and height. This would make way for a high-quality building with a new health centre and much needed residential dwellings. The residential element of this site will allow for investment in the new healthcare buildings and services for the community. The current aspiration is to redevelop the existing healthcare facility, with enabling residential development funding new and improved healthcare facilities and the NHS requires that sufficient value be generated to do this. An assessment will be made to help establish a reasonable development quantum and type of development to ensure the NHS can deliver a new healthcare facility. The greater the sites development potential, the greater value can be derived for investment in essential health services. NHSPS therefore support the acknowledgement that this site can be intensified. In summary, NHSPS support the principle of the proposed redevelopment of the site and seek to ensure that the site is allocated within the New Local Plan. Whilst there is an active healthcare need and demand on this site, with plans progressing to improve facilities, the NHS does require flexibility in its estate. Therefore, to guarantee the allocation is sound, by being sufficiently flexible, the allocation should also allow for a residential use only, if the healthcare services can be re-provided elsewhere. Any relocation would involve improving services, potentially co-located/integrated with other uses and in a more accessible location in accordance with commissioning requirements. To achieve this, a suggested amendment is provided below:		

			Site allocation: Comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment of existing health centre with enabling residential ~~and community uses,~~ or residential only, if the existing services are relocated within an alternative healthcare facility in the wider area. Any relocation of services would need to be thoroughly assessed and ultimately approved by commissioners. This process would also be in accordance with Core Strategy Policies CS19 (Provision and maintenance of community and recreational facilities) and CS20 (Delivering educational achievements, healthcare provision and promoting healthy lifestyles). This would also correspond with the objectives of London Plan policies S1 (Developing London's social infrastructure) and S2 (Health and social care facilities) which seek to ensure enhanced and improved social infrastructure is delivered in London.		
	3	LWA SA 03	Unfortunately I can't make the zoom meeting tonight but I would like to know more about the planned development for The Jenner Health centre. It is in need of development and could provide a lot of homes. However, the site is very polluted because of the traffic junction at brocket rise/A205. I believe this area was responsible for the pollution that caused Ella Kissi Debrah's tragic death. Do you have monitoring at this site? What sort of housing is planned for the site? I heard it might be sheltered housing for vulnerable people who are most affected by air pollution. How will you protect them from high levels of air pollution? Will there be car park space for residents? How will you ensure the development doesn't contribute to raised air pollution levels here in the short and long term? During recent roadworks 19-22 Feb, traffic was diverted down St Germans road. It was interesting to see there was very little build up of traffic here as cars could access the A205 without queuing and homes are further away from the road here. Is there a way of diverting traffic from queueing at Brockley rise that wouldn't adversely affect air pollution on the alternative routes?	Noted. The Local Plan broadly seeks to promote modal shift away from private car use to movement by walking, cycling and use of public transport. This approach is set in the context of improving poor air quality, and the A205 is an Air Quality Management Area. Car parking provision on the site will be considered having regard to the maximum parking standards set by the London Plan and the Local Plan Policy TR4. The nature of housing provision, including tenure type and dwelling mix, will be considered at the planning application stage, having regard to the Local Plan Part 2 Housing policies. Traffic diversion schemes are beyond the scope of the Local Plan.	No change.
Discourse Architecture	3	LWA SA 3	Comment: We support the proposed redevelopment of the site to provide housing and re-provision of the health centre. Given the scale of existing buildings on Brockley Rise and St Germans Road, which is higher than on Stanstead Road, we would support a maximum height of development as follows: Stanstead Road: 3-4-storeys Brockley Rise: 3-4-storeys	Support noted. Following the Regulation 18 consultation, additional work on the Tall Buildings Study has been undertaken to inform the Local Plan policies on buildings heights.	Local Plan amended with more detailed requirements on buildings heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.

			St Germans Road: 3-4-storeys We do not support higher development in the centre of the site		
	3	LWA SA 04	Regarding the above proposed development of up to 30 residential units, could you please indicate how any re-development might impact on the existing residents of the Havelock House estate. I realise that things are at a very early stage, but as a resident of Havelock House, I have some concerns as to how this might impact on the all the residents of Havelock House and its 2 other blocks on the estate. I look forward to hearing from you.	The site allocations has been removed from the Plan	Havelock House, Telecom Site and Willow Tree House site allocation has been removed from the Plan.
Forest Hill Society	3	LWA SA 04	**Site Allocation 4 Havelock House, Telecom Site and Willow Tree House, near Horniman Drive** We recognise that there is potential for development on this site but we have concerns about possible impact on existing trees and small woodland area at the rear of the site. Consideration should be given to additional TPOs on this site to recognise the importance of this site, while leaving other space for potential development.	Agree that redevelopment of the site would result in the loss of green infrastructure, so the site has been removed from the Plan	Havelock House, Telecom Site and Willow Tree House site allocation has been removed from the Plan.
Tewkesbury Lodge Estate Residents Association	3	LWA SA 04	We have carefully considered the proposal for "The Havelock House/Telecom Mast Site / Willow Tree House Site" but at present we feel that we must oppose it for the following reasons. We think that in its present form the proposal is contrary to many of the principles that are set out in the Council's Development Plan. 1. Green space. Within the Green Infrastructure (Section 10) section of the plan is the statement that "The Council will seek to deliver net gains in biodiversity (and support the London Plan to be 50% green by 2050". More specifically for the West Area, Point 9 of the objectives is to "Protect and enhance open and green spaces along with the distinctive woodland character of the area" . The proposed development of The Telecom Site will reduce the area of green space within the Borough by more than any other proposed site mentioned in the development plan for Lewisham West, and possibly by more than any other proposed site in the plan for the whole of Lewisham. 2. The Great North Wood. The Development Plan for the West Area makes welcome reference to remnants of the Great North Wood that can still be seen in Forest Hill (see paras 18.2, 18.8, 18.9, 18.13). These remnants form a wildlife corridor between Sydenham Woods and One Tree Hill, both of which are recognised as Nature Reserves in the London Borough of Southwark. The proposed development site is one of the best parts of the Great North Wood that we have in Forest Hill, and for that matter in Lewisham. The Council should make sure that it retains not only all the Oak trees on the skyline but also the other areas of natural woodland that lie below, between The Telecom Mast and both Willow Tree House and Havelock House. Wildlife habitats. On page 368 of the Plan is the statement in para 10:11 that "It is imperative	Agree that redevelopment of the site would result in the loss of green infrastructure, so the site has been removed from the Plan	Havelock House, Telecom Site and Willow Tree House site allocation has been removed from the Plan.

			that wildlife habitats are protected and appropriately managed so that their special biodiversity value is maintained and, ideally, improved over the long-term." The current wildlife value of the site is demonstrated by the following and recent observations. A pair of Peregrine Falcons bred there last summer. The Peregrine is at the top of the food chain, and "our" Peregrines would have preyed on small birds over the whole of the development site. A flock of 50 Redwing arrived from Scandinavia just before Christmas and 5 remained around the site until March. The site forms an important link in the wildlife corridor - see below. 3. Wildlife corridors. As described in paras 2 and 3 above, the Oak trees on the development site are part of a wildlife corridor which traces the course of the former Great North Wood from Sydenham Woods to One Tree hill. Woodland birds still migrate along this corridor. In Spring there are Chiffchaff, Willow Warblers and Blackcap (regularly), Buzzard and Red Kite (occasionally) and Hobby and Firecrest (rarely). In late Summer there are Chiffchaff, Willow Warblers and Garden Warblers (regularly) and Pied Flycatchers (rarely). In Winter there are Redwing (regularly) and Brambling, Siskin and Redpoll (rarely) 4.Biodiversity. Rare downland grasses, plants and invertebrates have been found on the nearby Honor Oak Road Reservoir Site, and a similar survey of the grassy slopes of the proposed development site would be prudent. We welcome the mention in the Plan of the need to survey all mature trees. However there are areas of hedge and scrub which add to the biodiversity of the site. For example they provide nesting sites for song birds which construct open nests, which are vulnerable to predation by squirrels and domestic cats. Blackbirds in particular have almost disappeared from our area. 5. Net gains in biodiversity. We recommend that additional native trees other than Oak be planted on the proposed development site, partly to shield existing residents from the sight of the two masts that are on the site, but also to increase biodiversity. This would support the Council in its Plan "to deliver net gains in biodiversity (and support the London Plan to be 50% green by 2050)". We are working with the Council to raise funds to plant native Hornbeam on the nearby Horniman Triangle to increase the biodiversity of our Great North Wood remnants: they are equally needed on the Telecom Site. Other concerns. As well as our concerns for the natural environment we also have the following concerns about the development of the site. 1. If the Telecom Mast is to be retained, then the recommendations of the Stewart Report should be		

			followed, and local accommodation should not be built in close proximity to the Mast. 2. Again if the Telecom Mast is to be retained, it would not be safe for a public footpath to pass close to such a potentially dangerous construction. 3. Also, if the Telecom mast is to be retained it will not be possible to accommodate 30 residential units without radically changing the character of the site. According to The Plan's map, there is insufficient space for the construction of the 30 additional homes that are described in the plan, if they are to be built in the style of buildings already on the site and around it. 4. Finally, the steep gradient of the site makes the creation of "the feel of a village green" (as described in the Plan) unrealistic. Conclusions We recognise that there is a pressing need for additional housing, and we know that the Council is obliged to meet the target of providing 1667 new homes every year. But the Council is also committed to "to deliver net gains in biodiversity (and support the London Plan to be 50% green by 2050)". On this site, which may be the greenest site in the Plan, we think that the needs of the environment should come first. For these reasons we urge the Council to remove the Telecom Mast, Willow Tree House and Havelock House from its Development Plan.		
Discourse Architecture	3	LWA SA 05 LWA SA 10	5 Land at Forest Hill Station west (Devonshire & Dartmouth Roads) (p760) 10 Land at Forest Hill Station East (Waldram Place and Perry Vale) (p771) Comments on Sites 5, 10 &Forest Hill Town Centre & Station Further to our comments above on Lewisham's West Area - Key Spatial Objectives (p735), this critical area within Forest Hill should be subject to a masterplan, not left for piecemeal development. The public realm in the town centre is currently not fit for purpose. The Local Plan should establish a framework for redevelopment that promotes high quality buildings and public space on both sides of the railway. Forest Hill is currently divided by the heavy traffic of the South Circular and the rail line. The Local Plan should address these issues, which have a negative impact on the lives of local people. The pedestrian routes under the line via the existing station underpass and Waldram Crescent pavement should be improved and made more accessible.	Where there has been no advanced pre-application discussions the council has used a SHLAA based method to determine indicative site capacities – more details can be found in the Ste Allocations Background Paper Following the Regulation 18 consultation, the site capacities and mix of uses have been re-visited. This has taken into account the complexities of both sites including the need for an appropriate a mix of employment and town centre uses at this district centre site, whilst introducing residential uses and creating a sense of arrival into the district centre. ~~-~~Based on these considerations, the residential units and emplpyment floorspace have been amended for Land at Forest Hill Station West whilst they have remained the same at Land at Forest Hill Station East. Optimal capacity for the sites will be established at planning application stage through a design led approach.	Land at Forest Hill Station West and Land at Forest Hill Station East site allocations amended by making reference to masterplanning and landowners working in partnership. Land at Forest Hill Station West site allocations amended by reducing residential to 80 units and increasing employment floorspace to 801m^2.

			A new footbridge over the line, between Perry Vale and Clyde Terrace, could connect the east and west sides of Forest Hill and potentially link the residents of Perry Vale Ward with Forest Hill Pools. Improved residential links would create a more favourable commercial environment for the shops and restaurants at the north end of Perry Vale, which is currently cut off from the centre of Forest Hill. We believe that the density of development, in particular residential accommodation, could be increased in line with the new Mayor's Plan for London and the Forest Hill Society / Discourse Architecture master plan for the town centre.		
	3	LWA SA 07 LWA SA 04	**Site Allocation: Featherstone Lodge, Eliot Bank and Havelock House, Telecom Site, Willow Tree House, Honor Oak Road** • Both these sites are along the ridge of the Great North Wood, and retain its basic natural features of mature trees with grassland. They are an important part of the green corridor from Sydenham Hill Woods to One Tree Hill and are rich in local fauna and flora. These must be retained and enhanced as part of any housing development plan, along with ways to make it an inviting place for residents as set out above. London Wildlife Trust is an expert in these woodland habitats as it has managed the Sydenham Hill Wood nature reserve since the 1980s, and has run the Great North Wood project for the past 4 years. This has done much to develop the sense of integrity and history of the area and its value to the natural environment. I would urge the Council to work with the Trust to establish firm ground rules for developers, for these and any other development proposals along the ridge**.**	Disagree, Featherstone Lodge site allocation provides a variety of references to mature trees, natural landscaping and a tree survey, in order to protect the natural setting of the site. Agree that significant redevelopment of the Havelock House site and grounds may result in the loss of green infrastructure, so the site has been removed from the Plan	Havelock House, Telecom Site and Willow Tree House site allocation has been removed from the Plan.
Sydenham Society	3	LWA SA 08 LWA SA 14 LWA SA 15	**Other sites listed**: the former Sydenham Police Station in Dartmouth Road, 74-78 Sydenham Road and 154-158 Sydenham Road are all in the process of being built out.	Agree that the Sydenahm Police Station site has been completed and that 154-158 Sydenham Road is nearing completion.	Sydenham Police Station and 154-158 Sydenham Road site allocations have been removed from the Plan.
	3	LWA SA 08	The Build at Site 8, The Former Sydenham Police Station of 33 units. This private development is virtually completed, I was surprised to find, having moved around the area very little during the Pandemic. What if any requirements were applied to the particular build by Lewisham Planning? What proportion of this private build is Affordable, what are the CIL costs payable to Lewisham Council and how will the CIL monies be used to contribute to improvements in infrastructure, environment or other local community improvements? The Build at Site 14, 154-160 Sydenham Road, another private development behind the main street frontages of 76 units near to Kent House Road. This is quite a large development. What, if any, requirements were applied to the particular build by Lewisham Planning? What proportion of this private build is Affordable, what are the CIL costs payable to Lewisham Council and how will the CIL monies be used to contribute to improvements in	Agree that the Sydenahm Police Station site has been completed and that 154-158 Sydenham Road is nearing completion.	Sydenham Police Station and 154-158 Sydenham Road site allocations have been removed from the Plan.

			infrastructure, environmental or any community improvements. Is any of this money available to local usage, as for instance you talk of improving frontages and many of the shop fronts in this area are shabby and need improvement, viability of businesses appears fragile?		
Forest Hill Society	3	LWA SA 09	**Site Allocation 9 Willow Way Locally Significant Industrial Site** We support the designation of Willow Way as a Locally Significant Industrial Site and believe that a combination of employment and residential uses is appropriate for the site. With careful development, there is the opportunity to ensure space for employment that fits with the nearby Forest Hill Cultural Quarter and supports the cultural and creative industries.	Support noted.	No change.
	3	LWA SA 09	I am writing to express my disapproval of the proposed development at the above site [Willow Way LSIS). There is a garage on this site, and car body shop, both of which I have used, in particular the garage and MOT Service centre. It has taken me 25 years of being a car owner to find a local garage which I trust, is female friendly (i.e., not patronising or scary) and does a great job at a reasonable price. This is an important local family run business that needs local support and has many loyal customers. I urge the council to rethink this proposal. The area already has empty flats on Kirkdale, we don't need more, but the local residents do need good local businesses in order to keep it flourishing	Following the Regulation 18 consultation the Council has held landowner meetings. Informed by these discussions the site allocation for the Willow Way employment site has been amended to provide more certainty over the masterplan process and outcomes sought. This includes protections for the MOT centre and the amenity of the neighbouring public house.	Willow Way LSIS site allocation has been amended to provide more certainty over the masterplan process, to give protection for the MOT centre and the amenity of the neighbouring public house.
	3	LWA SA 09	I. Views: It is a mistake to think that tall buildings can be built, say on the Sainsburys site, without obstructing the views from Telegraph Hill. That is where the real claustrophobia comes in. These views can never be replaced once gone. The example is the mess the city of London has made by totally allowing St Paul's cathedral to be obscured. It is so hard to see it now. This is vandalism. Certain cities like Paris have had the vision to see that these are immeasurably important assets. Panoramic views from Telegraph Hill fall in this bracket.	Noted. Following the Regulation 18 consultation, additional work on the Tall Buildings Study has been undertaken to inform the Local Plan policies on buildings heights. The London Plan sets out the London View Management Framework, which the Local Plan helps to give effect to – further details are set out in the Local Plan Part 2 policies on View Management.	Local Plan amended with more detailed requirements on buildings heights, informed by the Tall Buildings Study update.
	3	LWA SA 09	This is to affirm my opposition to the proposal {Willow Way West] My home is in Taylor's Lane, a km away, and I have been a customer at Dartmouth Service Station for (I believe) twenty plus years. It is an excellent small business- the sort you should be encouraging to flourish- and I can assure you that it is highly regarded locally. The proposal would mean its closure, loss of employment and the loss of a valued local amenity. I hope that you will ensure its survival.	Following the Regulation 18 consultation the Council has held landowner meetings. Informed by these discussions the site allocation for the Willow Way employment site has been amended to provide more certainty over the masterplan process and outcomes sought. This includes protections for the MOT centre and the amenity of the neighbouring public house.	Willow Way LSIS site allocation has been amended to provide more certainty over the masterplan process, to give protection for the MOT centre and the amenity of the neighbouring public house.
	3	LWA SA 11	I am a resident in Brockley Cross and I believe the site used by Howarth (timber shop) in Brockley Cross is a great site to develop. Brockley station (1 minute walk, 10-20 minutes	Support noted. The site allocation mentions that employment floorspace must be re-provided but also states that uses must be sensitively integrated into	No change.

			into the City), three bus lines (171,172, 484), three primary schools and two secondary within walking distance (John Stainer, Haberdasher, Myatt...). Howarth brings a high number of HGVs in the area which cause a number of problems. They are oversized (and seem to get larger every year) compared to our small residential streets, struggle to manoeuvre and cause traffic, noise, vibration, pollution....	the development in order to ensure the protection of amenity for all site users	
Discourse Architecture	3	LWA SA 11	11 Perry Vale Locally Significant Industrial Site (p773) We question the designation of the narrow Perry Vale site as a 'Locally Significant Industrial Site'. If industrial use is retained at the south end of the site it will have negative consequences for the development of the site as a whole: • Access to the industrial area by trade and heavy vehicles will conflict with residential use in the narrow portion of the site • The future construction of a footbridge linking Perry Vale and the east side of the railway with Forest Hill Pools and Dartmouth Road will be obstructed. This link would meet the requirements of the Mayor's Healthy Street initiative to encourage more travel on foot or by bicycle. The Perry Vale site should be developed to a higher density, appropriate to its proximity to the adjacent public transport hub and town centre facilities, with co-location of residential and employment uses, rather than continuation of the existing occupation by single-storey commercial units and surface parking. This site could be viewed differently, as part of the proposed Forest Hill cultural hub. However, we accept that the current location of the post office sorting depot on the site is a valuable and convenient local amenity, albeit one potentially in conflict with mixed use densification of the site. We question the allocation of the Perry Vale site as a Locally Significant Industrial Site. The proximity of the site to the town centre and rail station differentiates this site from other sites identified for industrial development. The Perry Vale site is more suited for the co-location of residential accommodation and uses associated with the creative industries and the new Forest Hill cultural hub. There is also an opportunity to provide parking for visitors to the town centre who wish to engage in the cultural hub, night-time economy and swimming pool. Improving the connections across the railway, making them more attractive, accessible and safer will promote a balanced social and commercial environment across Forest Hill.	Noted. The designation of Perry Vale as an LSIS has been informed by recommendations of the Lewisham Employment Land Study, which reflects the importance of ensuring sufficient industrial land and capacity to meet the Borough's future needs. The Local Plan makes provision for employment-led mixed use redevelopment of the site in order to make the optimal use of land and improve its place qualities, including improvements to the station approach. The development guidelines encourage that employment uses complement the Forest Hill Cultural Quarter.	No change.
	3	LWA SA 12	**Site 12, Sydenham Road, Loxley Close**- possible 131 units. This is an area covered by a largish privately owned warehouse style Lidl Supermarket with a locally Listed building close by, which I assume is the Golden Lion Pub, and it is stated that any redevelopment or intensification, must not impact negatively on this public house. There is	The London Plan directs Local Authorities to allocate single storey retail stores and surface car-parks. The indicative site capacities have been derived from a standard methodology explained in the Site Allocations background Paper. The indicative capacity	Land at Sydenham Road and Loxley Close site allocation boundary amended to remove furniture shop.

			an old second hand furniture shop between. The supermarket is very popular with local families, as the prices are much lower than at other well-known local retail food suppliers like the mini Tesco and Sainsbury's. It seems doubtful that this privately owned business will come forward to develop in a manner that matches the style of local small retail businesses, housed in the traditional style higher up Sydenham Rd. There is a car park at the back which could be partially commandeered, but any build as proposed in the Local Plan, states that it should protect the amenity of nearby properties (like my own) with boundary landscaping, and I propose that it would be good to include a tree-filled greening of the ubiquitous tarmac. I would really support new and improved access to the allotments, as suggested, and that building heights are no higher than the 2 storeys of nearby homes. The Plan is positive, but to achieve it would appear to be quite a challenge.	also includes town centre uses which could be used to re-provide the supermarket.	
	3	LWA SA 13	**Site 13, 113-157 Sydenham Road** – possible 168 residential units. This site covers the area of a largish private car dealership and hire car and car storage showrooms and external space behind. Again this is a modern development with no connection with the traditional character of the area. It is important that any new development or intensification does not impact on the really popular and traditional Public House next door, The Dolphin which is Listed. The Plan is positive in that it recommends design in line with the Conservation area close by on the Thorpe Estate. Again, is the dealership really likely to come forward for redevelopment, even though the very strong intention of the Local Plan is for a change of the modal style, from car to walking and cycling?	Support noted.The London Plan directs Local Authorities to allocate single storey retail stores and surface car-parks such as those associated with car dealerships.	No change.
	3	LWA SA 14	The Build at Site 14, 154-160 Sydenham Road, another private development behind the main street frontages of 76 units near to Kent House Road. This is quite a large development. What, if any, requirements were applied to the particular build by Lewisham Planning? What proportion of this private build is Affordable, what are the CIL costs payable to Lewisham Council and how will the CIL monies be used to contribute to improvements in infrastructure, environmental or any community improvements. Is any of this money available to local usage, as for instance you talk of improving frontages and many of the shop fronts in this area are shabby and need improvement, viability of businesses appears fragile.	All details on the planning application can be found on the planning website using the reference number DC/17/104571. 154-158 Sydenham Road is nearing completion.	154-158 Sydenham Road site allocation has been removed from the Plan.
	3	LWA SA 15	**Site 15**, The prior **Supermarket** on the corner of Girton Road/Sydenham Road is now being transformed into a Pure Gym. Neighbours know that I am a Councillor and have told me they are upset by the fact that this Gym is being allowed to stay open all night. Girton is a quiet residential road full of families and a number of older residents who are not happy with this situation, fearing the potential for night disturbance and late parking in the road. In your site proposition, the Local Plan states that this site should take account of residential amenity, and that any build should be in alignment with the character of	The Local Plan is a 20 year strategy so whilst the site may not come forward in the immediate future we would hope it would come forward in the plan period.	No change.

			the area. In fact the building, a two storey modern smaller supermarket, has not been aligned with the local character since the 70s, and can only become so by being replaced altogether. The history is that the site was originally occupied by the Granada Cinema, opened 1931 and demolished 1971, a great building that was unfortunately not Listed and saved, as the Forest Hill Capitol Cinema building was. It is clear that the Gym is investing a lot in refurbishing the premises, and I assume will not be interested in discussing with Planning its demise and the quality rebuild envisaged by the Local Plan. There is therefore no financial CIL outcome and nearby residents are not content either. I invite your comment on this.		
	3	LWA Site Allocations	**Perry Vale/Land at Forest Hill Station West/Land at Forest Hill Station East** Do you have any comments on the proposed vision? The vision is flawed. The housing requirements has been based on data pre-pandemic and therefore needs to be reassessed based on the fact nearly 1million people leaving London to relocate due to flexible and smart working from home. More development in this densely populated area will increase emissions/pollution from traffic in area (Section of South Circular up to Forest Hill station with dangerous bend/poor access to Devonshire Road).	The latest evidence prepared by the GLA, which takes account of the impacts of Covid-19, suggests that there will continue to be significant population growth in London over the long-term, which will need to be considered through the plan process. The London Plan also sets a strategic housing requirement (target) for the borough that the Local Plan must meet. The Local Plan broadly seeks to promote modal shift away from private car use to movement by walking, cycling and use of public transport. This approach is set in the context of reducing carbon emissions and improving air quality.	No change.
Blackheath Society no 2	3	Section 13	**Table 13.1** contains net home units and gross floor space for site allocations by Area and is very important, both in demonstrating ambitions for housing, workspace and town centre uses by Area and the potential ability to meet the Borough's increased housing targets in the new London Plan. The North and Central Areas look set for most development, the West and East the least. Is this driven by genuine need and strategic intent or by what is possible given site allocation analysis? This split should be more prominent as it drives much of the Plan. It needs genuine exposure and buy-in from all stakeholders, especially neighbourhoods directly affected. It looks broadly realistic given the character analysis of the Areas but potentially controversial and contentious. Are the Community/Green Infrastructure and Transport policies well-matched to these ambitions, especially in the North and Central Area? Here the BLE brings no new stations, only upgraded interchanges.	Noted. The figures in Table 13.1 are based on the indicative site capacities for the site allocations included in the draft Local Plan. The site allocations were identified through a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, and are considered to be deliverable within the plan period. Further details are set out in the Site Allocations Background Paper, which is available on the Council's local plan Evidence Base webpage. As part of the Local Plan preparation an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published. The IDP sets out the necessary infrastructure (schools, health care facilities, road and public transport improvements etc.) that is required to accommodate the level of growth anticipated through the Local Plan.	No change.
Brockley Society	3	Section 13 Paragraph 13.5	Page 471, paragraph 13.5: As mentioned above, the Council's existing conservation area character appraisals and SPDs perform an important function in setting development standards that protect heritage assets. Any proposed additions, replacements or revisions should be publicly consulted on to ensure these standards are maintained and improved.	Noted. The Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement sets out how the Council will engage with and consult the public on planning guidance documents.	No change.
Greater London Authority	3	Section 13	The Site Allocations are proposed to deliver 38,000 sqm net additional workspace and 24,000 sqm net additional town centre floorspace over the Plan period to 2040 (Table 13.1 of the draft Plan). Despite slightly different	Site allocations specify different floorspaces for employment and main town centre uses.	Table 13.1 amended to latest floorspace figures arising from the site allocations.

			terminology and timescales, this appears to exceed the additional space requirements identified in the borough's Employment and Retail Studies (21,800 sqm employment floorspace up to 2038 and 14,500 sqm indicative retail floorspace up to 2035). The London Office Policy Review 2017 identified a negative composite floorspace demand of -2,500 sqm for the borough up to 2041, and Lewisham town centre was identified as showing demand for existing office functions, generally within smaller units (Town Centre Network Office Guidelines C), but not for mixed-use or speculative office potential. The council will need to produce evidence of demand that justifies the proposed level of provision and/or create the right economic conditions for exceeding demand through an evidence-based economic development strategy. The Mayor would be particularly concerned if this would result in a loss of industrial capacity (see also section below). In this context it is also important to make a clear distinction between industrial space, and office and retail development	The floorspace figures are indicative, based on a theoretical land use mix split. The actual floorspace to be delivered on sites coming forward could differ from these estimates as they will be considered more thoroughly through the Development Management process. An additional supply of floorspace, above and beyond the requirements suggested in the Employment and Retail Studies, will enable sufficient non-residential floorspace to be delivered throughout the Plan period, should some of the sites not be brought forward for development or their delivery delayed.	
NHS (HUDU)	3	Section 13 Table 13.1	The housing figures set out in Table 13.1 'Site allocations – indicative delivery outcomes' shows substantial housing growth across the different neighbourhoods and places. It is essential that the local plan demonstrates how infrastructure capacity required to meet the growth in population will be delivered. New residents will place additional demands on health infrastructure (acute, mental health, community and primary care). While the health sector (SELCCG and the wider NHS) have provided evidence to the Council of projects required together with the substantial investment needed to bring existing infrastructure up to modern standards, there are additional challenges from Covid-19 and resultant pressures which will continue for many years	Noted. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared alongside the Local Plan. This sets out the infrastructure required to support the levels of growth being planned for, including social infrastructure and community facilities. The IDP has informed the preparation of the Local Plan. The NHS has been consulted on the IDP and helped to inform its preparation. The IDP will be subject to regular review over the plan period, which will assist with the identification of new infrastructure and funding gaps/commitments as information becomes available.	No change.
Quaggy Waterway Action Group	3	Section 13	QWAG supports the Local Plan's aim to 13 *"Retain, reinforce and help shape the distinctive character and identity of Lewisham's communities and townscapes by ensuring that all new development responds positively to the special attributes of its local context – including the cultural, historic, built and natural environment - and is designed, constructed and maintained to a high quality standard."*	Support noted.	No change.
Quaggy Waterway Action Group	3	Section 13	The Local Plan should support local distinctiveness but too much development has been permitted which is not resonant of or reflective of the locality, and could be plonked down anywhere.	Noted. The need for new development to identify and respond positively to Lewisham's local distinctiveness is a recurrent theme set out throughout the Local Plan. Previous decisions on planning applications are outside the scope of the Local Plan.	No change.
Quaggy Waterway Action Group	3	Section 13	The opportunity to ensure that works to the rivers and their confluence in central Lewisham made the most of Lewisham being one of the few London boroughs with not one but two rivers flowing through the main urban centre, and with much of the borough's diverse population able to be involved and inspired by greater contacts with and knowledge of their local rivers.	Noted. Part 3 of the Local Plan makes clear that the river network is a defining feature of the Central Area and that development proposals should maximise the ecological function and character of waterways, including river restoration around Lewisham town centre. The plan's site allocations set out specific requirements in this respect.	No change.
Quaggy Waterway Action Group	3	Section 13	The Lewisham Gateway scheme has done the minimum possible with the rivers, which remain in concrete albeit with some artificially created meandering, riffles and flow, and the nearby small open space is of limited amenity and	Noted. Previous planning decisions are outside the scope of the Local Plan. It is considered that the draft Local Plan provides a clear direction and robust	No change.

			ecological value and does nothing to underpin local distinctiveness; the scheme happens to be in central Lewisham but it could be anywhere because it says nothing about the area.	policies for waterway management in the Borough, including within central Lewisham.	
Quaggy Waterway Action Group	3	Section 13	It remains unclear how the Local Plan will result in spaces and places which support and reinforce the borough's distinct environment, heritage and culture.	The draft Local Plan Policy QD1 requires that all new development must be delivered through the design-led approach, and informed by an understanding of the site's local context. This is an overarching policy, which other design policies emanate from. Part 3 of Local Plan set out policies and guidance which respond to the distinctive qualities of Lewisham's character areas and neighbourhoods. These were informed by the Lewisham Characterisation Study. Development proposals will be required to demonstrate how they satisfy the Local Plan requirements.	No change.
Historic England	3	Site allocations	The detail relating to design guidelines within site allocation policies as it relates to heritage assets and built character (although please see comments below in regard to tall buildings) is also welcomed. We do however have some comments in relation to specific sections.	Support noted. Responses to additional comments set out elsewhere in this consultation statement.	No change.
Historic England	3	Site allocations	As indicated above, we consider the design guidelines within the site allocations policies to be helpful both in their identification of relevant heritage assets and the design parameters set out intended to ensure the conservation of heritage significance. However, we also note that there is no reference to maximum building heights in any of the proposed site allocations within the zones identified as appropriate for tall buildings.	Noted. Following the Regulation 18 stage public consultation, the Council has commissioned additional work on the Tall Buildings study. This has been used to inform the Regulation 19 document, with further details on locations suitable for tall buildings and building heights. For planning decisions, the site allocations will need to be read in conjunction with other policies, including QD4 Building Heights.	Local Plan Policy QD4 amended with additional details on tall buildings locations and building heights.
London Borough of Bromley	3	Site allocations	With regard to the proposed site allocations, we have no specific comments but would welcome sites near the Borough boundary making explicit reference to this and the need to consider impacts on Bromley.	Noted. It is considered that the London Plan will help to ensure that developments appropriately consider and do not have an adverse impact on neighbouring boroughs.	No change.
NHS (HUDU)	3	Site allocations	The text within individual site allocations should make reference to mitigation of their impact on the borough's health infrastructure and contribute to expanding affordable and high quality capacity	The draft Local Plan Part 2 policy CI1 on Community Infrastructure requires development proposals to plan positively to meet identified need for community infrastructure having regard to the IDP, which would include health care provision. It is not considered necessary to repeat this policy in the site allocations. The plan must be read as a whole.	No change.
NHS (HUDU)	3	Site allocations	Within each site allocation under Development Requirements there should be reference to the need to mitigate the impact on health infrastructure.	The draft Local Plan Part 2 policy CI1 on Community Infrastructure requires development proposals to plan positively to meet identified need for community infrastructure having regard to the IDP, which would include health care provision. It is not considered necessary to repeat this policy in the site allocations. The plan must be read as a whole.	No change.
Royal Borough of Greenwich	3	Site allocations	In general, the site allocations should include more explicit guidelines or expectations in relation to building heights. This has particular relevance to sites close to or on the borough boundary, where tall buildings have the potential to impact the townscape and amenity of neighbourhoods within Royal Greenwich. We would also recommend that, where guidance around building heights and impacts on heritage assets is provided, this be moved from the "Development guidelines" section to the "Development	Noted. Following the Regulation 18 stage public consultation, the Council has commissioned additional work on the Tall Buildings study. This has been used to inform the Regulation 19 document, with further details on locations suitable for tall buildings and building heights. For planning decisions, the site allocations will need to be read in conjunction with other policies, including QD4 Building Heights.	Local Plan Policy QD4 amended with additional details on tall buildings locations and building heights.

			requirements" section to reflect the weight given to design and historic character in the NPPF.		
Sport England	3	Site allocations	<u>Site allocations</u> With regard to any future site allocations, we would advise that the allocation of new sites for sports facilities should be identified through the use of a robust and up to date evidence base such as the Lewisham Playing Pitch Strategy. Para 96 of NPPF and planned positively para 92 of NPPF to ensure that the right facilities are in the right place. It is also essential that where sites adjacent to playing fields are proposed to be redeveloped that the new use does not prejudice the use of the playing field (for example, due to ball strike).	Noted. The Local Plan has been informed by a technical evidence base, which includes The Lewisham Playing Pitch Strategy, Open Space Assessments and studies, and the Parks and Open Spaces Strategy.	Local Plan Policy Quality Design policy on amenity amended to reference that development does not prejudice the use of playing fields.
Thames Water Utilities Ltd	3	Site allocations	Table submitted which provides Thames Water's site specific comments from desktop assessments on water, sewerage/waste water network and waste water treatment infrastructure in relation to the proposed development sites.	Noted.	Some amendments to sites allocations have been made in line with the comments provided in the table of sites.
Transport for London	3	Site allocations	Sites within PTAL 4-6 should be clearly identified as car-free per the London Plan policy T6. In many instances, the development guidelines under site allocations (even with PTAL 6b) specify – 'Car parking provision should be the minimum required to maintain the viability of the town centre, whilst also reflecting the Public Transport Accessibility Level'. This statement is not in compliance with the London Plan, nor does it align with our evidence which demonstrates that better public realm and increased walking and cycling contribute more to town centre viability than does access by car. In fact, car dominance detracts from the public realm and therefore it detracts from the viability of town centres. And it should be noted that people walking and cycling spend more on London's high streets than do people who arrive by car (http://content.tfl.gov.uk/mts-walking-action-plan.pdf). Recent Department for Transport evidence supports this, suggesting that increasing access by sustainable modes can be driven by reductions in town centre car parking (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/switching-to-sustainable-transport-a-rapid-evidence-assessment).	Noted. The site allocations will be amended for conformity with the London Plan.	Local Plan policy TR4 amended to clarify that sites within PTAL 4-6 must be designed to be car-free. Local Plan site allocations amended by removing text on car parking that is not in general conformity with London Plan.
Transport for London	3	Policies Map	Big Yellow Storage, 155 Lewisham Way, New Cross, London SE14 6QP and Wearside Depot These sites are not identified as a site allocations, but are critical in delivery of the BLE. The formal safeguarding directions give a degree of protection to the sites. However, it is considered that identifying future uses of the sites through a site allocation, including for BLE infrastructure, would serve as to best protect the interests of the BLE, and new underground services to Lewisham.	Both sites are subject to safeguarding order which clearly identifies the sites.	Local plan amended to show the BLE safeguarded sites on the Regulation 19 policies map.

Lewisham Local Plan

Regulation 18 consultation statement

Appendix 2 – Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Written Responses Split Part 4 and 5

September 2022

Organisation (if relevant)	Part	Section, policy or paragraph	Comment	Council officer response	Action
Telegraph Hill Society	4	DM	The Plan also needs to detail how the Council will enforce and monitor its own compliance with the Plan. In order to retain the trust of both residents and developers it is extremely important that the Council transparently upholds the principles it is espousing. At the macro level this involves setting and monitoring progress towards achieving a detailed series of targets, and the need for the introduction of these is set out in our opening paragraphs on the Vision (paragraphs 3 to 8). To have such a "Vision" is admirable and, as we have said, Lewisham's Vision is laudably aspirational but, unless the progress towards it is measured and failures to achieve it rectified, it is worth less than nothing. A Vision that is not adhered to will simply lower the opinion of the Council in the minds of residents, stakeholders and	Part 4 of the Local Plan sets out a monitoring framework with targets along with indicators to measure performance of the plan, which is divided in to thematic policy areas. Part 4 policies set out the framework for delivering the Local Plan. This sets out a range of measures and tools, and indicates that the Council will use planning enforcement where necessary. In line with planning law,	No change.

			potential partners and will lose general respect. At a more granular level we have numerous examples of where planning policies have been ignored by developers and planning applications not made where they were clearly required with no enforcement action apparently taken. We also have examples where planning decisions have been made which were clearly against explicit bars in the UDP (i.e. where the UDP says "The Council will not allow …" and yet the Council did so allow). Whilst we appreciate that the Council may not have the resources to follow up every infringement at present, that should not be expected to be the case throughout the life of the Plan, nor should any part of the "Vision" imply that such infringements might be allowed. To ensure the "Vision" succeeds, it needs to be enforced.	Part 1 of the Local Plan sets out that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise	

Culverley Green Residents Association	4	DM	**There are no success criteria** At the moment, there seems to be a single success criteria — a building target. If it is achieved it will be a hollow achievement if it results in no change in Lewisham's homelessness, or the flats are unoccupied investments, or the lack of green spaces and crowded transport means that the area is home only to the most economically disadvantaged. Targets could include reduction in homelessness, distance from green spaces, longevity of residency, etc.	Disagree. The Local Plan sets out Strategic Objectives across a range of policy topic areas. Part 4 of the plan also sets out the Monitoring Framework with metrics against which the successful delivery of the plan will be assessed.	The Part 4 monitoring framework has been reviewed and updated with additional indicators.
Deptford Society	4	DM	There is a general lack of quantifiable, verifiable targets against which the success or otherwise of policies can be judged. Ongoing issues with enforcement and maintenance of public space and heritage buildings continue to undermine delivery of attractive and welcoming public realm and shopping areas.	Disagree. The Local Plan sets out Strategic Objectives across a range of policy topic areas. Part 4 of the plan also sets out the Monitoring Framework with metrics against which the successful delivery of the	The Part 4 monitoring framework has been reviewed and updated with additional indicators.

			In Deptford High Street CA the following issues are particularly prevalent: - Graffiti - Increase in fly-tipping and litter - Maintenance of public open space - Maintenance of buildings and shop fronts	plan will be assessed. Planning enforcement is outside the scope of the Local Plan.	
Deptford Society	4	DM	Enforcement Effective enforcement of planning control would support the Lewisham Local Plan however the plan contains no mission statement or mandate in respect of enforcement. The concept of effective management control can very easily be undermined where enforcement procedures are ineffective or where enforcement procedures are drawn-out. For enforcement to be effective it needs to be made public and dealt with efficiently. We have examples of unresolved enforcement cases which go back almost a decade.	Noted. Planning enforcement is outside the scope of the Local Plan. However an additional policy point will be included to note that the Council will use planning enforcement as a tool to support the delivery of the plan.	Local Plan amended with an additional policy point in Part 4 on Delivery and Monitoring to reflect that the Council will use powers available to it, including planning enforcement, to support the delivery of the Local Plan.

			We have other examples of long-standing cases where in response to enforcement action, planning consents have been granted for reinstatements and/or alterations but where these works have not been carried out and the original offence remains. The longer that cases are left unaddressed, the stronger the perception becomes that there are no planning constraints within the Conservation Area. We are aware there are limited resources within the enforcement team and appreciate officers' efforts. LBL enforcement currently allocates cases according to 4 levels of priority. Priority 1 cases include: ‘works are being carried out which will cause irremediable harm, for example, works to a listed building, demolition of a listed building and works to trees with protection orders’		

			Priority 3 cases include: 'installation of shop fronts, unauthorised detached structure and non-compliance with the approved consent. Visits to be carried out within 10–15 working days' Unauthorised alterations to buildings within the conservation area are currently treated as priority 3 cases; in view of its 'at risk' status we recommend the council classify them as priority 1 and that this be stipulated in the local plan.		
Deptford Society	4	DM	We would like to see clearer wording to set out how statements will be used in determination of applications. A clearer identification of measurement or quantitative requirements which should be demonstrated through submitted statements would be helpful, and how this information will be used to monitor and enforce agreed obligations and the quality of developments.	The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides that development proposals must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This is set out in Part	No change.

				1 of the Local Plan. Planning statements support applications to demonstrate how policy requirements will be satisfied. The Council uses planning enforcement powers to ensure that development is for authorised uses.	
Deptford Society	4	DM	The strategy to deliver and monitor the plan is lacking. Documenting how regular updates to the local plan will be made, to capture and respond to changing needs and circumstances, and to allow opportunity for further engagement and consultation on progress is needed to ensure the effectiveness of the plan is maximised and the plan can remain adaptive and relevant.	Part 4 of the Local Plan sets out the framework for monitoring and delivering the Local Plan, which the Council considers is proportionate and robust. The Council is legally required to review its	No change.

				Local Plan every 5 years and where necessary, update it to ensure it is in line with higher level planning policies. Where changes are proposed to be made, the Council will carry out consultation in accordance with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement.	
NHS (HUDU)	4	DM	The London Plan (March 2021) paragraph 11.1.37 states "Boroughs should use the London Healthy Urban Development Unit Planning Contributions Model (HUDU Model) to calculate the capital cost of the additional health facilities required to meet the increased demand". This should be reflected in the Local Plan, and set out in further detail in the updated Planning	Noted. The use of the HUDU model will be considered when the Council updates is Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.	No change.

			Obligations SPD. We are keen to support the Council to use the HUDU Model and if the relevant officer makes contact this can be arranged.		
Blackheath Society no 2	4	DM 01	Not enough emphasis/detail on engaging/harnessing citizens and groups (DM1)	Noted. Policy DM1 sets out that a wide range of stakeholders, including community, groups will support the plan's delivery. However it is acknowledged some further details in the supporting text could be helpful. The Council's Statement of Community Involvement should also be referred for further information.	Policy DM1 supporting text updated to provide further details on how local communities will assist in delivering the Local Plan.
Blackheath Society no 2	4	DM 01	**DM1 Working with stakeholders to deliver the**	Noted. Policy DM1 sets out	Policy DM1 supporting text updated to provide further details on how local

			Local Plan. There is far too little detail on how these aspirations/promises will be met, given recent poor engagement with local stakeholders and the manifest lack of capacity to do so effectively in the face of recent budget cuts and covid. In particular, more imaginative and transparent ways of engaging stakeholders in a modern, fluid and fast moving society (including the Council itself) need to be developed and embedded in Council processes and attitudes. A great opportunity is being lost by not engaging more frequently and effectively in dialogue with local knowledge, experience, ideas and enthusiasm of local amenity societies and community groups. A defensive silo approach needs to be avoided and partnership working encouraged.	that a wide range of stakeholders, including community, groups will support the plan's delivery. However it is acknowledged some further details in the supporting text could be helpful. The Council's Statement of Community Involvement should also be referred for further information.	communities can assist in delivering the Local Plan.
Telegraph Hill Society	4	DM 01	As part of the delivery process and ensuring compliance with the principles in the Plan it is fundamental, as we have outlined above, for the	Noted. The preparation of design codes and planning guidance is	No change.

			Borough to commit to updating as soon as possible its guidance and detailed policies including Conservation Area Character Appraisals and to introduce design codes based on a more detailed understanding of each area. See our further references to this in paragraphs 60 131, 135, 142 and 258.	outside the scope of the Local Plan. However the Council has and will continue to prepare guidance to support the implementation of the Local Plan. The extent of guidance will be subject to resources available and priority of need for the information.	
Telegraph Hill Society	4	DM 01	There is very little in the Plan or the Vision which shows an on-going involvement with residents in what happens in the Borough once the final Plan is adopted. It is fundamental to good planning that local communities are involved, especially as such communities will evolve and change over the 40 year life of the Plan.	Noted. Policy DM1 sets out that a wide range of stakeholders, including community, groups will support the plan's delivery. However it is acknowledged some further details in the	Policy DM1 supporting text updated to provide further details on how local communities will assist in delivering the Local Plan.

				supporting text could be helpful. The Council's Statement of Community Involvement should also be referred for further information.	
Telegraph Hill Society	4	DM 01	Nor should relevant parts of any community be left out of consideration purely because of artificial boundaries drawn either for the purpose of this Plan or for electoral ward purposes. As Part Three of the Plan acknowledges, boundaries are blurred and developments in one area can affect easily affect others	Noted. The Council's Statement of Community Involvement sets out how it will consult the public on planning decisions.	No change.
Telegraph Hill Society	4	DM 01	Ward boundaries, in particular, do not relate to either character areas or neighbourhoods mapped out in figure 13.1. For example ¼ of Telegraph Hill is in the North Area and ¾ is in the West Area and yet it is all in Telegraph Hill Ward, which also includes	Noted. The character areas or sub-areas in the Local Plan were informed by the Lewisham Characterisatio n Study, and	No change.

			Honor Oak and the Kender Triangle. The Plan acknowledges that New Cross/New Cross Gate is the principal shopping centre for much of Telegraph Hill and the great majority of the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area and the community of people who live there will be affected by developments on the Hatcham Works site, but none of those people are in the New Cross Ward where Hatcham Works and the district shopping centre is located. We have argued in other submissions that the Ward boundaries are inappropriate for planning purposes and the split between the North and West Areas of the Plan make them even more so. It follows, therefore, that Local Ward Assemblies, for example, are an inappropriate vehicle for community engagement and new groupings, more in alignment to this Local Plan, need to be developed. The opportunity also seems to have been missed to align the Area	provide a helpful means of providing policies at a more granular or neighbourhood area (rather than borough-wide) level. The Local Plan must be read as a whole for planning decisions, which is clearly stated in Part 1 of the plan. It should be noted that the Local Plan Part 2 Policies on Heritage are borough-wide policies including for Conservation Areas. These will help to ensure consistency of approach in	

			boundaries with the four Neighbourhood Community Development Partnership areas used for health and social services planning.	planning decisions for CAs. The Council's Statement of Community Involvement sets out how the public will be consulted on planning decisions.	
Telegraph Hill Society	4	DM 01	We welcome the commitment by the Council in DM1.A to take a "proactive and positive approach" to working alongside community groups. In order to add some flesh to this otherwise bland statement, the Council should acknowledge that community groups do not have the resources, being volunteers, in the same way as either the Council or developers do. The planning process is therefore inherently biased and unfair and the Council should do all it can to ensure that any unfairness against local residents and community groups is removed as far as	The Council's Statement of Community Involvement sets out how the public will be consulted on planning decisions. Funding and support for community groups is outside the scope of the Local Plan.	No change.

			possible. There should therefore be firm commitments stated within the Plan that, when funds are available, the Council will: • re-introduce the Amenity Societies Panel (even just providing the relevant files for discussion and a space to meet would be beneficial all round) • provide resources to help communities understand planning issues and get involved in the planning processes at Local Plan, area plans, neighbourhood plan and site-specific planning levels and also in designing Character Appraisals and Design Codes to further inform future local development and • provide similar levels of assistance to community groups and concerned residents as are provided for developers in terms of seeking advice.		
Telegraph Hill Society	4	DM 01	We note that the wording of DM1.A which specifies "local communities and community groups" separately from "key stakeholders" suggests that local communities and	Agreed.	Local Plan policy DM1.A amended as suggested.

			community groups are not key stakeholders when, in fact, they are the primary interested parties in anything which affects their communities. We imagine this to be a drafting error and that the implication is not intended. We would suggest that this be re-written to read: “to working alongside key stakeholders, including local communities and community groups, key stakeholders, landowners and development industry partners, and the wider public”		
Telegraph Hill Society	4	DM 01	With reference to policies DM2.B and DM2.C we note that CIL money will be allocated “to help ensure local areas are appropriately supported with infrastructure and benefit from investment generated by new development”. This should also state that it will be allocated to ensure that local areas are compensated for any disadvantages that might accrue from new development. The Ward Assemblies, as we have pointed out above (paragraphs 260 to 263) do not	Planning obligations (S106 agreements) are legal obligations entered into to mitigate the impacts of a development proposal and the appropriate mechanism to ensure that development proposals are	No change.

			correspond with the areas affected by developments and therefore are not the appropriate forums in which to discuss allocation of CIL monies. DM2.B and DM2.C need to be re-written to ensure that all residents affected by developments have an equal say in the use of neighbourhood CIL.	acceptable in planning terms. The Council has established governance arrangements for the allocation and use of Neighbourhood CIL (NCIL). These are outside the scope of the Local Plan.	
Blackheath Society no 2	4	DM 02	**DM2 Infrastructure funding & planning obligations.** The Council's record on planning infrastructure improvements/upgrades to match the demands and timing of new developments has not been good. Nor has its record in raising, collecting and utilising S106 and CIL funds, many of which remain unspent. More specific proposals and targets are needed in the Plan, rather than just theory.	Noted. Whilst we accept that the spending of S106 funds could be better the Council has delivered significant infrastructure improvements including a programme of school improvements and extensions,	No change.

				improvements to parks and open spaces and securing public transport improvements such as the DLR upgrade. For further details on planning contributions spend please see the IFS on the Council website.	
Environment Agency	4	DM 02	**Infrastructure funding** Lewisham raises a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and paragraph B of DM2 states that a portion of this will be allocated towards neighbourhood priorities to help ensure that local areas are appropriately supported with infrastructure. We would like to highlight the benefit of considering the funding of improving flood defences with CIL. Improvements to flood defences could be incorporated into projects to provide additional local outcomes, such	Noted. Policy DM2 sets out a list of areas where planning obligations may be sought, and this includes flood risk management. The Council has set governance arrangements for the allocation and use of Neighbourhood	No change.

			as the creation of parks and open spaces.	CIL. Proposals for projects involving flood risk management / improvements would be welcomed and will be considered through this process.	
Metropolitan Police Service	4	DM 02	**Section 106 / CIL contributions to mitigate impact on crime** Policy H01 (Meeting Lewisham's Housing Needs) of the emerging Lewisham Local Plan sets out that the Council will look to optimise the capacity of housing sites in order to ensure that *a. "The draft London Plan minimum ten-year target of 16,670 net housing completions over the period 2020 to 2030 (or 1,667 net completions per year) is met and exceeded; and* *b. That delivery against Lewisham's Local Housing Need figure is maximised."*	Noted. Policy DM2 sets out a list of areas where planning obligations may be sought, and this includes community safety measures. It is acknowledges that the draft IDP does not currently include a section on emergency services. The inclusion of this	Infrastructure Delivery Plan updated to include new section on emergency services.

			It goes on to state at paragraph 7.4 of the emerging Lewisham Local Plan that, *"It is imperative that we prepare Lewisham's new Local Plan having regard to the draft London Plan, including the borough-level housing targets, in order to ensure it aligns with the spatial development strategy for the region. At the same time, we must ensure that national planning policy requirements are satisfied. Through the Lewisham Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2019), we have calculated the Local Housing Need (LHN) figure for the Borough, in line with the NPPF. The SHMA indicates that the current position for the borough is a minimum housing need figure of 1,939 net units per year based on the 2016 London Plan target. The LHN figure is 2,334 net units based on the draft London Plan (Intend to Publish version) annual housing target of 1,667 units. These LHN figures are significantly higher than Lewisham's strategic housing*	in the IDP would support relevant CIL spend over the plan period on infrastructure required to support growth.	

			target set out in both the current and draft London Plan." In terms of employment in the Borough, Policy EC1 (A Thriving and Inclusive Local Economy) states that, *"The Council will help to build a thriving and inclusive local economy by attracting and generating inward investment".* The sub text to this Policy states that *"Helping to facilitate a thriving, diverse and inclusive local economy is one of our key priorities. This means growing and strengthening the local economic base, making available a wide range of job opportunities, workspaces and employment sites across the Borough."* Further, Policy EC2 (Protecting Employment Sites and Delivering New Workspace) sets out that, *"There is a forecast need for 21,800 square metres of net additional employment floorspace (Use Class B1) in the Borough up to 2038."* Growth in other land		

			uses such as retail and hotels is also expected. The growth in homes, offices and other uses will significantly increase the need for policing and the cost for associated infrastructure. This therefore represents a legitimate infrastructure requirement that should be accounted for.		
Metropolitan Police Service	4	DM 02 CI 01	Policy CI1 (Safeguarding and Securing Community Infrastructure) of the emerging Local Plan states that Lewisham Council will: "A. *The Council will work collaboratively with stakeholders to identify current and projected future requirements for community infrastructure, and to secure the necessary provision of this infrastructure. Need for provision in the Borough will be considered having regard to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, along with the relevant corporate plans and strategies of its key stakeholders, including for healthcare,*	Noted. It is acknowledges that the draft IDP does not currently include a section on emergency services. The inclusion of this in the IDP would support relevant CIL spend over the plan period on infrastructure required to support growth.	Local Plan supporting text amended to refer to emergency services as part of community infrastructure. Infrastructure Delivery Plan updated to include new section on emergency services.

			education, recreational and other community services." The sub text to this Policy, at paragraph 9.1 sets out *that "Community infrastructure is also commonly referred to as social infrastructure. It covers a range of services and facilities that contribute towards inclusive and sustainable communities by providing residents and visitors with opportunities to enjoy a good quality of life. Community infrastructure includes provision for health services, education and training, community facilities (including public houses), places of faith, and sport and recreation facilities for people of all ages and abilities."* We highlight that both the emerging Lewisham Local Plan and Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (November 2020) do not make reference to either 'policing facilities' or 'emergency services' as a social and community infrastructure. The MPS have to move towards		

			securing S106/CIL from development due to the impacts on crime. The MPS would like to have the ability to receive financial contributions during Lewisham Council's New Local Plan period and are in the process of working up a formula linking to development impacts which should be available soon. A breakdown of non-property related infrastructure sought by the MPS in the future is detailed below. This list has been taken from other Police and Crime Commissioners who are already receiving financial contributions; **Staff set up costs** - Uniforms. - Radios. - Workstation/Office equipment. - Training. **Vehicles** - Patrol vehicles. - Police community support officers (PCSO) vehicles. - Bicycles.		

			Mobile IT: The provision of mobile IT capacity to enable officers to undertake tasks whilst out of the office in order to maintain a visible presence. **CCTV technologies:** Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras to detect crime related vehicle movements.		
NHS Property Services	4	DM 02	**Policy DM2 Infrastructure funding and planning obligations** It is important that the Council maximises opportunities to use the Community Infrastructure Levy and/or planning obligations to secure healthcare infrastructure. Large residential developments often have very significant impacts in terms of the need for additional healthcare provision for future residents, meaning that planning obligations or financial contributions for new healthcare facilities are necessary. The requirement that London boroughs recognise the role large sites can play in delivering necessary health facilities is critical.	Noted. The Council recognises the importance of ensure the population benefits from access to high quality health and social care in Lewisham. The Local Plan sets the framework to ensure that new development is appropriately supported by such infrastructure.	No change.

			Similarly, cumulative development can place incremental pressure on health services and the Council should actively engage with the NHS to ensure an equitable share of Community Infrastructure Levy funding is secured for healthcare developments and services. NHSPS will be working with the Council and CCG to ensure such funding is made available. NHSPS are also aware that the Council currently has a Community Infrastructure Levy charge of £103.17 per sqm on 'all other uses'. NHSPS have previously raised concerns about this charge via the Councils consultation on its Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule, September 2018. Without further detail, it is assumed that 'all other uses' also includes the provision of new, publicly funded, healthcare buildings. It should be noted that healthcare uses do not	Part 4 of the Local Plan deals with delivery, including arrangements to secure infrastructure. Policy DM2 sets out a list of areas where planning obligations may be sought, and this includes social and community infrastructure. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan also includes a section on health and care facilities, which will provide a link to relevant CIL spend over the plan period. The CIL Charging Schedule and CIL Rates are	

			generally accommodate revenue-generating operations and have operating costs that are often higher than the income they receive. They therefore require public subsidy and many of these developments will also be infrastructure themselves, which the Community Infrastructure Levy may be required to fund. Therefore, the Councils Charging Schedule should have a nil rate on healthcare buildings, as any charge could prevent the ability of the NHS to deliver the new infrastructure that is required to support Lewisham's aspirations for growth within the Plan. We would therefore request that both healthcare floorspace and any developments involving the NHS Estate should, without exception, be attributed at zero rate on the Charging Schedule.	outside the scope of the Local Plan.	

Port of London Authority	4	DM 02	**14. Policy DM2: Infrastructure funding and planning obligations.** Support the policy but consider that the list of areas where planning obligations may be sought, highlighted in part E is amended to include green **and blue** infrastructure, to emphasise the importance of the boroughs various waterways.	Noted.	Local Plan amended to refer green and blue infrastructure in list of planning obligations, as suggested.
Transport for London	4	DM 02	Part E lists a number of issues that may be addressed through planning obligations, however, there is currently no indication of their priority should financial viability issues arise. Part E should be amended to make it clear that affordable housing and transport infrastructure share equal highest priority, as set out in the London Plan. With the changes to the CIL Regulations (2010) last year, there is now greater flexibility in terms of how CIL and s106 work together and fund infrastructure. This requires a certain level of detail to understand what infrastructure is intended to be funded	Noted. Local Plan DM02 supporting text makes clear that affordable housing and transport infrastructure share equal highest priority in accordance with the London Plan. Local Plan amended to include formulaic	Local Plan amended to include formulaic approaches to calculating planning contributions, where appropriate, informed by Viability Assessment Update.

			through CIL and which is to be funded through s106, or indeed a combination of the two. Recent changes in government guidance now also require that any formulaic approach to s106 obligations is set out in the local plan, and as the previous Lewisham Planning Obligations SPD was adopted in 2015, you may wish to consider the obligations that could be addressed through a standard calculation or tariff-based approach and clearly set those out within the new local plan. You may also consider updating the Planning Obligations SPD in parallel with the local plan process to ensure that the Borough's approach to developer contributions is clear.	approaches to calculating planning contributions, where appropriate. The council envisages commencing work on an update to the Planning Obligations SPD as the local plan progresses towards adoption.	
Transport for London	4	DM 02	Whilst DM2 references planning obligations in connection with public transport improvements, it should explicitly reference the BLE. It remains TfL's view that it would be advantageous for the Borough to commit to identifying how planning obligations can support the	No decision has been made on this issues so this would be premature to include within the Local Plan.	No change.

			funding of the BLE, as there will be an expectation that significant developer contributions would be needed with the possibility of other Borough funding avenues. Using a dedicated proportion of CIL, or other levy could alleviate uncertainty for developers as to the obligations required, and reflect the relationship between the BLE and its role in unlocking developments in Lewisham. Currently, there is no formula set out as to how contributions could be calculated. Consideration of a formula/mechanism should be developed to capture monies or land needed for the BLE. Furthermore, we ask land to be safeguarded and routes provided to and from stations.		
Blackheath Society no 2	4	DM 03	**DM3 Masterplans and comprehensive development**. Masterplans need to cover broader areas, not just individual sites, so that there is more strategic, coordinated and holistic planning for areas, rather than competitive, defensive focus on individual	Noted. The Local Plan sets out the spatial strategy for the Borough, which will help to ensure a coordinated approach to	No change.

			sites that causes escalation of height, density, style etc. through precedent, plus a lack of sharing of the costs of amenity improvements and a hotchpotch result. Lewisham town centre is a prime example of failure over the past 10 years, Blackheath Hill is a very recent emerging example, and Lee Green looks to be in danger of a repeat of this trend.	managing growth and development, along with new investment. The Council has, and may in the future, prepare area-based frameworks where significant growth is planned and it considers additional guidance is necessary. Site masterplans are an important tool used to support planning applications, and to demonstrate how development proposals will support the delivery of the spatial strategy.	

NHS (HUDU)	4	DM 03	**DM3 Infrastructure funding and planning obligations** The wording of clause D 'having regard to the policy requirements of the statutory Development Plan' makes it essential that the individual polices including site allocations refer to the requirement to expand health infrastructure capacity for the plan to positively meet the housing and population growth it sets out. Paragraph 19.12 refers to a new SPD Planning Obligations being published. We look forward to working with the Council to reference and implement the NHS HUDU Planning Obligations Model as required by the London Plan.	Noted. The requirement for development proposals to plan positively for and support the delivery of community infrastructure is set out in draft Local Plan Part 2 policy CI1 Safeguarding and securing community infrastructure. The Council will engage with the NHS on the preparation of any future review and update to its Planning Obligations Guidance SPD.	Noted.
	4	DM 05	A true 'vision' for the future is what is needed, one that accepts the effects of COVID-19 and Brexit, neither of which have fed into this strategic document. We would therefore	Noted.	

			welcome a more flexible and evolving set of strategies that could be reviewed as the effects from these on the built environment, the economy and the community are felt, understood and, as the report suggested, be ready to respond to changes in wider planning context. A more agile and flexible standpoint is needed. We would welcome a commitment to reviewing the Local Plan periodically to ensure targets are set, being reached and objectives respond to the changing and evolving needs of the borough.		
Blackheath Society no 2	4	DM 05 Table 19.1	**Table 19.1**: Monitoring framework. Some targets seem very unambitious and occasionally complacent/unrealistic/unclear: **LP15 Cultural infrastructure (venues & facilities).** Unambitious given focus on culture and creativity. No list of such venues/facilities. Specific problem of facilities just across borough border (e.g. Blackheath Halls, Blackheath Conservatoire, Age Exchange	LP16 – We have strengthened our pubs policy to try and resist there redevelopment. LP17 – We have corresponded with our community's team regarding community infrastructure –	Noted

			and its library, which are all in RBG but serve many Lewisham borough residents). How to measure: each venue not of equal value. Realistic? **LP16 Public houses.** No net loss. Unrealistic if for continuing in use as pubs, which are closing nationwide due to changing lifestyles. Need to retain and support good neighbourhood pubs or repurpose if heritage buildings. **LP17 Community infrastructure**. No net loss. Unambitious given forecast growth in population and new housing. Particularly important to retain and expand in areas of intense development, especially North and Central Areas. **LP18 Open space**. No net loss (designated). Unambitious, especially in the face of a rising population, lessons learned from covid about the importance of good quality and safe open space. And specifically green space? Is there a baseline for this, split between public and private (including gardens)? This needs	No further need was identified.	

			protecting and expanding, for reasons of health, well-being and carbon reduction, as well as to contribute to the Mayor's ambition of a green city (>50% overall). **LPxx**. No targets on **capital spending** (including CIL) on **basic infrastructure to support new housing and other development**. **LP25-27 Housing & Workspace**. What does 'in the character area' mean? Does it mean in each/all five character areas? If so, it is too vague, untargeted and uncalibrated. If not, it should specify by area, as in Table 13.1 on page 473		
Blackheath Society no 2	4	DM 05	**DM5 Monitoring and review**. Need to be careful of planning decisions driven by targets creating perverse incentives. Need to be realistic about timescale. Need targets for each 5 years of Plan's 20 years (as well as routine annual reporting monitoring review), then formal review, evaluation and change where needed. D Welcome focus on viability review regarding land values but other things will change	Noted	DM5 amended to include 5 year review in line with the NPPF.

			e.g. population growth; retail habits; relative values of residential, commercial etc. use; impact of big transport infrastructure changes; etc.		
Deptford Society	4	DM 05 Table 19.1	**Page 805**, table 19.1 (LPIs) LPI18 - open space. We consider 'no net loss' to be a poor aspiration and would encourage the council to set a target to increase the amount of open space. Does the definition of 'open space' mean space that is publicly accessible? If not, a distinction should be made in any monitoring figures between the two.	Disagree. Draft Local Plan monitor LPI18 is considered appropriate given the Local Plan objectives to protect open space. This will also help to support implementation and review of policies concerning acceptable loss of open space. However it is recognised that further monitors in the green infrastructure section could be added.	Local Plan Policy GR2 amended to make clear distinction between open and green spaces. Further monitors in the green infrastructure section added to monitoring framework.
Deptford Society	4	DM 05 Table 19.1	**Page 805**, table 19.1 (LPIs) LPI21 Air quality. Likewise we consider the LPI relating to air	Noted.	Further monitor on air quality added to monitoring framework, focussed on achievement of air quality objectives.

			quality to be extremely unimaginative. It does nothing to drive improvements to the borough's existing air quality, which in some places (especially around the main roads in Deptford and New Cross) is already known to be extremely poor.		
Environment Agency	4	DM 05	We recommend the monitoring section of the new Local Plan could be updated to include annual updates on the total metres of rivers restored/improved, number of pollution incidents and m2 of urban greening e.g. areas of new/improved green spaces delivered such as parkland, riverside buffer zones and green roofs/walls. This will show how the positive new local plan policies on Green Infrastructure and climate change are delivering the policy objectives for environmental outcomes and urban greening, river restoration and adapting to climate change.	Noted.	Further monitors in the green infrastructure section added to monitoring framework, including on river corridor improvement.
Historic England	4	DM 05	Monitoring: It should be noted that the new London Plan	Noted. The London Plan	Further monitors included on heritage and historic environment.

			policy M1 (Monitoring) contains a new Key Performance Indicator relating to heritage. This is intended to monitor whether the applications that the GLA are consulted on have a beneficial, neutral or harmful impact on the historic environment – we would commend this approach to the Council in its monitoring framework.	monitors cover development activity in Lewisham in terms of referable applications. The Local Plan monitoring framework will be amended with additional monitors on heritage.	
London Wildlife Trust	4	DM 05	In Table 19.1 Monitoring framework, Green Infrastructure only has one measure, that of Open Space (LP18; No net loss of designated open space). We suggest another; no net loss in quantity of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation.	Noted.	Further monitors in the green infrastructure section added to monitoring framework.
NHS (HUDU)	4	DM 05 Table 19.1	**DM5 Monitoring and Review** Table 19.1 which sets out Local Performance Indicators does not link the indicators to the vision and strategic objectives set out at the beginning of the Local Plan. Unfortunately, this makes it difficult to measure progress against the objectives.	Noted. The Local Plan monitoring framework has been reviewed and updated. Health is a cross-cutting issue so this topic area will	Further monitors added to monitoring framework, including monitors to measure improvement in addressing deprivation.

			There are no indicators relating to health and wellbeing. For Community Infrastructure the indicator is no net loss. (LP1 17) Given the scale of population growth set out in the local plan and that much of the existing community and social infrastructure is poor quality this indicator needs to measure the provision of new and fit for purpose community infrastructure, or new /improved infrastructure by area. For successful delivery of the local plan infrastructure needs to be provided when and where it is needed. We suggest local performance indicators for Strategic Objectives G, H and I <u>G Healthy and Safe Communities</u> 16. Measure (reduction) in health inequalities, particularly in geographic areas falling with the most deprived communities (IMD 2019). 17. % of the street network meeting the Healthy Street principles or scoring X	be addressed by the revisions.	

			18. No /% of developments which meet the policy requirement (35/50%) genuinely Affordable Housing within a tenure blind design. 19. Reduction in crime and fear of crime. <u>H Securing the Timely Delivery of Infrastructure</u> 20. % of the infrastructure set out in the IDP delivered alongside with housing development <u>I Ensuring High Quality Education, Health and Social Care</u> 22. Increase in residents accessing high quality education, health and social care facilities (baseline required to measure increase)		
The St John's Society	4	DM 05	There is a lack of measurable targets – how will Lewisham assess whether the Plan has been followed? Need 5 yearly targets and review.	Noted.	Noted. The Local Plan monitoring framework has been reviewed and updated with additional monitors.
The St John's Society	4	Enforcement	DELIVERY AND MONITORING The current planning enforcement needs to be stricter, tighter, and better funded. There needs to be	Planning enforcement is outside the scope of the Local Plan.	Local Plan amended with a point about the use of planning enforcement in the delivery section.

			much better enforcement with adequate resources and means to ensure much of the good work in the plan is realised. Without this deterrent, unplanned and even illegal development will continue.	However a point about the use of planning enforcement will be included in the delivery section.	
Blackheath Society no 2	5		**App 2 Glossary**: night-time economy (43 refs incl. re Blackheath) not defined here or in EC18. Appears to be 6pm-6am.6pm-12pm more appropriate for Blackheath which is not like Lewisham and Catford, which have more in common with central London. Design-led approach (54 refs) is not defined, although key to QD policies	Further details are set out in the London Plan. The council will use conditions to ensure operating hours are appropriate for the use and location.	No change.
Blackheath Society no 2	5		**Sch 1 Strategic and local views, vistas and landmarks** – few local views, none on/in/from Blackheath Village or Heath. Several needed, in all directions.	We are not considering more view within this version of the Local Plan	No change
Blackheath Society no 2	5		**Sch 5 Town centres** – Blackheath is a district centre per London Plan and draft Local Plan. What does this mean in practice? Benefits? Risks? Differentiation from others.	We are not considering more view within this version of the Local Plan	No change

Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum Ringway No 2	5		*Submitted The Ringway Gardens 268 Baring Road, Grove Park, London, SE12 0DS: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal*	Further work has been undertaken on this	The Urban National Park area has been upgraded to Metropolitan SINC
Telegraph Hill Society	5	Glossary	We refer to the following terms in the above paper which we believe require further consideration to avoid confusion: • Heritage Asset (paragraph 140) • Markets (paragraph 176) • Opportunity Area (to eliminate the discrepancy identified in paragraphs 34, 35 and 40)	Heritage assets and opportunity areas are defined in London Plan and national policy.	Local Plan amended with additional details on distinguishing markets for purpose of policy implementation, within the Markets policy.
Telegraph Hill Society	5	Glossary	There are also terms which are used within the Plan which are not defined in the glossary. In some instances they are terms that stem from government or GLA guidance and therefore definitions should be referred back to that, in others no definition is given and therefore the interpretation of those terms is left wholly open to doubt. Some terms which we believe should be considered for definition are: • design-led (see paragraph 42)	Many of the terms used are established by or set out the national planning policy framework, as well as the London Plan. These will need to be referred alongside the local plan. Some additional cross-referencing will	Local Plan glossary reviewed and updated.

			• garden (rather than “back garden” see the discussion in paragraphs 125 to 128 • good design • healthy streets (as in “Healthy Streets Approach” and “Healthy Streets principles”) • heritage environment (see paragraph 137) • home (family housing is defined, but “home” is not) • main town centre use • re-enforce and re-invent (as used in figure 3.2) • special characteristics (which we take to mean those characteristics which make an area distinctive and contribute to its specific character and which include but are not confined to those identified in the Characterisation Studies, Conservation Area Character Appraisals, area or site-specific SDGs and any Design Codes).	be added to the plan. The Local Plan also includes further definitions and details in the policy supporting text, and therefore are not repeated in the glossary.	
Blackheath Society	5	Schedule 1 QD 05	Few local views, none on/in/from Blackheath Village or Heath. Several needed, in all directions.	We are not considering more view within this version of the Local Plan	No change

Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum	5	Schedule 3	Schedule 3 – non designated heritage assets should include Buckthorne Cutting and the Hither Green / Grove Park Cutting from South Circular Grove Park Station in ASLC section.	Buckthorne Cutting is not designated as an ASLC	No change
HopCroft Neighbourhood Forum	5	Section 21 Part 2 Section 10	The green space appendix at the end of the document does not appear to show any intended protection enhancements despite the promises made, other than at Mountsfield Park. The Buckthorne Nature reserve that has been seeking protections for months/years is not even on the list.	Noted	This appendix has been updated to reflect those spaces designated through the additional Open Space and MOL reviews
HopCroft Neighbourhood Forum	5	Section 21	Schedule 3 – non designated heritage assets should include Buckthorne Cutting in ASLC section.	Buckthorne Cutting is not designated as an ASLC	No change