



# **Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options**

## **Schedule of consultation comments with Officer responses**

CTCLP Further Options - Comments Received

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
<b>Introduction</b>				
Stewart Murray, GLA	1.4 Previous consultation and context	Comment	Need reference to the draft London Plan Revised Minor Alterations – due for adoption later this year. London Plan Ref: London Plan Revised Minor Alterations	<b>The early minor alterations are not yet adopted and should not be included within the Plan. The Plan will be amended to explain the relationship to the London Plan at the beginning of the document.</b>
<b>Town Centre Study area</b>				
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.2 Town Centre Study Area and Key Issues	Comment / Object	Broadly there is agreement that the 8 zones as agreed in the documents are key developmental areas within the redevelopment zone. However it would be desirable that the plan drew out further the way in which the connective areas between the eight zones interact, and facilitate better interaction and coherence in design, in both form and function. The site should be planned as one coherent space rather than 8 zones.	<b>The level of detail contained within the Plan is appropriate. All of the Major Sites policies 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 emphasise comprehensive site wide approaches and taking account of the surrounding context, enhanced settings and connectivity with surrounding areas. Policy Option 21 (Design and public realm) provides guidance for the town centre as a whole. The Council will review this in the proposed submission version to ensure that design principles provide a consistent and coherent approach to the town centre as a whole.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.2.1 Rushey Green and Bromley Road	Comment / Object	Rushey Green is not just the High street it is in the entire locality covering the eight zones. The report should be made to reflect this throughout, as a significant number of residents feel there is greater affinity and value to area using this name rather than Catford.	<b>Disagree. Catford is the town's established name and is referred to in a range of higher level documents including Lewisham's Core Strategy and the London Plan. A change of name would cause confusion for the general public. Catford is therefore the most appropriate name to refer to in this Plan.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.2.1 Rushey Green and Bromley Road	Comment / Object	Heading 2.2.1 should be changed to Rushey Green high street and Bromley Road.	<b>Disagree. Section 2.2 makes reference to the eight character areas. The first sentence of the sub section entitled Rushey Green and Bromley Road acknowledges that this is the high street of the town centre.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.2.1 Rushey Green and Bromley Road	Comment/ Object	Building usage, especially medical use. High Street decanting Cycle usage on pedestrian footpaths Number & function of fast food take-aways, betting shops, and pay-day loan lenders/pawnbrokers	<b>Comments noted. CLP Option 1 will be amended to refer to improved movement and facilities for both pedestrians and cyclists. The number of take-away shops will be addressed on a borough-wide basis, through Policy 19 of the Development Management Local Plan. CLP Option 13: Town centre vitality and viability will be amended to specifically refer to limiting the number of hot food take-away shops, in accordance with the borough-wide policy.</b>  <b>Betting shops form part of a wider 'use class' that includes financial and professional services such as banks and building societies (A2 Use Class). Therefore any restrictive policy applying to A2 uses would impact on a wide range of</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
				premises, without being able to single out betting shops in particular.
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.2.3 Catford Centre and Milford Towers	Comment / Object	If economically feasible and advantageous, I would like to see the development of additional retail floor space via an upper floor or floors to the Catford shopping precinct/Milford Towards even at the loss of housing stock, as beneficial	<b>Disagree.</b> CLP Option 13 encourages an additional 8,100 sqm gross of A1 comparison and 1,800 sqm gross of A1 convenience retail floorspace throughout the town centre. This additional floorspace can be accommodated whilst also redeveloping the Catford Centre for a mix of both retail and residential uses, in line with CLP Option 2.
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.2.5 Plassy Road Island	Comment / Object	Plassy Road Island is an under utilised site that doesn't feel as if it is part of the wider shopping facilities, and is only accessible from the Broadway side via a small tunnel. It would be desirable, to decant housing from this site and develop this as a retail shopping area. Plassy road development should be sympathetic to both the Catford Broadway Theatre Design as well as the period public house on the site.	<b>Policy 5 seeks mixed use development to complement the Primary Shopping Area and includes both a mix of retail, community/leisure uses and residential units. Part 5(1g) seeks integration with the site into the Primary Shopping Area and its immediate surrounds through improved access and permeability within the site and to Rushey Green. Figure 5.5 recognises both the Broadway Theatre and the pub as heritage assets and CLP Option 23 seeks to sustain and enhance them.</b>
<b>Issues and opportunities - Note: the plan will be restructured and will include a streamlined section on issues and opportunities</b>				
Local Resident	2.3.1 Issues and Opportunities	Support	As a local resident I hope you will accept my comments on the Catford Local Plan Further Options 2013 report. I like the way you have set out 'issues' and 'opportunities' throughout: it is a clear way of telling us what you are thinking and allows us to check if we agree with you.	Comments noted.
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.3.1 Issues and Opportunities - Retail	Comment / Object	Add to Opportunity: To use the pre-existing entrepreneurial spirit which used to reside in the Catford Mews and creating more opportunity for small and start-up businesses.	Comments noted. CLP Option 10: Economic Growth for Catford will be amended to refer to encouraging small and start-up businesses. The text accompanying the CLP Option 10 already refers to the provision of space for small and medium sized premises as one of the key issues for Catford. The justification text to CLP Option 10 will be amended to refer to opportunities for entrepreneurship.
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.3.1 Issues and Opportunities - Retail	Comment	Residents often talk about 'trying to get Marks and Spencers to return', this should be read as lay-man's terms for asking for an increase in the number of GOAD key attractors to be established in the area, especially department stores, even potentially at the detriment of other developments.	Comments noted. CLP Options 10 (1b) and 13 (1b) encourage new retail to maintain Catford as a Major Town Centre including an additional 8,100 sqm gross A1 comparison and an additional 1,800 sqm gross A1 convenience floorspace.
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.3.1 Issues and Opportunities - Retail	Comment / Object	A review of mixed use planning developments, where ground floor retail units are topped with residential buildings should be reviewed in the locality, with a focus on centralising retail into the economic centres.	Comments noted. CLP Option 11 will be amended to refer to encouraging an appropriate mix of compatible land uses, creating activity in the day and evening. Policies 2, 4 and 5 promote mixed use developments with residential above ground floor non-residential uses at the Catford Centre, Laurence House and Plassy Road. In order to support housing needs and the vitality and viability of the town centre, CLP Option 10 seeks the delivery of a greater

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
Local Resident	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, Civic functions	Comment / Object	"Opportunities: Consolidate Council and civic functions on one site". As a resident I don't care a jot about this. I am concerned that shuffling their own offices around will distract the council and planning team from focusing their intellects and energies on improving the more important bits of Catford centre. The council has already made mistakes with its offices on that patch (that old civic cathedral was beautiful, torn down for a new civic centre which seems perfectly adequate). Personally I think Laurence House looks great (love those climbing plants), and is accessible for users.	<b>component of residential within the mix of uses.</b> <b>Disagree. CLP Options 3 and 4 will redevelop the Civic Centre and Laurence House sites and allow the Council's civic services to be consolidated in a more efficient manner. Without the redevelopment of these sites a range of further benefits would be unlikely to happen such. These benefits include improving the South Circular, enhancing the pedestrian/cycling environment along Catford Road, providing public realm space outside of the Broadway Theatre, the introduction of active and mixed use ground floor uses, setting back the building from Catford Road, consolidating traffic access and providing publically accessible open space.</b>
Local Resident	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, Library	Comment / Object	"The layout and structure of the building are not ideally suited for library use". I disagree, it's fine!! The only issue is difficulty crossing the south circular to get to it.	<b>Disagree. Policies 3 and 4 will redevelop the Civic Centre and Laurence House sites and will consolidate the Council's services in a more efficient manner. CLP Options 1 and 4 seek improvements to the pedestrian environment along Catford Road including simplifying the pedestrian crossing at Catford Road and Rushey Green junction and improving access and permeability between the sites.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, Library	Comment / Object	The retention of Library Facilities and the community learning resources in Rushey is important. It is not necessary in my mind for them to be located specifically in Laurence House but within the imminent locality.	<b>CLP Option 3 seeks a redevelopment that will provide a consolidated range of council and civic uses including a library.</b>
A. Dunne	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, Community space	Comment/ Object	Firstly, space in the centre of Catford that didn't adhere to a religious belief for use by the community. I suppose this could be used for weddings, yoga classes, birthday parties etc. This would be a great opportunity to have a community space.	<b>Although a community hall is not specifically mentioned, CLP Options 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 allow for the provision of new community and civic facilities at Civic Centre, Laurence House, Plassy Road Island, Catford Greyhound Stadium and Wickes/Halfords.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, Community space	Comment / Object	Add in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To increase service provision and community facilities that meets local need in the area</li> <li>• To support economic regeneration in the area</li> </ul>	<b>Comments noted. Objective 8 and CLP Option 25: Social infrastructure will be amended to strengthen the importance of social infrastructure to support the proposed levels of growth. CLP Options 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 allow for the provision of new community and civic facilities at Civic Centre, Laurence House, Plassy Road Island, Catford Greyhound Stadium and Wickes/Halfords.</b>  <b>The Council considers the Plan adequately encourages and supports economic regeneration. In order to stimulate economic regeneration, the Plan contains specific policies on the sustainable growth of the local economy (CLP Option 10), employment uses (CLP Option 12) and town centre</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
				<b>vitality and viability (CLP Option 13).</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, Community space	Comment / Object	It would be desirable for LBL to establish a relationship with an organisation such as 3Space for vacant buildings in prominent positions activity whilst also supporting Rushey Green community infrastructure.	<b>Disagree. This is beyond the scope of the Plan.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Policy option 25 Social Infrastructure	Comment / Object	Provision of community facilities within the plan should be identified and increased, there has been significant and sustained calls by residents in council forums for this.	<b>Comments noted. Objective 8 and CLP Option 25: Social infrastructure will be amended to strengthen the importance of social infrastructure to support the proposed levels of growth. CLP Options 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 allow for the provision of new community and civic facilities at Civic Centre, Laurence House, Plassy Road Island, Catford Greyhound Stadium and Wickes/Halfords.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, Food and drink, Community space	Comment / Object	An 'appropriate' evening economy would be highly desirable. We have currently entertainment provision that is centred around the provision of cheaper drinking venues, that can and do exacerbate anti-social behaviour in the areas. Non-alcohol focussed evening activity such as a cinema, sports/gym facilities, coffee/restaurants (eat-in) and community space development would be welcome, it would also retain middle income earners who work for both the LBL and Lewisham Hospital in the area also.	<b>Comments noted. CLP Option 14: Evening economy uses specifically encourages proposals that will contribute to the evening economy including restaurants and family friendly leisure developments.</b>  <b>The effects of restaurants, cafes and drinking establishments will be addressed on a borough-wide basis, through Policy 17 of the Development Management Local Plan. CLP Option 13 will be amended to refer to this policy and managing adverse effects.</b>  <b>CLP Options 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 allow for the provision of new community/civic facilities and/or family friendly leisure facilities at Civic Centre, Laurence House, Plassy Road Island, Catford Greyhound Stadium and Wickes/Halfords.</b>
Rose Freeman, Theatres Trust	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, Broadway Theatre	Support	Thank you for your letter of 22 February consulting the Theatres Trust on the updated planning strategy for Catford Town Centre. We are pleased that the operations of the Broadway Theatre will be improved – please consult us for any relevant planning applications.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, Broadway Theatre	Comment / Object	The use of the Broadway Theatre as a more multi-purpose facility would be an additional bonus, whilst retaining its cultural/theatrical purposes.	<b>Policy 3 seeks to retain and enhance the operations of the Broadway Theatre.</b>
A. Dunne	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, Cinema	Support	I also found the possibility of a cinema very exciting.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
Mrs L Olofinjana	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, Cinema	Comment / Object	I think a cinema for Catford is a must - the entire borough has no cinema whereas Greenwich has 3. Catford is the perfect location for a cinema and as page 31 says, this will attract many more people to the area and restaurants there.	<b>No specific site has been identified for a cinema however the Vision seeks an improved leisure offer and Objective 4 seeks to establish Catford as an evening and weekend leisure destination. The Plan contains a strong focus on</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
				developing a mix of uses, including leisure uses, and supporting the evening economy (see CLP Options 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14). CLP Options 2, 3, 4 and 5 allow for the development of a mix of uses including leisure (D2) at the Catford Centre, Civic Centre, Laurence House and Plassy Road.
S. Duncan	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, Cinema	Comment / Object	Similarly, if there is any way to incentivise/help the building of a cinema in Catford (or rebuilding as there were some beautiful cinemas in Catford in the past, I think). Again, there needs to be something else besides shops. Creating a cinema in an existing building (in part of the theatre, in one of the old cinemas on Rushey Green, or in that disused turreted building at the west end of Brownhill Road, opposite the Salvation Army, or building a new cinema within one of the development spaces, would be a tremendous boost for us all, and would help shift away from this- I feel- culturally damaging and long-term-unsustainable sense that shopping is a leisure activity).	<b>No specific site has been identified for a cinema however the Vision seeks an improved leisure offer and Objective 4 seeks to establish Catford as an evening and weekend leisure destination. The Plan contains a strong focus on developing a mix of uses, including leisure uses, and supporting the evening economy (see CLP Options 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14). CLP Options 2, 3, 4 and 5 allow for the development of a mix of uses including leisure (D2) at the Catford Centre, Civic Centre, Laurence House and Plassy Road.</b>
E. Weidman	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, Cinema	Comment / Object	Also a boutique style cinema would be good... bring people into Catford. Would be nice to tie a nice bar/ coffee shop to this... Could this and Tesco's share the parking... I would be happy to help with designs as I have my own design business here in Catford.	<b>The Vision, Objective 4 and CLP Options 2, 3, 4,5 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 25 support family friendly leisure developments such as cinemas. Restaurants that will contribute to the evening economy are supported in CLP Option 14. CLP Option 1: Traffic and transport will be amended to refer to public car parking spaces. There will be opportunities to comment on the design aspects of developments as part of consultation on planning applications.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, Cinema	Comment / Object	It would be desirable to have additional appropriate social activity space within the regeneration zone, which also operates into the evening. Catford has a tradition of hosting the Boroughs cinema and desire to see this return would augment provision, as well as support associated retail services. It is my belief that a policy response to the need of a Cinema would be desirable, it is a key issue for discussion in many community forums. The O2, Peckham and Beckenham cinemas are all too far away without clear public transport links, which adversely affects provision for Children and Young people.	<b>The Vision, Objective 4 and Policies 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 25 support family friendly leisure developments such as cinemas.</b>
A. Dunne	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, Cinema	Comment / Object	In addition to my previous comments I also thought of a couple of other things that might be interesting for the area alongside the housing and new shops and potential for things such as a cinema.	<b>The Vision, Objective 4 and Policies 2, 3, 4,5 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 25 support family friendly leisure developments such as cinemas.</b>
Local Resident	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, Cinema	Comment / Object	The UKCG building on the corner of Bromley Road/Catford Gyrotory was approved planning permission on condition that it reopened the cinema previously there for community use. It has not yet done so. The Council seems strangely content to ignore this breach.	<b>Disagree. This is beyond the scope of the Plan.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, Gym	Comment / Object	It would be desirable for an expansion of provision at the Ladywell Arena be the preferred site of development, as the Ladywell Leisure Centre is set to close.	<b>Disagree. This site is beyond the boundary of Catford Town Centre Local Plan area.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Other issues	Comment / Object	Provision of petrol stations	<b>Disagree. The provision of petrol stations within the town centre is beyond the scope of the Plan.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Other issues	Comment / Object	Land banking for future DLR/Tube transport infrastructure should be planned for in the most appropriate areas.	<b>Comments noted. CLP Option 1 will be amended to support the principle of extending the London Underground and the DLR subject to rail alignments that satisfactorily safeguard open spaces, pedestrian and cycle connectivity and local amenity. These issues will be considered as more detailed proposals for the Underground and DLR routes are unveiled.</b>
<b>Vision and Objectives</b>				
Stewart Murray, GLA	Vision Text Box (page 44)	Object	To ensure conformity with London Plan delete text 'aspirations of the Lewisham Town Centre to achieve Metropolitan status' London Plan Ref: Annex Two	<b>Disagree. Strategic Objective 4 and Spatial Policy 2 of the adopted Lewisham Core Strategy seeks to promote Lewisham town centre to a Metropolitan town centre by 2026. The Vision, Objective 1 and paragraph 5.33 of the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan also aspires towards this and has recently been through Independent Examination.</b>
Richard Parish, English Heritage	3.1 Vision for Catford Town Centre	Comment / Object	We consider that the realignment of the A205 has the potential to greatly improve the quality and attractiveness of the Town Centre. However, the traffic and public realm works, and the redevelopment of the Civic Centre and Laurence House sites will have a direct relationship to each other and should be undertaken in a co-ordinated manner to ensure a coherent and complimentary response to the new context created, existing townscape and heritage assets. As such, we would recommend the Council considers producing an integrated masterplan for these sites to give clarity to the vision for the Town Centre.	<b>Disagree. The level of detail contained within the Plan is appropriate and gives clarity to the Vision for the town centre. Design principles and the integration between sites and their surroundings have been identified for each of the Major Site CLP Options 2-7. There will be further opportunities to comment on individual sites at planning application stage. Furthermore, Figure 5.5 identifies the heritage assets within the town centre and CLP Option 23 seeks to sustain and enhance Catford's heritage assets and their settings, in line with Development Management Local Plan proposed submission policy 36.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	3.1 Vision for Catford Town Centre	Comment / Object	Inclusion of 'study and play' should be included into the vision.	<b>Disagree. This is too detailed for an overarching Vision. Strategic objective 7 seeks new public spaces. Objective 8 seeks to promote active and lifestyles. CLP Option 25 identifies the need to retain existing and provide additional social infrastructure such as schools, childcare and community and leisure facilities.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents	3.1 Vision for Catford Town Centre	Comment / Object	Amendment to : Catford Town Centre, home of the council's services and the civic heart of the borough, will be a lively, attractive town centre focused around a high quality network of	<b>Comments noted. The Vision has not incorporated the proposed changes as the Vision needs to be succinct. Objective 8 will be amended to make reference to the need</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
Association			public spaces. Driven by the redevelopment of key opportunity areas, including the redevelopment of the former Catford Greyhound Stadium site and the Shopping Centre, Catford will have an improved retail offer and will be home to a diverse residential community, <i>with local amenities and infrastructure meeting local needs and aspirations</i> . The Broadway Theatre and Studio will continue to be a focus for arts and cultural activities and the-market in will continue to contribute to Catford's identity.	<b>for sufficient social infrastructure to support growth and CLP Option 25 recognises that the proposed growth of Catford will result in the need to provide additional social infrastructure.</b>
B. Gray	3.1 Vision for Catford Town Centre	Comment / Object	The vision for Catford could be more vivid and include community, friendly, enjoyable, intercultural which were features people identified as good in previous consultations as mentioned in parts of the Catford Plan.	<b>Comments noted. The Vision has not incorporated the proposed changes as the Vision needs to be succinct. The Council will review CLP Option 25 and Objective 8 to strengthen the community focus.</b>
Stewart Murray, GLA	3.3 Catford Plan Objectives	Support	Full support for Catford Objectives as set out on page 50 London Plan Ref: 3.8, Housing SPG	<b>Support noted.</b>
<b>Transport (See also PO 24 Sustainable Transport)</b>				
Ms L. McAlister	Parking	Support  object	Also, with the increase in new homes comes an increase in the need for school places. Primary schools are already currently oversubscribed, and yet there is no mention of increasing places for secondary schools, or any new schools planned. If a key goal of the plan is to increase the housing available, and therefore the population of Catford, how can school places and parking not be included in the scope?	<b>The social and transport infrastructure needs are considered as part of the plan making process. Social infrastructure, including school capacities are considered in CLP Option 25. The Council will review CLP Option 1 to include reference to securing public car parking spaces.</b>
Stewart Murray, GLA	Policy option 1 Traffic and transport, 2.13, 3.2	Support	The proposals are in general conformity with the London Plan subject to further discussion with TfL regarding the de designation of land safeguarded for the re-alignment of the South Circular Road and the recommended alternative. London Plan Ref: 2.13, 3.2, 4.7, 7.6	<b>Support noted. The council has discussed the re-alignment of the south circular with TfL.</b>
Local Resident	Policy option 1 Traffic and transport, DLR, p62	Comment  Objection	I prefer TfL's proposal for the DLR route rather than the council's. It will be cheaper and the visual impairment would be minimal (it's cool to see trains).	<b>Council officers have had discussions with TFL on early proposals for extending the DLR from Lewisham to Bromley. These early discussions indicated considerable impact on development sites and open space in Lewisham from the TFL proposal. As such to minimise adverse impact LBL officers have suggested the tunnel option.</b>
Mr Liam Henderson, TfL	Policy Option 1 Traffic and Transport, DLR, p62	Comment  Objection	I have reviewed the draft document and have the following comments to make on behalf of Docklands Light Railway (DLRL). DLRL welcomes the inclusion of a proposed DLR extension to support the regeneration of Catford Town Centre. There are a number of comments which would clarify the proposals at this stage: DLRL requests the following modifications to the text – <b>Docklands Light Railway proposals</b>	<b>The Council accepts that the DLR proposals are at an early stage of discussion and subject to change. As such the qualifications and amendments are noted and will be taken into account when drafting the proposed submission version.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>TfL is considering the extension of the DLR from Lewisham to Bromley. Various options are being explored, <del>with the emerging preference being for an initial route</del> from Lewisham to Catford Bridge with an improved interchange between a new DLR station, Catford Bridge and Catford stations. <del>There could be and new intermediate stations at Lewisham High Street and (e.g. near Ladywell). The later phase This route would subsequently extend the line</del> from Catford to Bromley North or South.</p> <p>Lewisham Council's preferred option is the alignment of a DLR route in a tunnel from Lewisham to Catford, approximately under the current alignment of A21 and Catford Road, and a new Catford DLR station south of the A205 that could be provided within the Wickes and Halfords site. An interchange with the existing Catford stations could still be achieved with new passenger links under the A205.</p> <p>TfL's alternative option <del>for the section from Lewisham to Catford is an</del> part-elevated and part-surface level <del>only</del> extension from Lewisham to Catford Bridge/Catford via Ladywell. <del>The existing Lewisham to Hayes line through Catford Bridge is currently safeguarded for the future expansion to the Bakerloo Underground line.</del> TfL's proposed route would need to run parallel to the existing railway and this would <del>potentially impact upon a small part of the consented scheme for the former Greyhound Stadium site and potentially impact on recent park and river improvement works to Ladywell Fields. , and result in a significant visual impact of a DLR line crossing over the A205.</del></p> <p>Note – The alignment of the proposed Bakerloo line has no formal safeguarding.</p>	
Mr Liam Henderson, TfL	Policy Option 1 Traffic and Transport, DLR, p63	Comment  Objection	<p><del>TfL have not advised the Council of a preferred route, provided detailed plans or indicated cost and funding for the project are still at a very early stage of development of the proposed DLR extension, with detailed routes, costs and funding sources yet to be identified.</del> The proposal to extend the DLR has been included within this Further Options plan for discussion and comment as any proposal would impact the town centre and the borough as a whole. The Council's preference is for any route to be tunnelled to reduce physical and visual impact. All comments will be passed on to TfL for consideration.</p>	<b>The Council accepts that the DLR proposals are at an early stage of discussion and subject to change. As such the qualifications and amendments are noted and will be taken into account when drafting the proposed submission version.</b>
Charles Muriithi, Environment	DLR	Comment	We note the Plan is looking at options for improvements to existing rail infrastructure, including a proposed extension of the Docklands	<b>The Council accepts that the DLR proposals are at an early stage of discussion and subject to change. As such the</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
Agency			Light Railway into Catford. At this early stage we feel it is wise to point out that any tunnelling works within Catford for such a scheme are likely to present a significant risk of impact on the Thames Water groundwater supply boreholes that abstract chalk groundwater from underneath Catford.	<b>comments made are noted and will be taken into account when drafting the proposed submission version.</b>
Nick Graham, TfL	Policy Option 1 Traffic and Transport, DLR, p62	Comment Objection	<p>The following modifications to the text are suggested: TfL is considering the extension of the DLR from Lewisham to Bromley. Various options are being explored, <b>with the emerging preference being for an initial route</b> from Lewisham to Catford <b>Bridge</b> with an improved interchange between a new DLR station, Catford Bridge and Catford stations. <b>There could be <del>and</del> new intermediate stations <del>at Lewisham High Street and</del> (e.g. near Ladywell). <del>The later phase</del> This route</b> would subsequently extend <b>the line</b> from Catford to Bromley North <b>or South</b>.</p> <p>Lewisham Council's preferred option is the alignment of a DLR route in a tunnel from Lewisham to Catford, approximately under the current alignment of A21 and Catford Road, and a new Catford DLR station south of the A205 that could be provided within the Wickes and Halfords site. An interchange with the existing Catford stations could still be achieved with new passenger links under the A205.</p> <p>TfL's alternative option for the section from Lewisham to Catford is <del>an</del> part-elevated and part-surface level <del>only</del> extension from Lewisham to Catford Bridge/Catford via Ladywell. <del>The existing Lewisham to Hayes line through Catford Bridge is currently safeguarded for the future expansion to the Bakerloo Underground line.</del> TfL's proposed route would need to run parallel to the existing railway and this would potentially impact upon a small part of the consented scheme for the former Greyhound Stadium site and potentially impact on recent park and river improvement works to Ladywell Fields. <del>, and result in a significant visual impact of a DLR line crossing over the A205.</del></p>	<b>The Council accepts that the DLR proposals are at an early stage of discussion and subject to change. As such the qualifications and amendments are noted and will be taken into account when drafting the proposed submission version.</b>
E. Weidman	Bakerloo Line and DLR	Comment	<p>We are really excited about the prospect of the Bakerloo line coming to Catford as well as other discussions of the DLR, it maybe a long way off but we are in the right position to now push for this, petition to get it... work along side Southwark who also want this.... This is the key to putting Catford on the London map, in my opinion. This in itself will chance Catford's future. This will bring new business and people into the area. The Tube is a powerful thing.</p> <p>The DLR link to the city will also help. This being said we do not</p>	<b>Comments in support of the Bakerloo line extension and the DLR extension to Catford are noted.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			want to make Catford like Deptford... There are so many high rises there with 'city' people living in them. Most of these people do not step foot on Deptford High Street so the local shops have not particularly benefitted... This we must be careful of.	
Miss D. Leah	DLR	Support	The extension of the DLR would be very beneficial for Catford and would bring much needed jobs to the area.	<b>Support for the DLR extension is noted.</b>
S. Newton	DLR	Comment	Implementing the proposed extensions to the DLR and Bakerloo line are essential not only for Catford but the whole of the transport network, particularly for the relief of congestion at London Bridge.	<b>Comments in support of the Bakerloo line extension and the DLR extension to Catford are noted.</b>
Nick Graham, TfL	Policy Option 1 Traffic and Transport, DLR, p63	Comment	TfL <del>have not advised the Council of a preferred route, provided detailed plans or indicated cost and funding for the project</del> are still at a very early stage of development of the proposed DLR extension, with detailed routes, costs and funding sources yet to be identified. The proposal to extend the DLR has been included within this Further Options plan for discussion and comment as any proposal would impact the town centre and the borough as a whole. The Council's preference is for any route to be tunnelled to reduce physical and visual impact. All comments will be passed on to TfL for consideration.	<b>The Council accepts that the DLR proposals are at an early stage of discussion and subject to change. As such the qualifications and amendments are noted and will be taken into account when drafting the proposed submission version.</b>
S. Duncan	DLR and Bakerloo Extension	Comment	If there is any way to join the campaign for the Bakerloo line extension to Catford and/or the DLR, I would love to do so. I cannot overstate how needed I feel this is. The present train lines are getting more and more congested (both the trains and platforms themselves and the routes going through London Bridge from Ladywell and Hither Green)and this will become more of an issue when more flats are built and marketed to young commuters. Already the new developments in Hither Green (with only a fraction already occupied) have made a dramatic difference to the how trains at Hither Green Station are- with trains going from being busy but manageable to being unable to serve all those who want to use them- with passengers, staff and drivers getting more and more frustrated (this has become a big issue over the past 3 weeks). Tube and DLR in Catford would alleviate some of this congestion, as well as giving Catford a dramatic boost from greater and more flexible links to the rest of the city. The Bakerloo line extension would provide a much needed easier/quicker link to South West London via Elephant and Castle. This would also help relieve some of the (car) traffic problems. I realise this may be a hard fight but I think it would be worth really fighting. I was living in Haggerston/Hoxton in East London when the Overground finally arrived. The difference it has made to the local economy, cultural mix, activities, life of the area was extraordinary. This is really what Catford needs	<b>Comments in support of the Bakerloo line extension and the DLR extension to Catford are noted.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
L. Agbaimoni	Bakerloo & DLR extensions	Comment	These ideas are exciting for Catford. I think, in regards to the Bakerloo line, helping to make this happen would in it self do as much, (if not more), to bring new business and money to Catford as all the other plans combined. I think the council should perhaps see how much money it could raise through resident support and businesses so that it can present this information to TFL. I know that the money raised would be a small dent in the great sum of costs for TFL. But as this issue has been recently brought up again in parliament, I think we should use this as a catalyst to campaign for the Bakerloo line to be brought south London. I think if incentives can be propositioned for residents and business alike, perhaps we can help to get the ball rolling. Southwark will have a great sum to raise, as they need more work, but it is in their interest too and would also benefit Camberwell.	<b>Comments in support of the Bakerloo line extension and the DLR extension to Catford are noted.</b>
S. Duncan	DLR	Comment	If there is any way to join the campaign for the Bakerloo line extension to Catford and/or the DLR, I would love to do so. I cannot overstate how needed I feel this is. The present train lines are getting more and more congested (both the trains and platforms themselves and the routes going through London Bridge from Ladywell and Hither Green)and this will become more of an issue when more flats are built and marketed to young commuters. Already the new developments in Hither Green (with only a fraction already occupied) have made a dramatic difference to the how trains at Hither Green Station are- with trains going from being busy but manageable to being unable to serve all those who want to use them- with passengers, staff and drivers getting more and more frustrated (this has become a big issue over the past 3 weeks). Tube and DLR in Catford would alleviate some of this congestion, as well as giving Catford a dramatic boost from greater and more flexible links to the rest of the city. The Bakerloo line extension would provide a much needed easier/quicker link to South West London via Elephant and Castle. This would also help relieve some of the (car) traffic problems. I realise this may be a hard fight but I think it would be worth really fighting. I was living in Haggerston/Hoxton in East London when the Overground finally arrived. The difference it has made to the local economy, cultural mix, activities, life of the area was extraordinary. This is really what Catford needs.	<b>Comments in support of the Bakerloo line extension and the DLR extension to Catford are noted.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.6.7 Rail links	Comment Object	The inclusion of the Bakerloo Line and associated infrastructure should be built into the plan alongside that of the DLR. Crossing the railway tracks for pedestrians should from the greyhound site to Doggett Rd should be reviewed.	<b>Comments in support of the Bakerloo line extension and the DLR extension to Catford are noted. The planning permission for the former Grayhound Stadium makes provision for a bridge over the railway.</b>
A. Dunne	Roads	Comment	I found the 40 year deadlock from TFL frustrating, this could	<b>Comments in support of the Council's proposed A205 road</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			change the face of Catford. Is there no way that pressure could be applied to TFL to try and encourage a decision to be made?	improvements are noted.
Col. N. Wallace St Dunstan's College	Roads	Comment  Object	<p>As you also know St Dunstan's acquired last year the Private Banks Sports Ground, now renamed the Jubilee Ground . The northern frontage of the Jubilee Ground is within the designated area of the town centre and is shown in the Further Options document as being directly required to facilitate the Council's recommended option, in particular the proposals put forward for the Laurence House site and for Catford Hill between Catford Bridge railway station and Canadian Avenue. The school has embarked upon an improvement programme for the ground which to date has included improvements to the pitches, the changing rooms/club house, the security of the site and boundary treatment. In addition to building up its own use of the facility, it has also actively encouraged use by other local schools and the community and has continued commercial lettings.</p> <p>Whilst St Dunstan's was aware of the long standing Catford gyratory highway improvement scheme including the safeguarding of the north-eastern corner of the site when it acquired the Jubilee Ground, the Council's latest proposals would have significantly more impact upon the sports facility. The school would therefore welcome discussions with officers on the implications thereof which would include (but not be limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- proposals for the relocation of the vehicular access for the ground and given this access is likely to be further to the south down Canadian Avenue separate pedestrian/cycle provision should be made off Catford Hill.</li> <li>- the proposed public space/urban realm, realignment of the SCR and improvements to Catford Hill as suggested will result in a significant loss of land from the sports ground as will the creation of a new vehicular access. The school would be particularly concerned if this resulted in the loss of sports pitches at the site given their current and intended increasing use and thus we would wish to agree an indicative layout assuming the Council's recommended options are adopted.</li> <li>- proposals for oversailing the sports ground, placing structures within it, boundary treatment and site security consequent upon the changes put forward to Catford Hill and Canadian Avenue.</li> <li>- Ensuring access to the storage space leased by the school below the road is maintained if the Catford Hill and public space/urban realm proposals are implemented.</li> <li>- timing of the works – and addressing uncertainty in the interim</li> </ul>	<p><b>The A205 improvement scheme has been proposed for a long time and as stated St. Dunstan's were aware of these proposals when they purchased the sports ground. It is not anticipated that the CLP proposals will require more land at this location than the TFL proposals. The Council will continue to consult those affected by implementing the CLP road proposals and will seek agreement on detailed implementation taking into account the points made in this representation.</b></p>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>- funding for the works and land acquisition – the school would expect to be fully compensated and should not have to contribute to costs of the scheme including accommodation works</p> <p>- pedestrian and cycle provision on Catford Hill – improvement of these would be supported (including west from the railway lines towards the school ) but at the least the existing facilities should be retained including the subway (or at grade alternative) at Catford Bridge station.</p> <p>I appreciate that the above list goes into details of proposals when the Council is at an earlier stage in their formulation. However we consider it important that these matters are considered as part of the work towards publication of the proposed submission plan so as to ensure that what is put forward is practical and can be supported by St Dunstan's.</p>	
Mr R. Omerod	Roads	Comment Object	I am worried about the impact of changes to the A205 on Engleheart Road. It would appear there will be increased levels of traffic and the associated problems. What assessment has been carried out on the impact of the road changes to houses in the surrounding area.	<b>The Council will continue to consult those affected by implementing the CLP road proposals and will seek agreement on detailed implementation taking into account the points made in this representation.</b>
Mr Liam Henderson, TfL	Page 84	Comment	There is the option of including an intermediate station at Medusa on the 'TfL route'. The borough may want to highlight this location for reference.	<b>The Council accepts that the DLR proposals are at an early stage of discussion and subject to change. As such the qualifications and amendments are noted and will be taken into account when drafting the submission plan.</b>
Nick Graham, TfL	Transport	Comment	<p>The GLA in a letter dated 28<sup>th</sup> March provided a response to this Further Options document which included general comments from TfL. I now set out below more detailed comments from TfL on those parts of this document relating to rail and taxi/private hire.</p> <p>As you will realise the highways and associated bus, pedestrian and cycle proposals have a particular significance for TfL since they affect the A205 and A21, both of which are part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). In Catford, land has been safeguarded for many years for improvements to the gyratory where these two roads meet and currently it is a Roads Task Force case study area. We therefore wish to provide further comments on these aspects of the document and are consulting at high level within TfL. However due to leave and jury service we have been unable to complete this consultation to meet your deadline. As discussed with your colleagues we would therefore be grateful if you could accept a late response from us on these matters and in addition to continue discussions with Council officers during preparation of the next stage of the Local Plan.</p>	<b>Comments noted.</b>
Nick Graham, TfL	Roads	Comment	The Council should however note that the existing alignment of the	<b>Comment noted and error will be corrected for submission</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			A205 is incorrectly shown west of Catford Road in the document. Stanstead Road is part of the A205 and not as indicated on most of the figures Catford Hill, which is the A212.	<b>plan.</b>
Miss D. Leah	Roads	Comment	What are the alternatives for the South Circular you allude to? - no detail is given about these "cheaper" plans.	<b>Not clear what this comment refers to. The Council's preferred option for the A205 improvements are set out as preferred option 1 and explained in detail in pages 54-63 of the Further Options document.</b>
L. Agbaimoni	Road	Comment	<p>As a proud resident, I'm very excited about the regeneration of the area. I'm hoping for a positive effect on the current landscape. It would be great if we could look at the plans? I hope that the design and layout is based on furthering the area and not just cramming in as much homes as possible.</p> <p>Its good news to London that the area will be providing 800 plus homes, but the new residents/ businesses/ jobs will increase the already full flow of traffic to the area. I can understand that the seemingly easy solution highlighted in (4.6) of running through the car park, would not be easy to implement and would be costly. I just hope that the road solutions you have outlined will be sufficient enough to deal with the increasing population for years to come. Because a quick fix, may not be a fix at all. Improving the A205 should be just as important as building homes. Perhaps a redesign and a sacrifice of some homes should come first. I think a responsible approach is to consider that it is currently possible to solve the A205 issues, once the redevelopment starts it will not be. If the a205 was directed through the carpark, the large area above the a205 that is left could be a new community area, cinema, or something else if it is too small for homes.</p>	<b>Comments noted. Improving the A205 is an important aim of the CLP and will be reflected in the proposed submission version.</b>
Nick Graham, TfL	National Rail	Comment	<p>Network Rail and the TOC's should comment further on the Council's aspiration for enhanced railway facilities at Catford and Catford Bridge stations. However London Rail is not aware of any Network Rail funding for either station. There is always a better case for Network Rail investing in stations if there is third party funding. We would therefore recommend that the Plan provides for seeking developer contributions, towards achieving the station improvements where appropriate.</p> <p>In terms of TfL, there is the prospect of some funding going towards improvements at one or both stations, if the Government was to devolve powers over suburban rail services and the associated stations to the Mayor/TfL. Improvements would however be largely cosmetic, i.e. deep clean, repainting and providing</p>	<b>Comments noted. CLP Option 26 set out the Council's preferred policy for implementation . It is noted that Catford and Catford bridge are Network Rail's responsibility.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>enhanced facilities where necessary (signage, customer information, ticket machines, etc.) rather than anything more substantial such as replacing the building in the case of Catford station.</p> <p>The Council's proposal for a new public space between the two stations and more general public realm improvements around them is related to the redevelopment of the former Greyhound Track site and the Halford/Wickes site, to the proposals for the A205 and the potential DLR and/or Bakerloo Line extensions.</p> <p>It should be noted that Catford Bridge and Catford Stations are NR stations. The term London Overground applies to stations on the routes for which TfL has responsibility (e.g. Honor Oak Park). References in the document and future ones should be amended accordingly unless or until powers are devolved to TfL.</p>	
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Catford Road and Railway Stations	Comment	<p>Integration of Railway stations into one coherent rail interchange. Land banking for future DLR and/or Bakerloo line modifications Traffic management and flow from Addenmore Road and Ravensbourne Road on to A205 Ravensbourne River Provision of cycle parks</p>	<b>Comments noted. All these issues are dealt with in the Further Options and will be carried forward in the proposed submission version.</b>
Local Resident	p49	Comment	<b>Please</b> consider including a small (2 metre) path from Doggett road (just north of the three storey houses) to Platform 2 of Catford Bridge Station. Just get national rail to put a ticket machine there, like at Hither Green and Crofton Park. It will save a lot of passengers 5 minutes on each journey (for commuters that's 40 hours a year).	<b>Comments noted.</b>
Nick Graham, TfL	London Underground	Comment	<p>With regards to the Bakerloo line extension proposal, it is currently a long term aspiration of TfL and there is no funding allocated.. As you are also aware the alignment of the proposed Bakerloo line extension has no formal safeguarding.</p> <p>Some preliminary work is currently being undertaken on possible routes and their associated costs and benefits and potential development opportunities.</p> <p>The current proposal is to extend the existing line from Elephant &amp; Castle, via either Camberwell and Peckham or Old Kent Road, to Lewisham in tunnels. The extension would then either terminate at Lewisham (to which TfL is aware LB Lewisham are opposed) or take over the existing track and stations on the National Rail Lewisham to Hayes line, replacing the current train service on that</p>	<b>The Council accepts that the DLR proposals are at an early stage of discussion and subject to change.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>link. The latter option would mean that the Bakerloo line would have a stop at Catford Bridge.</p> <p>The references made to the Bakerloo line extension in the Catford Local Plan Further Options document are broadly in line with the current position and mention of the possible extension is, welcomed by TfL especially given that the long term nature of both.</p>	
J. Hui	Transportation	Comment	<p>I understand that TfL is favouring an extension of the DLR to Catford rather than the extension of the Bakerloo Line. Whilst this will be boost to the area in the short term, this still does not solve the lack of transportation links into the heart of the west end. South East London is the only area in London without an Underground Line. The extension of the Bakerloo Line will be a much more beneficial investment in the long run as it will increase access to the South East of London and will provide a direct link into the west end of London, thus drawing more people and business into the area.</p> <p>I fully support the extension of the DLR but I would urge that pressure should be maintained for the Bakerloo Line extension as this will provide Catford with a much greater return in the long term.</p>	<b>Comments in support of the Bakerloo line extension and the DLR extension to Catford are noted.</b>
Nick Graham, TfL	Other - Taxis and Private Hire Vehicles (PHVs)	Comment	<p>Taxis provide an essential door to door service. All taxis are wheelchair accessible and many taxis also have other accessibility features. Taxis also provide an important contribution towards TfL's 'Safer Travel at Night Campaign' as taxi ranks outside venues and stations allow people to travel safely home at night and minimise illegal touting. PHVs can offer a similar service albeit they must be pre booked through a TfL licensed operator and cannot ply for hire when stationary. Our experience in Lewisham is that travel by taxi and PHVs is in demand and there is every reason to expect this demand to exist in Catford especially if appropriate drop off/pick up and rank provision is made.</p> <p>Currently there are only three taxi ranks in the borough of Lewisham all of which are busy but none are in Catford. At present, NR passengers must alight at Lewisham station in order to get a taxi for their onward journey or have one pre booked. A rank serving Catford and Catford Bridge stations (and potentially DLR and/or Bakerloo line passengers) would therefore provide a greater choice and be of specific help for disabled passengers, those travelling late at night and those with heavy baggage or young children. In addition it would relieve pressure at Lewisham station. Appropriate provision within Catford town centre would support the</p>	<b>The comments on the importance of taxi provision are noted. The Council will review CLP Option 1 to include a reference to taxi provision in the proposed submission version.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>Council's aspirations to improve the retail and leisure offer as well as serve existing shoppers and other visitors.</p> <p>The Catford Local Plan Further Options document has wide reaching proposals however, there seems to be little consideration of how the town centre, stations and major sites identified will be served by taxis and PHVs. In our view appropriate provision for taxis and PHVs should be addressed within the document. It is important to consider the need for taxi ranks and/or set down/pick up facilities at an early stage to ensure there is adequate provision to meet existing and new town centre and station demand and for specific developments, such as (but not only) the hotel and supermarket.</p> <p>We therefore suggest that LB Lewisham speak directly to TfL Taxi and Private Hire in relation to taxi and PHV provision during preparation of the next stage of the Catford Local Plan and subsequently . More specific advice can also be provided on potential locations, the specification/features of ranks and drop off/pick up facilities and issues which need to be addressed when progressing detailed briefs and designs for schemes in Catford town centre. We can also seek the views of the trade. However it is important that the policy context is set out early on.</p>	
Mike O'Callaghan, TfL	Transport feasibility	Comment	<p>Thank you for meeting with my colleagues, and myself on the 11<sup>th</sup> March 2013. We had an in depth discussion regarding the proposals in the Local Plan and the effect it would have on the highway network in Catford Town Centre.</p> <p>The proposals contained in, the Council's recommended option for highways and transportation in the Local Plan have been reviewed in depth and the emphasis on walking and cycling are welcomed as well as the commitment to improve public transport, notably Buses, provision in the town centre. Some aspects of Lewisham's recommended option may not be viable but TfL would want to investigate their feasibility further and also review funding options for implementation as this could determine the preferred alternative as well as timing of delivery over the next few years.</p>	<b>Comments noted.</b>
E. Weidman	Traffic	Comment objection	<p>There is a big issue with the traffic in the area and if the car park behind the current library needs to be sacrificed then so be it. This is probably the best solution for the A205 route. Traffic really needs to be alleviated. I don't buy the excuse that there will then be too much space in front... this seems odd?</p>	<b>The TFL safeguarded route for the A205 improvements have not been implemented for 40 years. The Council's preferred option is considered an implementable solution.</b>
M. O'Callaghan, TfL	Road gyratory	Comment	It has long been an aspiration of TfL, and before that of Lewisham	<b>The TFL safeguarded route for the A205 improvements have</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			Council, to remove the gyratory system thus generating a more cohesive town centre but in the past there was never sufficient funding for the complex and wide ranging solutions developed. TfL would ask that Lewisham Council not discount the option to remove the gyratory system in the Local Plan. We would be happy to meet with you in the future to explore alternative options for the removal of the gyratory.	<b>not been implemented for 40 years. The Council's preferred option is considered an implementable solution and does not involve the full removal of the gyratory system.</b>
S. Newton	Reroute South Circular	Comment Object	A major regenerator of the area would be to remove that part of the South Circular that bisects the site, contributing considerably to the blight of the area and inhibiting development. Take up the proposal to reroute it to the South of Laurence House. I know this has been on the agenda now for 40 years, so all the more reason to press TfL to take action. It makes so much sense it is unbelievable that it wasn't done years ago.	<b>The TFL safeguarded route for the A205 improvements have not been implemented for 40 years. The Council's preferred option is considered an implementable solution.</b>
B. Gray	Parking	Comment objection	<p>It is proposed to remove a fair number of parking spaces. People will use their cars to come to the town centre and will spend more time and buy more if they can jump into their car and have reasonably priced parking, particularly the 90% of catchment area who currently don't come into the town centre.</p> <p>The Plassy Road car park is full all day and has quite a lot of parking in the evening as are the streets. If more people come into the town centre parking will be an issue. Nationally it is desired that town centre discourage car use but in reality people will continue to go to Bromley or stay on after work in town and get the train to Catford and go home.</p> <p>There is currently a problem with council staff parking in residential streets and having fewer employee car parking spaces will make that worse. The Culverley Green Society are approaching the Council about the currently problem</p>	<b>The Council employed SKM Colin Buchanan to investigate future parking requirements in the town centre. This evidence base will be used to determine the appropriate level of parking in the town centre and justify the proposed submission plan.</b>
Ms L. McAlister	Parking	Support object	<p>As stated, this is a unique opportunity to get things right! Do not be small in ambition.</p> <p>Many of the changes proposed are excellent, however there are a couple of concerns that might be currently described as "out of scope" for the Catford Plan, but which have immense effect on residents. With the recommendations stated, there absolutely needs to be consideration for parking. One comment says that parking is under utilised, therefore the plan is to reduce parking. I would imagine the parking is under utilised in Milford towers due to the unpleasant and unsafe environment, and also that it is charged. As a resident near to the council buildings, I struggle to park near my home due to the all day free parking of staff from the council,</p>	<b>The Council employed SKM Colin Buchanan to investigate future parking requirements in the town centre. This evidence base will be used to determine the appropriate level of parking in the town centre and justify the proposed submission plan.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			hospital and schools. If the goals to improve Catford are achieved, parking can only get worse.	
Miss D. Leah	Pedestrians	Comment	The pedestrian experience is very poor and often dangerous - particularly trying to cross the South Circular to get to the stations. The traffic is a nightmare with queues back along the South Circular most of the time which gives a very bad impression of the area and does not encourage people to stop to use the local shops.	<b>Comments noted. Objective 5 and CLP Option 1 are focussed on improving both the traffic and pedestrian environment in the town centre.</b>
B. Gray	Pedestrians	Comment	Plassy Road site housing density should be kept low in order to provide plenty of open and moving around space for pedestrians to create a good through flow and access to services for the shops, which is the current problem with Milford Towers and properties in proximity to delivery vehicles for Argos, Boots etc. Potentially a large number will have few places to cross the A21 and A205 to get to the town centre and stations adding to the already large numbers of people for whom it is not easy or save to move around or cross and more opportunity for accident getting across the dedicated bus lane that runs across. This national road has no scope to increase phasing time of pedestrian crossing lights, to add more crossings which will affect the flow of traffic which TFL will not change as their priority is to move traffic along these strategic arterial roads.	<b>Comments noted. Objective 5 and CLP Option 1 are focussed on improving both the traffic and pedestrian environment in the town centre.</b>
Mike O'Callaghan, TfL	Pedestrian/cycling	Comment	With the recent renewed emphasis on pedestrian's and cyclist's facilities there would be further opportunities to revise previous proposals to create a less traffic dominated environment in the town centre. For example, the conversion of Rushey Green between Catford Road and Brownhill Road into a bus interchange with north-south cycle routes would be considered in a different light to when it was previously proposed and could now be considered a viable option. TfL would welcome the opportunity to hold another liaison meeting with you once the Local Plan Consultation has been completed and analysed. I would ask you to consider these points as part of the consultation process and include them in the revisions made to the Local Plan.	<b>Comments noted. The Council will continue to work with TfL on developing a workable and implementable solution to the traffic issues in Catford.</b>
Nick Jeffrey, Planning Sub-Committee of Culverley Green Residents' Association	Cycling	Comment	North and westbound cyclists turning right from Catford Road into Doggett Road: This is one of the most difficult and dangerous turns in Lewisham and sadly neglected. As I am a member of London Cycling Campaign I am copying this to the Lewisham Branch of LCC. cc Lewisham Branch of London Cycling Campaign cc Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor	<b>Comments noted. The safety of cyclists is a Council priority in considering the road and junction improvements in the town centre. Objective 5 seeks to improve facilities and movement for cyclists and CLP Option 1 will be amended to refer to cyclists.</b>
A. Dunne	Cycling	Comment	Transport is an item mentioned in the article. As a cyclist this is of interest to me. How can I ensure that my voice is heard? I think that	<b>Comments noted. The safety of cyclists is a Council priority in considering the road and junction improvements in the</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			making the area more cycle friendly would also help to ease congestion and pollution by encouraging more cyclists onto the road. Currently cycling in Catford can be risky at times. Again models are in place else where in London such as the major's cycle super highways. I was encouraged by the section on cycling in the document and await exact details on how the experience of cycling will be enhanced.	<b>town centre. Objective 5 seeks to improve facilities and movement for cyclists and CLP Option 1 will be amended to refer to cyclists.</b>
L. Walmsley	Cycling	Comment	In the preamble and context to the document prioritizing cycling gets mentioned many times, yet when it actually comes down to the Road and Transport policy (4.1) it gets a tiny little paragraph. I am aware that current London Transport policy prioritizes traffic flow above all else, but does Catford's local one have to? Cycling is growing in popularity, the political landscape may be very different in ten years time. It would be a shame, given the redevelopment of the town centre is such an opportunity to not put cycling at the heart of the transport strategy. The strategy has to work for ten years as well as now and demand is only going to grow, even if London wide politics prevent the local planners from taking much positive action to support cyclists now, having a framework in place will make it easier for Catford to adapt in the future.	<b>Comments noted. The safety of cyclists is a Council priority in considering the road and junction improvements in the town centre. Objective 5 seeks to improve facilities and movement for cyclists and CLP Option 1 will be amended to refer to cyclists.</b>
Tim Collingridge, Lewisham Cyclists	Cycling	Comment  Object	<p>General points: Although cycling is mentioned fairly often in the text of the document it is very lacking in solid measures to assist the movement of cyclists to and through the Catford Town Centre area. The only concrete proposals (Page 58) seem to be for enhanced Advanced Stop Lines and improved Cycle Parking &amp; Storage. With such a large renewal project involving major road and building re-development we would hope to see the opportunity being taken to establish much enhanced cycle facilities throughout.</p> <p>There is a complete absence from the diagrams of established (except for the Waterlink Way) or potential cycle routes. Also there is no illustration of current cycle flows.</p> <p>The document seems to be almost totally focused on pedestrian, bus and motor vehicle needs with cycling just getting passing vague, and inconsistent, references.</p> <p>Objectives Given the major redevelopments planned to both the road system and the Town Centre buildings we would like to see firm commitments to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Provide proper 'Go Dutch' style segregated continuous cycle paths with junction priority (as illustrated on P140 of the document).</li> </ol>	<b>Comments noted. The safety of cyclists is a Council priority in considering the road and junction improvements in the town centre. Objective 5 seeks to improve facilities and movement for cyclists and CLP Option 1 will be amended to refer to cyclists.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			2) Look at alternative cycle routing opportunities through the re-developed and re-modelled areas to avoid the main A21/A205 junction in both E-W and N-S directions. 3) Have cyclist 'permeability' through all road closures and one way streets. 4) Allow shared use on the basis of 'considerate cycling' in pedestrianised zones. 5) Ensure the widespread provision of secure cycling parking in the Town Centre to encourage higher levels of cycle usage for short trips like shopping. 6) Mandate the provision of a decent number of high quality cycle storage e.g. lockers, inside new developments in the area.  Some detailed points (in no way exhaustive) just to illustrate where some of these objectives could readily be achieved:	
<b>Catford Centre and Milford Towers</b>				
Stewart Murray, GLA	Policy Option 2 Catford Centre and Milford Towers Bullet points 1 a – c.	Comment	Support the approach taken for the site but suggest inclusion of indicative floorspaces which should be in line with the London Plan and maintain Catford's role as a Major Centre. London Plan Ref: 2.13, 4.7 and 4.8	<b>A summary of the quantum of expected development will be included in the proposed submission version. The PBA Catford Retail and Economic Impact Assessment suggests that the Catford Centre site should accommodate a majority of the additional retail floorspace.</b>
Stewart Murray, GLA	Policy Option 2 Catford Centre and Milford Towers Bullet points 1e.	Comment	Need to mention re-provision of any affordable housing lost as part of any redevelopment proposals London Plan Ref: 3.11 and 3.12	<b>CLP9 and the justification to the policy contain reference to affordable housing provision. CLP2 and the justification to the policy will be amended in the proposed submission version to include reference to affordable housing.</b>
John Davis, Petersham Land (Catford) Ltd	Policy Option 2 Catford Centre and Milford Towers	Comment	Further to the publication of the Draft Catford Plan, I am responding as a stakeholder in Catford. I am a director of Petersham Land ( Catford ) Ltd. Petersham Land ( Catford ) Ltd owns the leasehold interest of the property occupied by Tesco. The lease is for 99 years from 1972, and Tesco occupy the property on 3 sub leases for a similar term. We have been working with The London Borough of Lewisham since the beginning of 2009, to jointly bring forward a retail development.  We have been, and continue to be fully supportive of the regeneration plans for Catford. In early 2009 we were asked by London Borough of Lewisham to negotiate on their behalf, as well as our own, with Tesco, to ascertain whether a viable scheme could be conceived, and act as a “ kick start “ for the remaining desirable regeneration plans of the Borough. Between 2009 and 2012, we have been involved in design work with architects on our own behalf and that of The London Borough	<b>Disagree. The PBA Catford Retail and Economic Impact Assessment acknowledges that the redevelopment of the site will do the most to energise Catford and improve its retail offer. It states that the Catford Centre is critical to delivering change and may well be the catalyst to delivering other projects.</b>  <b>The Council does not consider the refurbishment of Milford Towers to be an option. It does not meet current housing standards and provides a poor living environment. The architecture is stark and foreboding and the concrete structure dominates the spaces. Furthermore there is public support for its demolition due to its poor living environment and the impact on the shopping centre and surrounding area.</b>  <b>Feasibility work undertaken for the Council has informed the Council's preferred approach which is to demolish and</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>of Lewisham. For much of this period our negotiations with Tesco have been on the basis of them either purchasing the entire core retail area of Catford themselves, or jointly with a property company partner, developing a scheme which would be anchored by a substantial Tesco store with a sales area in the order of 80,000sq ft. ( Close to double the existing sales area ).</p> <p>These proposals would have attracted other major national retailers to the site, and indications were from appraisals carried out during this period, that such a scheme would have proven viable. Viability is obviously essential to all concerned including The London Borough of Lewisham, given Lewisham own a substantial amount of the core retail area themselves, investing in excess of £ 10.00 million in 2010, acquiring retail properties from St Modwin PLC. The Borough also of course own the freehold of the site.</p> <p>In recent times, ( during the last 12 months ) Tesco have nationally reduced their expansion plans, both in terms of new store opening and large extensions, and have concluded they would currently only be willing to occupy a new store of some 40,000 sq. ft. sales, which is little different from their current store.</p> <p>Their decision is understandable given the economic climate, and despite the fact they are prepared to pay a significantly higher rent per square foot for a new store, developing a Town Centre scheme, with such a reduced size of anchor store, is not currently a financially viable proposition.</p> <p>This leaves all parties with a series of conundrums, and I feel the following are worthy of consideration.</p> <p>Catford as has been identified, has a major catchment to serve. The local population have for many years been provided with a very poor quality retail offer. A substantial percentage of that catchment chooses to shop elsewhere because of this low quality. The development ultimately built will service local needs for many decades, perhaps for at least 50 years. Is it worth waiting until there are seeds of recovery, and there is demand for increased floor space from the major anchor tenant, rather than embarking on a scheme in the short term with inevitable compromises ( assuming one can be made viable at all ) ?</p> <p>Would it be worth considering changing the order of regeneration ?</p> <p>Perhaps redeveloping the Local Authority offices and allowing for</p>	<p><b>develop the Catford Centre and Milford Towers in a single phase.</b></p>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>the possible conversion of Lawrence House to residential, before attempting to redevelop the Town Centre. This may give developers and potential retail occupiers more confidence to invest in Catford, and time for the retail economy to recover.</p> <p>Another possible option: I appreciate the Borough could consider righting off their £ 10.00million investment in the Town Centre to assist with viability. However, I assume this is undesirable. If so, it may be an option to look at a refurbishment of the existing scheme. There are many examples throughout the country, of refurbishments providing a very satisfactory compromise that enables retailers to justify investment in new shop fitting, and encourages the local community to reconnect with their town centre.</p> <p>Rental values in Catford are very low, and a sympathetic refurbishment is likely to improve these dramatically.</p> <p>There is no reason why a refurbishment could not include an area for the existing market, so little risk of this amenity being lost.</p> <p>As I pointed out earlier, a new scheme in the current economic climate is unlikely to provide sales space for Tesco of very much more than they are currently trading from. A complete refurbishment of the existing car park with dramatically improved lighting and signage would in itself have a major impact on the public's willingness to use the facility and therefore the Town Centre Shops.</p> <p>With the decant of Milford Towers in progress I appreciate this conspires to create another problem. This may not be entirely insurmountable however. The regeneration plans provide for new residential accommodation above the proposed retail. This is planning policy in many areas of the country and is understandable, but of course has proved often to become a major social problem years later. ( as has been the case with Milford Tower ) Would you consider allowing a refurbishment of Milford Tower, rebranding the property, and enabling it to provide high quality residential accommodation that could complement a retail refurbishment ?</p> <p>During all the discussions that have taken place during the last few years it has never been finally concluded how the local community</p>	

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>could be provided with a retail offer during a development period ( which is likely to be in the order of 24 months ). A refurbishment would be a great deal less disruptive.</p> <p>Economic circumstances have altered a great deal since members decided on the desirability of the regeneration of Catford. As the saying goes .... about " cutting one's coat according to your cloth ". Rather than stay committed to a regeneration program that may prove to be undeliverable would members consider alternatives ?</p>	
Local Resident	Policy Option 2 Catford Centre and Milford Towers p65	Comment	I think it would be better for everyone if you put more than 200 houses on the site, if you could then also reduce the number of houses (preferably to zero) on Catford Dog Track. Once open spaces like that are built on, they are lost forever.	<b>Disagree. The proposed housing density on the sites are based on optimal density levels as set out in the London Plan.</b>
E. Weidman	Policy Option 2 Catford Centre and Milford Towers	Comment	It would be great to 'knock down' Millford towers. I know this is being worked towards but it must be replaced with something 'better'. Despite this needing to be done, It is a solid building and should be replaced with a better solution, not a cheap quick development. I propose a Passivhaus building or something like as an Eco development. This is Catford's chance to win a Design Award and put Catford on the TRENDY map!! Please think about this. Look at Camden councils newest Passivhaus mixed residential development, this should be the new way to build. Council tenants, Buyers and Part Buy tenants to live side by side. In this way we do not end up with another horrible 'estate' and instead people who love where they live. These buildings are built really well, provide exciting homes for people to live in, promoting more community feel and really look after our environment. I would be happy to be involved in the design side.	<b>Comments noted. The lasting design of buildings is a key consideration and CLP9 requires that the design of all new homes needs to meet the housing design standards of the Core Strategy. This will be amended to include reference to the London Plan housing standards in the proposed submission version.</b>
Tom Collingridge, Lewisham Cyclists	Policy Option 2 Catford Centre and Milford Towers	Comment	<p>1g) – Retail circuit with pedestrianised street through the site – needs to allow for considerate cycling for people visiting the location and passing through.</p> <p>2c) - Improved 'pedestrian' access from residential areas and Catford Greyhound Stadium site must include provision for cyclists e.g. bridge over Catford Bridge railway line.</p> <p>Fig 4.9 Area 2b) should be shared use pedestrian/cyclist.</p>	<b>Comments noted. Policy part 2c will be amended in the proposed submission version to include reference to cycle access to residential streets.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Policy Option 2 Catford Centre and Milford Towers	Comment	<p>Facades/frontages on Thomas Lane and Holbeach Road</p> <p>Shop frontages including items for sale outside of premises</p> <p>Provision of public toilets</p> <p>Provision of street furniture</p> <p>The need for later night opening services</p> <p>Provision of amenities for the site residence (schools, health services, etc.)</p>	<b>Comments noted. The policy will be amended in the proposed submission version to refer to the provision of public toilets.</b>
Mr J. Mondrzejewski	Option 2	Object	This option fails to require the retention of the former Conservative	<b>Comments noted. The Local List status is a material</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			Club. The buildings which are visible from Thomas Lane are clearly of 18th Century date and locally listed. I doubt that there are any other buildings predating the Victorian era remaining in Catford. While the retention of historic buildings may be rather annoying for developers, they represent a fantastic opportunity to do something different. The challenge they pose frequently results in more interesting development schemes than would otherwise have been provided and the retention of links with the past are always popular with the public. What will not be popular, however, is the loss of one of the few locally listed Georgian buildings in Catford for an extension to a supermarket or to a car park. The development of the area will also generate the funds to secure the restoration of the building so there is no excuse for the not including the retention and restoration of this heritage asset as a constraint within option 2.	<b>consideration in the development management process and therefore the desirability to sustain and enhance the heritage asset will be considered with any application. CLP Option 23: Heritage assets requires new development to sustain and enhance Catford's heritage assets and specifically refers to the Conservative Club.</b>
Mr J. Mondrzejewski	Option 2	Comment	While the Catford Bridge Tavern has been protected from change of use to retail and placed on the local list, an architecturally superior 1930s pub building, the Rising Sun in Rushey Green, has been left to rot, following the grant of planning permission for redevelopment (which expires in November of this year). No doubt the Council's emerging policy on protecting pubs as both community and heritage assets will be a material consideration in the determination of any application for an extension to the time period of his planning permission.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
<b>Civic Centre</b>				
Stewart Murray, GLA	Policy Option 3 Civic Centre Bullet point 1 a	Support	Allocate the Civic Centre site for mixed use development and re-provision of community/civic uses. London Plan Ref:	<b>Comment in support is noted.</b>
Stewart Murray, GLA	Policy Option 3 Civic Centre Bullet point 2 a	Comment	suggest indicative suitable range of heights for the site. London Plan Ref: 7.4, 7.6 and 7.7	<b>Comments noted. The Council considers that the criteria based approach of CLP Option 22: Tall buildings, together with the Tall Buildings Study evidence base document provides adequate detail regarding the approach to determining the appropriate locations and heights of tall buildings.</b>
Stewart Murray, GLA	Policy Option 3 Civic Centre Alternative options	Object	Object to alternative options. London Plan Ref: 2.13	<b>The alternative options have not been carried forward to the proposed submission version.</b>
Local Resident	Policy Option 3 Civic Centre p69	Comment	The argument for co-location is really weak and should be reconsidered. The first point given is that it would "provide the opportunity for new buildings ... more sustainable ... reduce carbon footprint" . Well of course demolishing buildings provides the opportunity to build new ones, that isn't a proper reason. And demolishing perfectly functional buildings and building new ones surely increases the carbon footprint overall! It sounds expensive,	<b>Disagree. A condition survey showed that many core elements of the Council's civic buildings are approaching the end of their useful lives. The benefits of redevelopment, rather than refurbishment, are set out in the supporting text.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			potentially aesthetically disastrous, and a huge distraction from more important work. I sincerely hope the council goes for "alternative option 3" instead - please.	
Tom Collingridge, Lewisham Cyclists	Policy Option 3 Civic Centre	Comment	2g) – Generous tree lined payments 6 to 8 metres wide seem to offer great opportunities for fully segregated bi-directional cycle lanes along Catford Road	<b>Comments noted.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Catford Broadway & Civic Quarter	Comment	Shop frontages including items for sale outside of premises Provision of public toilets Provision of street furniture Number & function of fast food take-aways, betting shops, and pay-day loan lenders/pawnbrokers	<b>Comments noted. The policy will be amended in the proposed submission version to refer to the provision of public toilets.</b>  <b>Betting shops form part of a wider 'use class' that includes financial and professional services such as banks and building societies (A2 Use Class). Therefore any restrictive policy applying to A2 uses would impact on a wide range of premises, without being able to single out betting shops in particular.</b>
<b>Laurence House</b>				
Tom Collingridge, Lewisham Cyclists	Policy Option 4 Laurence House	Comment	Fig 4.11 2h) – 3a) section could alternatively provide a fully segregated cycle routing for cycle flow from Catford Bridge through the Town Centre and continuing across into the Plassy Road Island Site to the North of Sangley Road.	<b>Comments noted. The policy will be amended in the proposed submission version to refer to ease of cycle movement.</b>
S. Newton	Laurence House	Object	I do not support the demolition of Laurence House and the Civic Centre as they appear to be serviceable although in need of refurbishment. The money could be better spent elsewhere. Surely the rerouting of the South Circular can be achieved without demolishing Laurence House?	<b>Disagree. A condition survey showed that many core elements of the Council's civic buildings are approaching the end of their useful lives. The benefits of redevelopment, rather than refurbishment, are set out in the supporting text to CLP Option 3.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Laurence House	Comment	Continued provision of a lorry park (not necessarily on this site) Provision of Library services (not necessarily on this site) Plassy Road Island and Sangley Road	<b>The proposals would mean the loss of the current lorry park. It is acknowledged that there is a need for such a facility, and this is currently being looked into on a south east London-wide level.</b>  <b>CLP Option 3 (1a) seeks a redevelopment that will provide a consolidated range of council and civic uses including a library.</b>
<b>Plassy Road Island</b>				
Stewart Murray, GLA	Policy Option 5 Plassy Road Island	Support	the proposals are in general conformity with the London Plan subject to further discussion with TfL regarding the de designation of land safeguarded for the re-alignment of the South Circular Road and the recommended alternative London Plan Ref: 2.13, 3.2, 4.7, 7.6	<b>Support noted. The council has discussed the re-alignment of the south circular with TfL.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
Tom Collingridge, Lewisham Cyclists	Policy Option 5 Plassy Road Island	Comment	<p>2g) - 'boulevard style' environment could incorporate a segregated cycle route which could ultimately give access to Sangley Road and Brownhill Road (via contra flow on Plassy Road).</p> <p>Fig 4.12 – improved pedestrian links into island site, but no mention of cycle links...</p>	<p><b>Comments noted. The policy will be amended in the proposed submission version to refer to ease of cycle movement.</b></p>
Planning prospects obo Dransfield Properties Ltd	Policy Option 5 Plassy Road Island	Oppose, comment	<p>In general the overall strategy for the Plassy Road Island site is supported. However some of the aspirations are unrealistic if regeneration of this gateway town centre site is to be achieved. Whilst the requirement to allocate the site to support and complement the primary shopping area is supported the option as it stands is too restrictive and prohibitive by requiring a mix of uses and limiting retail units to a maximum of about 1,500 sq.m (gross).</p> <p>The site is currently occupied by a number of large scale retail uses included in the Catford Island Retail Park and whilst it is agreed that intensification of current retail warehouses should be restricted a more realistic alternative option would be to include an additional large retail anchor, for example in the form of a food superstore. Having a large retail anchor at the northern end of the site would improve this end of Catford town centre as well as improving the attraction of Catford town centre as a whole. It could facilitate better legibility with the Catford Centre through enabling improved pedestrian linkage and stronger landscaping. Furthermore a large retail anchor could help prevent the trade leakage that Catford is currently experiencing to other anchor stores in the surrounding area (e.g. 25% of convenience trade going out of Catford to Sainsbury's in Lee Green according to the Council's 2010 amended Retail Capacity Study).</p> <p>Whilst a mix of uses within small units is preferred by the Council it is somewhat optimistic and likely to be undeliverable given the site's significant constraints, and exacerbated by the current economic climate. The Council's own 2013 Retail Impact Economic Assessment identifies an opportunity to provide a higher quality foodstore to improve consumer choice in Catford. By explicitly stating that larger retail uses are not acceptable the current recommended option is therefore limiting the potential for Catford to receive much needed investment.</p> <p>Core Strategy Spatial Policy 2 requires Catford to provide up to</p>	<p><b>Disagree. The Primary shopping area is defined in accordance with the NPPF and is based around the redevelopment of the Catford Centre which is allocated to provide the majority of additional retail floorspace. The plan-led approach identifies the Plassy Road Island site as an area that complements the uses within the primary shopping area, rather than intensifying their use in another location.</b></p> <p><b>The Catford Retail and Economic Impact Assessment, carried out by PBA consultants outlines that the amount of Convenience floorspace is above the National average. However, there is the opportunity to increase the convenience goods market share of the catchment and there may be scope to improve customer choice by introducing an improved convenience offer. PBA consider there is a qualitative need for an improved convenience goods offer, potentially through the extension, reconfiguration or redevelopment of the existing Tesco store.</b></p> <p><b>PBA recommend the Plassy Island site as one that provides complementary retail and leisure uses and/or as a site that adds to the attractions of the wider town centre. In the short term PBA's recommendation is to secure better connectivity. This supports the Council's planning objectives for the site as one which complements the uses within the primary shopping area, rather than intensifying these uses in another location.</b></p> <p><b>The retail capacity figure in the Catford Plan is based on a</b></p>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>22,000 sq.m of additional retail floorspace by 2026. Whilst the Catford Town Centre Local Plan also facilitates redevelopment of the Catford Centre the Plassy Road Island should not be discounted from contributing more heavily to that requirement given its town centre location (see comments below regarding including Plassy Road Island within the Primary Shopping Area and Primary Shopping Frontage).</p> <p>Eros House (on the north western corner of the Plassy Road Island site) is identified as a landmark building throughout the Catford Town Centre Local Plan. Whilst it is domineering in scale it does not have any architectural merit to warrant such a distinction and its size actually acts as a significant barrier to the legibility between the Island and the rest of the town centre. Rather than the current recommended option identifying the centre of the Island as a suitable location for a public plaza (or open space) this could be better located at the north western corner of the Island. An area of open space here would improve legibility with and connectivity to the rest of the town centre and would allow greater pedestrian movement through the Island site to Plassy Road and Rushey Green as required by the Council.</p> <p>The mix of uses currently proposed includes 350 dwellings above ground floor retail. Whilst town centre living is generally encouraged, Core Strategy Spatial Policy 2 requires Catford town centre to provide 650 new homes by 2016 and up to 1,100 homes by 2026. The total number of homes provided by the Key Development Sites (as shown in the AAP) is 1,739 which is vastly above and beyond the required amount. Plassy Road Island is the least appropriate of the Key Development Sites for residential development due to its location within the South Circular and existing large-scale retail uses. Whilst residential development is aspirational, the amount recommended is optimistic and likely to be undeliverable given the Island site's constraints. Sufficient residential development is provided elsewhere in the other Key Development Sites.</p> <p>Page 77 of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan identifies Plassy Road Island as a location to provide further quality complementary retail and leisure uses and/or as a function that can add attractions of the wider town centre. To some degree it presently operates somewhat in isolation to the rest of the town centre due to restricted linkages and free surface level car parking. As discussed</p>	<p><b>finer grained assessment of the needs for Catford. This is based on the assessment carried out by PBA consultants and is set out in the Catford Retail and Economic Impact Assessment.</b></p> <p><b>The north-western corner of the site is identified as a new area of public space, and allows for improved legibility and connectivity. This space is in addition to the proposed public space at the centre of the site.</b></p> <p><b>Residential development, as part of a wider mix of uses, is an essential aspect to achieving the objectives of the Catford Local Plan. CLP Policy 9: Providing new homes sets out how it is anticipated new homes will be distributed across the town centre.</b></p>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>above there is an opportunity for new development to contribute to an improved image and improve links between the site, the town centre and the adjoining residential areas. Therefore a new large-scale retail anchor that could facilitate improved legibility between the site and the rest of the town centre through an improved pedestrian environment and high quality landscaping is a more realistic and viable alternative option and should therefore be included as a recommended option for this important town centre gateway site.</p> <p>Contributions associated with any proposed development should only be sought where development is viable and able to provide them.</p> <p>The Recommended Option (Number 5) for Plassy Road Island should be less restrictive and include provision for (or potential of) a large-scale retail anchor store, for example in the form of a food superstore.</p> <p>A larger amount of retail floorspace should be promoted for Plassy Road Island site given its location within Catford Town Centre.</p> <p>Rather than recommending a public plaza within the centre of Plassy Road Island, an area of open space (such as a public plaza) could be better located at the north western corner of the Island, and flexibility should be allowed in this regard. Here it will provide better legibility with the rest of the town centre and create a better pedestrian environment. Opening up this corner could also provide landmark corner features enhancing this gateway location.</p> <p>The amount of residential development recommended for Plassy Road Island should be reduced in order to promote its retail function.</p> <p>The recommended option should explicitly state that contributions will only be sought where development is viable and able to make them.</p>	
<b>Former Catford Greyhound Stadium</b>				
Stewart Murray, GLA	Policy Option 6 Former Catford Greyhound Stadium	Support	the proposals are in general conformity with the London Plan London Plan Ref: 2.13, 3.2, 4.7, 7.6	<b>Comment noted.</b>
Local Resident	Policy Option 6	Comment	I support alternative option 2. I think the site should be kept as	<b>Disagree. The site has planning permission for residential</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
	Former Catford Greyhound Stadium p83		open and 'green' as possible.	<b>units and other uses. Barratt Homes have been selected as a development partner and the Council is in discussions regarding the build-out of the site. Work is expected to commence in Autumn 2013.</b>
Charles Muriithi, Environment Agency	Policy Option 6 Former Catford Greyhound Stadium	Support	Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the above document which we received on 25 February 2013. We are pleased to note that Ravensbourne River naturalisation/improvement is listed as an opportunity within the Catford Road, the Former Greyhound Stadium and the Wickes and Halfords study areas of the Catford Plan. We support this opportunity being maximised to deliver benefits for both biodiversity and the people of Catford.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Policy Option 6 Former Catford Greyhound Stadium	Comment	Naming and positioning site as a Rushey Green residence Improvement to the footbridge across Railways lines to Holbeach School Holbeach School expansion Traffic management Provision of amenities for the site residence (schools, health services, etc.) Provision of green space/landscaping	<b>CLP Policy 6 addresses improved links across the railway line to Holbeach Road and the design principles require open space and landscaping.</b>  <b>The CLP will be reviewed and updated where relevant to refer to the provision of social infrastructure, including school capacity and health care.</b>  <b>Changes to the road network are anticipated and these will be outlined in the proposed submission version of the plan.</b>
S. Duncan	Policy Option 6 Former Catford Greyhound Stadium	Object	Re the plans for the old Catford Stadium site. I feel strongly that this should not be developed into more flats/homes and/or shops. There are plenty of other opportunities for housing development in the Catford Plan (and plenty of existing homes which are in disrepair and unused or underused). There are also plenty of places for shops (the idea for rejuvenating the existing shopping centre is good). There are also plenty of shops in Lewisham and so what Catford really needs, I feel, is not more shops (yes, better shops but not more shops), but other community hubs or activities. I think the Catford Stadium site should be developed into an extension of the existing Ladywell Fields/Waterway parkland area, with a cafe with indoor seating (serving this side of the parkland) AND- ideally- a city farm. There are few city farms in this part of London (compared with East London). Hackney City Farm, for example, was instrumental in the regeneration of that area of Hackney and is now an important community hub for families (Catford is full of young families), for community classes (pottery, bike-repair etc) and for school visits. I know the Horniman Museum in Forest Hill now has some animals but it isn't really a city farm, and isn't within walking distance for Catford families.	<b>Disagree. The site has planning permission for residential units and other uses. Barratt Homes have been selected as a development partner and the Council is in discussions regarding the build-out of the site. Work is expected to commence in Autumn 2013.</b>
J. Hui	Policy Option 6	Comment	I am a local resident and I am pleased to see the proposed plans	<b>Comments noted. The Council's preferred option is</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
	Former Catford Greyhound Stadium		<p>for the redevelopment of Catford. I am certain that this will help stimulate and accelerate the regeneration of a rather down trodden area of London. Being a resident, I do have two concerns.</p> <p>I fully support the redevelopment of Catford Stadium as a residential/retail usage site and I am pleased to hear work will be starting later this year. My biggest concern is the strain this will have on the local infrastructure. In particular, the increased traffic on Manwood Road. Manwood Road is already being used as a cut through by motorists between Crofton Park and Catford and is a busy road at the best of times. The plans provided suggests that new residents will likely to be using Manwood Road if they are to travel north or west as the current intersection with the South Circular only allows left turn. My fear is that Manwood Road will become a major thoroughfare, increasing traffic noise. Also, this coincides with the plan to create a primary school on the Ladywell Fields Prendegast School site and the increase in traffic will only be a hazard to young children walking to and from school.</p> <p>I would suggest that a major rethink on the access point of the Catford Stadium site and consider alternative routes. One would be to create a link between the end of Maylon Road to the Catford Stadium Site. This will create an access along the train tracks. Whilst it will cut through a section of Ladywell fields, it will give the new site a direct access north.</p> <p>Another option is to introduce further traffic calming measures along Manwood Road to reduce and control the amount of traffic coming through, particularly in the morning and afternoons when school aged children will be crossing the road to catch the bus or to walk home. I am sure that you will agree this will be crucial to safeguard the safety of school children.</p>	<p><b>designed to improve both the traffic and pedestrian environment in the town centre.</b></p> <p><b>The Council will continue to consult those affected by implementing the CLP road proposals and will seek agreement on detailed implementation taking into account the points made in this representation.</b></p>
Tom Collingridge, Lewisham Cyclists	Policy Option 6 Former Catford Greyhound Stadium	Comment	<p>Planning permission includes a proposed footbridge across the Catford Bridge railways tracks providing a more direct pedestrian link... This should be a cycle/pedestrian shared use bridge like the one in Ladywell Fields. Would mean that cyclists from the Stadium site and the surrounding area would not have to go down to Catford Bridge to access the Town Centre as currently.</p> <p>1h) – improve pedestrian links across and under the South Circular (should refer to cyclists as well)  1j) – good – mentions cyclists as well!  2b) – good – mentions cyclists as well!!  Fig 4.13 – only shows N-S and E-W ‘pedestrian’ links to and</p>	<p><b>Comments noted. The policy will be amended in the proposed submission version to refer to cycle movement.</b></p>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			through Stadium site. Both should be for cyclists as well. Under Contributions mentions 'Pedestrian and Cycle access bridge' as an option – should be a Planning Requirement.	
Local Resident	Policy Option 6 Former Catford Greyhound Stadium	Object	I hope you will reconsider putting houses on the Catford Dog Track, and spread the required houses across other, already developed sites instead.	<b>Disagree. The site has planning permission for residential units and other uses. Barratt Homes have been selected as a development partner and the Council is in discussions regarding the build-out of the site. Work is expected to commence in Autumn 2013.</b>
S. Duncan	Policy Option 6 Former Catford Greyhound Stadium	Comment	I feel that this site should not be used to create more shops or housing- there is enough of that elsewhere in the plan. The plan should focus on the use of greenspace, of extending the parks (Ladywell Fields and the waterway) and should consider including a cafe with indoor seating and a city farm.	<b>Disagree. The site has planning permission for residential units and other uses. Barratt Homes have been selected as a development partner and the Council is in discussions regarding the build-out of the site. Work is expected to commence in Autumn 2013.</b>
Nick Graham, TfL	Policy Option 6 Former Catford Greyhound Stadium, p84	Comment	There is the option of including an intermediate station at Medusa if the 'TfL route' was to be implemented. The borough may wish to highlight this location for reference on Figure 4.13 Key Design Considerations.	<b>The Council accepts that the DLR proposals are at an early stage of discussion and subject to change. As such the qualifications and amendments are noted and will be taken into account when drafting the submission plan.</b>
S. Duncan	Policy Option 6 Former Catford Greyhound Stadium	Comment	Re the plans for the old Catford Stadium site. I feel strongly that this should <i>not</i> be developed into more flats/homes and/or shops. There are plenty of other opportunities for housing development in the Catford Plan (and plenty of existing homes which are in disrepair and unused or underused). There are also plenty of places for shops (the idea for rejuvenating the existing shopping centre is good). There are also plenty of shops in Lewisham and so what Catford really needs, I feel, is not more shops (yes, better shops but not more shops), but other community hubs or activities. I think the Catford Stadium site should be developed into an extension of the existing Ladywell Fields/Waterway parkland area, with a cafe with indoor seating (serving this side of the parkland) AND- ideally- a city farm. There are few city farms in this part of London (compared with East London). Hackney City Farm, for example, was instrumental in the regeneration of that area of Hackney and is now an important community hub for families (Catford is full of young families), for community classes (pottery, bike-repair etc) and for school visits. I know the Horniman Museum in Forest Hill now has some animals but it isn't really a city farm, and isn't within walking distance for Catford families.	<b>Disagree. The site has planning permission for residential units and other uses. Barratt Homes have been selected as a development partner and the Council is in discussions regarding the build-out of the site. Work is expected to commence in Autumn 2013.</b>
<b>Wickes and Halfords</b>				
Stewart Murray, GLA	Council's recommended	Support	generally support the approach taken London Plan Ref: 2.13, 4.7 and 4.8	<b>Comment noted.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
	option 7: Wickes and Halfords			
Stewart Murray, GLA	Council's recommended option 7: Wickes and Halfords – 1 b	Comment	suggest stronger text stating that convenience retail floorspace will be resisted in this location. Suggest indicative floorspace also needed. London Plan Ref: 2.13, 4.7, 4.8	<b>As an out of centre location the NPPF provides an adequately restrictive policy position.</b>
Local Resident	Policy Option 7 Wickes and Halfords p88	Comment	Content (though good luck getting all those residential's cars onto the south circular) - extremely pleased with the proposed opening and improvements to the River Ravensbourne and all those trees. At the moment that part of the Waterlink Way is a real put-off. Could you not move some of the proposed residential development from the dog track to this already developed site? Seriously, just load it up if it means leaving the Catford Dog Track to nature/public. Push for that DLR station to go there and you would sort out congestion problems trying to get residents' cars onto the south circular.	<b>Comments noted. The former Catford Greyhound Stadium site has planning permission for residential units and other uses.</b>
Charles Muriithi, Environment Agency	Policy Option 7 Wickes and Halfords	Support	Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the above document which we received on 25 February 2013. We are pleased to note that Ravensbourne River naturalisation/improvement is listed as an opportunity within the Catford Road, the Former Greyhound Stadium and the Wickes and Halfords study areas of the Catford Plan. We support this opportunity being maximised to deliver benefits for both biodiversity and the people of Catford.	<b>Comment noted.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Policy Option 7 Wickes and Halfords	Comment	Retention of 'bulk good' services in the area. Protection of, and access to, the river way Provision of green space/landscaping Use of arches under railway for retail & entertainment usage	<b>The Policy Option includes retention of 'bulky goods', access to the river and landscape and environmental enhancements.</b>
Tom Collingridge, Lewisham Cyclists	Policy Option 7 Wickes and Halfords	Support	2b) – Good – enhanced pedestrian <u>and</u> cycle links	<b>Comment noted.</b>
<b>Development sites</b>				
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Policy Options 1-7	Comment	Broad support, there is a question as to whether the local environment and infrastructure can deal with the number of new dwellings and clarity and risk assessment as to whether this is the case should be clearly brought out for public discussion during phase two of the consultation  If economically viable to the entire scheme more alternatives to the Milford Towers/upper floor usage of the Catford Shopping Centre would be desirous. Ideally the site would be used for commercial:	<b>Comments noted. CLP Option 25: Social infrastructure provides details of how the necessary social infrastructure is to be delivered, in order to meet the additional demand from population growth. Appendix 3 (Infrastructure Schedule) will be reviewed for inclusion in the proposed submission version. Objective 8 will be amended to specifically refer to the provision of social infrastructure to support growth.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			Office and Retail usage only, but not at an overall significant costs to the entire redevelopment.	
Stewart Murray, GLA	General comment about all sites	Comment	Is it feasible and viable to deliver all uses on a number of the sites – evidence to back this up for examination.	<b>Comment noted. Evidence is available and will be available at submission / examination.</b>
Stewart Murray, GLA	General comment about all sites	Comment	Need to reference affordable housing for each site London Plan Ref: 3.11 and 3.12	<b>Comment noted. CLP Option 2 – CLP Option 7 will be amended in the proposed submission version to include reference to affordable housing.</b>
Stewart Murray, GLA	General comment about all sites	Comment	Need to reference need for child playspace London Plan Ref: 3.6	<b>Comment noted. The proposed submission version will include reference to playspace where relevant.</b>
Stewart Murray, GLA	General Comment Key Design Consideration	Comment	Plans appear too generic; more detail could be included which would make the document much more useful to future developers and decision makers. London Plan Ref: 7.4, 7.6, 7.7	<b>Comments noted. The Council considers that adequate detail is provided.</b>
<b>Presumption in favour of sustainable development</b>				
Local Resident	Policy option 8 Presumption in favour of sustainable development p94	Support	Spot on.	<b>Comment noted.</b>
Stewart Murray, GLA	Policy option 8 Presumption in favour of sustainable development point 2 and 3 a	Comment	Include reference to London Plan	<b>The introduction to Section 4 states that all policies need to be read in conjunction with the London Plan. This policy option is based on national planning policies in the NPPF and the Council considers that further reference to the London Plan is not needed.</b>
<b>Providing new homes</b>				
Stewart Murray, GLA	Policy Option 9 Providing new homes point 1	Comment	The total number of net additional dwelling should be 1,739 to reflect numbers set out for each site. In addition, the text should note that this number is expressed as a minimum. London Plan Ref: 3.3	<b>CLP Option 9 will be amended in the proposed submission version to refer to a minimum of 1,850 new additional dwellings. This includes the totals from the sites listed within the policy plus an extra 11 dwellings to allow for some variation in the numbers of dwellings provided on some sites which at the time of plan preparation are estimates. .</b>
Stewart Murray, GLA	Policy Option 9 Providing new homes point 2	Support	<u>Strongly support</u> London Plan Ref: 3.4	<b>Support noted.</b>
Stewart Murray, GLA	Policy Option 9 Providing new homes point 6	Support	<u>Strongly support</u> London Plan Ref: 3.5 and Housing SPG	<b>Support noted.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
Local Resident	Policy Option 9 Providing new homes, p97	Object	I implore you: take the 589 homes proposed for Catford Dog Track, and spread them over the other - already developed - sites, they can take it, Plassy Road is an eyesore and no-one will mind if you add a few floors onto the developments there. Keep Catford Dog Track undeveloped, and incorporate it into the Waterlink Way. Now that really is sustainable development - giving clean air and open space to our children and forthcoming generations.	<b>Disagree. The site has planning permission for residential units and other uses. Barratt Homes have been selected as a development partner and the Council is in discussions regarding the build-out of the site. Work is expected to commence in Autumn 2013.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Option 9 Providing new homes	Comment	Commitment to providing at least some of these new dwellings with either communal out door or private garden space.	<b>All new dwellings must meet the standards in the London Plan and Lewisham Core Strategy which require the provision of private amenity space.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.3.4 Housing need	Comment	It is my view that the provision of housing of 4 bedrooms and housing with gardens are needed in the area.	<b>Comment noted. The justification to the policy states that family housing of 3 or more dwellings will be provided as part of any new development with 10 or more dwellings.</b>
Mr L. Stevens	Mix of housing	Support	Care should also be taken to ensure there is a mix of housing development and not just 1 and 2 bed flats so that there is a mix of families and people without children. Ideally most accommodation should be affordable (but I appreciate that the economics may not stack up) and not simply sold to overseas investors like so many new developments (such as the Barratt developments at Lewisham and Canada Water) so that people can put down roots and contribute to the local community and economy.	<b>Comments noted. CLP Option 9(5) seeks to ensure housing mix, tenure and affordability. The justification to the policy states an appropriate mix of dwellings having regard to site characteristics, setting, surrounding housing mix and the location of schools, shops, open space and other infrastructure requirements. The policy supports the approach taken in the National Planning Policy Framework (government planning guidance) which requires local authorities to plan for mixed and balanced communities.</b>
<b>Town centre vitality and viability</b>				
Local Resident	Policy option 13 Town centre vitality and viability p106 (Shop frontages)	Comment	Rushey Green is marked by its beautiful and mature plane trees, but there are gaps and these should be filled. They are the easiest, most beautiful, and most beneficial way of improving the frontage and impression of Catford. The area between Aldi's and Rushey Green is crying out for some greenery. Alternative Option 2 should be included to that end.	<b>Comments noted. CLP Option 21: Design and public realm will be amended to specifically refer to the valuable green space that the 'London Squares' provide. The aim to provide attractive street trees will be referred to in the justification of the proposed submission version of the policy, alongside aims to improve the public realm overall.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Option 13 Town centre vitality and viability	Comment	<p>It would be beneficial to include re-provision of space for a enterprise/start up zone, which was a function of the Catford Mews before the introduction of Poundland.</p> <p>It is my belief that Rushey Green High Street should be included in the primary shopping areas to give uniformity and not to give rise to the creation of a Cinderella section of the town centre, especially as this area is flanked by residential property.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted. CLP Option 10: Economic growth for Catford will be amended to refer to encouraging small and start-up businesses. The provision of new premises for these businesses would depend on individual proposals coming forward.</b></p> <p><b>Disagree. The Council considers the primary shopping area accurately reflects the core shopping area, incorporating the primary shopping frontages and closely related secondary frontages. The remaining secondary frontages provide vital variety and other facilities outside the primary shopping area which support these activities and which add</b></p>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
				to the overall functioning and attractiveness of the centre as a whole. The intention of CLP Option 13 is therefore to maintain a strong retail presence in the secondary frontages while adding a proportion of other retail types which contribute to the attractiveness of the centre.
Planning prospects obo Dransfield Properties Ltd	CLP Policy Option 13: Town centre vitality and viability	Object	<p>Part A. General: Support enhancing the vitality and viability of Catford Town Centre through encouraging new retail development. However, Core Strategy Spatial Policy 2 states that Catford Town Centre will accommodate up to 22,000 sq.m of additional retail floorspace by 2026 and Catford Town Centre Local Plan Policy Option 13 only provides an additional 8,100 sq.m gross of A1 comparison and an additional 1,800 sq.m gross of A1 convenience. This is 12,100 sq.m less than the Core Strategy requirement.</p> <p>Part B. Town Centre Boundary: Support the town centre boundary</p> <p>Part C. Primary Shopping Area: It is stated that the Primary Shopping Area contains those areas where retail development is concentrated and generally comprises the primary and those secondary frontages which are adjoining and closely related to the primary shopping frontage. This should include the Plassy Road Island as it too is part of the town centre and has a concentration of retail uses. It is also supported for further retail development that will be complementary to and closely related to the existing primary shopping area through better pedestrian access and improved legibility. It is part of the core shopping area of Catford, and this role should be reinforced through development to cement further its position within the Primary Shopping Area.</p> <p>The Alternative Option as provided on page 111 states that given the proposed vision and objectives, a reasonable alternative to the above policy option could include one or more of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The current and larger town centre boundary could be carried forward.</li> <li>2. <b>The proposed primary shopping area could be larger and include all secondary frontages along Rushey Green</b> (our emphasis added).</li> <li>3. A more flexible approach could be adopted for primary frontages. A requirement for a lower percentage of A1 uses could be included.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comments in support of enhancing the vitality and viability of Catford town centre is noted. The retail capacity figure in the Catford Plan is based on a finer grained assessment of the needs for Catford. This is based on the assessment carried out by PBA consultants and is set out in the Catford Retail and Economic Impact Assessment.</b></p> <p><b>Comment in support of the town centre boundary is noted.</b></p> <p><b>Disagree. The Primary shopping area is defined in accordance with the NPPF and is based around the redevelopment of the Catford Centre which is allocated to provide the majority of additional retail floorspace. The plan-led approach identifies the Plassy Road Island site as an area that complements the uses within the primary shopping area, rather than intensifying their use in another location.</b></p>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>4. A more flexible approach could be adopted for the secondary frontages.</p> <p>5. More detailed requirements could be included for other frontages.</p> <p>6. Relying on the policies in the London Plan and Core Strategy rather than a more detailed local policy for the Catford Market</p> <p>We agree with Point 2 that the proposed Primary Shopping Area should be larger and include all secondary frontages along Rushey Green, but this should be extended also to include the Plassy Road Island as a whole. An expanded and reinforced retail presence here would form a much stronger gateway into Catford town centre and enhance the centre.</p> <p>The Catford Town Centre Local Plan should promote higher levels of additional retail floorspace, including convenience space, if it is to maintain and enhance Catford as a major town centre in the retail hierarchy and reclaim trade lost to competing locations</p> <p>Plassy Road Island should be included in the Primary Shopping Area.</p>	
B. Gray	Vitality	Comment	<p>Inward Investment and Business development is key to the success of the town centre more emphasis needed on this and should include:</p> <p>Encouraging/insisting that existing comparison retail owners contribute to development of their shops or especially as they represent more than a third of the town centre floor space and attract just 7.2% of the catchment area market share. There is potential for an additional £360.4 million expenditure in this part of the retail sector by 2026 which should be an incentive.</p> <p>Similarly convenience retail at 27% of shop floor space is over represented compared to UK average of 17% and only have 17% of market share. Many of the small retailers in the retail study said they intended to stay in area hence business development critical for them to improve and contribute to development of the area and increase their performance. There potential for an additional £65.3 million expenditure in this part of the retail sector by 2026 which should be an incentive.</p> <p>Over reliance in the Catford Plan on large business units and major retailers for growth of the town centre which is out of date. Current</p>	<p><b>Comments noted. It is acknowledged that investment and business development is the key to the success of a town centre.</b></p>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>trend in comparable town centres in Brixton offer smaller more diverse niche retail, culture and leisure offer for specialised and constantly changing markets.</p> <p>Better understanding of existing and projected population needed in order to identify market in catchment areas who initially could be the main focus and maybe those with potential to using accessible public transport to Catford town centre.</p> <p>Retail study suggestion of “flexibility being important in order that floor space performs higher turnover levels than current performance and meet need” is a real challenge at the moment and creates a paradigm with suggestion in the plan for adding up to 5,600-8,100 sqm of floor space by 2026 and needs to be more strongly reflected in the Plan and picked up by developers.</p> <p>A lot of reliance on retail and flexibility above could include other use of retail space particularly to attract new emerging markets and maximise Catford's proximity to Shoreditch and Street and attract some traders formerly of Borough Market into Catford Market, some traders – a number were based in industrial/commercial units in New Cross and Deptford and used proximity and transport links to travel to London Bridge and people from Lewisham travel there buy. Developers need to get the idea of this from the Catford Plan to inform their marketing of their facilities.</p> <p>The 2008 MHE Shopping index shows that Catford at 440 is not far behind Brixton with 350 so the transformation is not so impossible. They have many similar features though Catford has more transport links via station and fast links to DLR.</p>	
A. Dunne	Market	Comment	<p>In terms of the market, again we should look towards models that are succeeding in London. London is a city famous for it's markets, why couldn't they be seen as an opportunity to add to this heritage. The new Brixton village is a fantastic addition to the Brixton area, as is Broadway market in Harrgerston. Hopefully we can learn from these areas.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted. The Council is seeking to broaden the appeal of the market by various measures. A grant from the Mayor of London's outer London fund has been received for improvements to the market both physically, environmentally, making the market larger and attracting a wider variety of stalls.</b></p>
Mr R. Omerod	Shops	Comment	<p>Reduction in the Number of betting shops.</p>	<p><b>Betting shops form part of a wider 'use class' that includes financial and professional services such as banks and building societies (A2 Use Class). Therefore any restrictive policy applying to A2 uses would impact on a wide range of premises, without being able to single out betting shops in particular.</b></p>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
Mr L. Stevens	Shops	Support	Better shops and businesses in the Town Centre would also attract people to live there and make the area a better place. I think a cinema would be a good addition to Catford Town Centre (as there would be space at either Catford Island or where the Wickes and Halfords are as part of a redevelopment) and encourage more people to go there.	<b>No specific site has been identified for a cinema however the Vision seeks an improved leisure offer and Objective 4 seeks to establish Catford as an evening and weekend leisure destination. The Plan contains a strong focus on developing a mix of uses, including leisure uses, and supporting the evening economy (see CLP Options 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14). CLP Options 2, 3, 4 and 5 allow for the development of a mix of uses including leisure (D2) at the Catford Centre, Civic Centre, Laurence House and Plassy Road.</b>
L. Walmsley	Shops	Comment	Although I completely agree with the document that higher end high street chains are completely under-represented in the town centre at the moment, this has to be a strategy for ten years. In other parts of the country as areas have improved, lower/middle end chain stores have moved in, increasing the rents and pushing the independent retailers out, they themselves are then impossible to get rid of if they don't fit the feel of the area. This is bad both for the bottom end of the market as independent shops often cater for customers who can't afford high street chains, and also the top end of the market as the presence of too many high street shops pushes the rents up which prevents small boutiques and cafes and independent toy shops from being able to establish themselves. For this reason you should have a policy of supporting and encouraging independent retail outlets in the longer term.	<b>Comments noted. CLP Option 10: Economic Growth for Catford will be amended to refer to encouraging small and start-up businesses. The text accompanying the CLP Option 10 already refers to the provision of space for small and medium sized premises as one of the key issues for Catford. The justification text to CLP Option 10 will be amended to refer to opportunities for entrepreneurship.</b>
L. Walmsley	4.2.3c		Leisure uses to be located above new supermarket or retail units. I wasn't entirely clear what is meant by this...if you meant bowling alleys and gyms etc. that sounds ideal. If you mean A3 and A4 units...restaurant, bars, clubs and pubs that is a really bad idea. I have been in town centres where that has been the policy, and if the A3 and A4 provision is only upper floor units they don't always attract the best type of bars and restaurants. It also means there is nothing going on at ground level at night except people going to and from those venues. This can make the area feel rough and dangerous. If A3 and A4 units are mixed in at ground level, their windows look out onto the street and people sitting outside or smoking in the doorways do, and this makes the area busier and safer. It also makes it possible for the casual punter to see what sort of restaurant or bar it is before they go inside. Of course upper level clubs and gig venues etc can be great, but it would be a really bad idea if this was where you located all the A3 and 4 stuff.	<b>Leisure uses are generally defined as bowling alleys, gyms etc that are categorised as a D Use Class by the Use Classes Order. A3 and A4 uses are classified as retail uses and would not be placed on upper floors by this policy. The policy would not promote retail forms of use on upper floors. Depending on their definition clubs are generally considered to fall within the D Use Class. However a club where there was a mix of activities for example a night club or bar with live entertainment would be put in a category where any application for planning permission would be considered on an individual basis according to the impact, the nature of the use and whether it was appropriate at this location.</b>
Kate Richardson, Culverley Green Residents	Vitality	Comment	It seems that the restoration of the fortunes of Catford Town Centre rests more on the increase in residential development than the retention of employment land and this can only increase the	<b>Comments noted.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
Association			dependency on the local population on other areas for work with a greater need for daily trips outside our area. In particular this will result from the proposed residential redevelopment of the Halford/Wicks and Laurence House sites. Together with the downsizing of the Council's workforce this will have a negative impact and it will therefore be vital to retain an invigorated retail and entertainment presence in the town centre.	
A. Dunne	Regeneration	Comment	<p>In addition, are these all going to be low budget, affordable housing? Catford is a very poor area and I hope that this 'radical revamp' is also seen as an opportunity to introduce economic diversity alongside the racial and cultural diversity that Catford has to offer. Catford has a reputation for being poor and I think that it's important for this not to be perpetuated especially given this rare opportunity.</p> <p>I also feel that it is an opportunity for people to bring people from outside of Catford into Catford. This should be seen as an opportunity to bring new people to the area with a different financial status. This would help Catford grow in terms of the wealth that it would bring and would help to redress the reputation that it seems to have developed. In addition bringing artistic groups to the area has historically been an effective way to raise the status of an area and change the make-up of the people in the area. This might be especially beneficial because of Goldsmiths being relatively local. This might come in the form of artists studios for example. I realise that the council cannot make this happen but might go some way towards encouraging it.</p>	<p><b>The National Policy Framework and the Lewisham Local Planning Documents require the creation of mixed and balanced communities. Some of these developments are likely to be built by social housing providers such as Housing Associations. Some of the developments will be built by commercial builders who will provide a proportion of affordable housing. This should result in a mix of people coming into the area.</b></p> <p><b>Comments about encouraging new artist's studios in Catford are noted. CLP Option 10: Economic growth for Catford will be amended to refer to encouraging small and start-up businesses. The provision of new premises for these businesses would depend on individual proposals coming forward.</b></p>
B. Gray	Regeneration	Comment	Sustainability should also include sustainable communities with employment opportunities and access to health education and other facilities for social and economic growth of the local population and benefit from local improvements, particularly those in the lower scoring LSOA's in Rushey Green and Catford South.	<b>Comments noted. The Council considers that the Catford Plan is sustainable and promotes employment opportunities, access to social facilities and other social infrastructure.</b>
<b>Evening economy</b>				
Local Resident	Policy Option 14 Evening economy and Policy Option 15 Restaurants, cafes and drinking establishments p112	Comment	Can you please consider including an additional point "Support pubs and restaurants and the local community by adopting a presumption of refusal for change of use applications where the existing business has proven to be popular and successful"	<p><b>The Council's Development Management Policy 20: Public houses aims to prevent the loss of public houses across the borough, included in Catford town centre. A requirement of this policy is that a viability report is submitted demonstrating that the pub has been operated positively and not run poorly in order to smooth the way for redevelopment.</b></p> <p><b>The justification to CLP Option 14 will be amended to reflect the importance pubs play in the evening economy.</b></p>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Policy Option 14 Evening economy	Comment	Specific planning policy and support for a Cinema to be reintroduced to the area. The evening economy should be diversified from solely drinking related activity, especially given the higher levels of religious belief in the area. We should strive for Health activities, café culture and community provision as core elements of the mix	<b>No specific site has been identified for a cinema however the Vision seeks an improved leisure offer and Objective 4 seeks to establish Catford as an evening and weekend leisure destination. The Plan contains a strong focus on developing a mix of uses, including leisure uses, and supporting the evening economy (see CLP Options 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14). CLP Options 2, 3, 4 and 5 allow for the development of a mix of uses including leisure (D2) at the Catford Centre, Civic Centre, Laurence House and Plassy Road.</b>
L. Walmsley	Sex venues	Comment	We do not have any of these in the area at the moment, it would be a really good idea to have a policy on this (obviously against) then that continues to be the case. It would be horrible to be caught out unprepared by that one!	<b>This is beyond the scope of the plan. A sex shop is classified as an ordinary retail shop in the Town and Country Planning Use Classes Order. In order to prevent an ordinary retail shop from being a sex shop would be dealt with under licensing regulations. Similarly a sex venue is classified as an ordinary 'D' leisure assembly use.</b>
<b>Restaurants, cafes and drinking establishments</b>				
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Policy Option 15 Restaurants, cafes and drinking establishments	Comment	Provision should be made for appropriate sized commercial spaces for upper end chain restaurants such as Pizza Express etc.	<b>Comments noted. The Plan does not go into detail on the size of units that will be provided in the town centre.</b>
L. Walmsley	5.3.5	Comment	<p>The aim of this policy option is to manage the potentially negative effects that can arise from restaurants, cafés and other food and drink establishments. While these uses make an important contribution to a vibrant town centre and shopping area and draw visitors to centres they can also create negative impacts that need to be managed.</p> <p>In the last two or three years as rental and house prices have soared in the rest of London considerable numbers of young professionals have moved into the area from places like North London and Hackney to find cheaper accommodation. Although unable to afford the rents in some of London's more popular areas these people have large disposable incomes and are tending to go back to the West End and Shoreditch in order to go out at night. 10 years ago Stoke Newington and Dalston were extremely dodgy areas with similar problems to those faced by Catford however today they have extremely thriving aspirational nightlife. There is clearly demand for the sort of establishments they have there in Catford as the success of the Catford Bridge Tavern has shown. It would be good for the area, and nice for people who constantly have to take the nightbus or late night train journeys back from going out to have a similar nightlife here. It would mean other boroughs of London were not getting peoples leisure spending.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted.</b></p> <p><b>The inclusion of this policy in the Catford Town Centre Local Plan is being reviewed as it repeats Policy 17 in the Development Management Local Plan Proposed Submission Version, which applies to the borough as a whole, including Catford town centre.</b></p> <p><b>Pubs are encouraged and supported in the town centre, as detailed in CLP Option 13: Town Centre vitality and viability points 1b where they are described as A4 uses. It is also referred to in the justification to Policy</b></p>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>Although the risks of bad venues have to be recognized, I think the policy needs to be worded in such a way as to offer encouragement to suitable A4 businesses to come to the area. It is especially urgent as Catford has lost half its pub sites in the last few years, if suitable businesses did want to put down root in Catford there are currently not many suitable sites available.</p> <p>The demographic wanting to use this kind of leisure facility is only likely to grow over the next 10 years, and as London evolves so rapidly it is impossible to say that the social makeup of the/using the town centre is going to be the same then as it is now, prejudicing against the requirements of what could be a key demographic because some of the current users of A4 units have problematic behavior is maybe a little short sighted.</p> <p>Other areas where I think the policy could be clarified to encourage the right sort of A4 units.....</p> <p>The Council recognises that the town centre will require more than comparison retail to remain a viable and vibrant centre, therefore the secondary shopping frontage will be promoted for other main town centre uses. This includes A2 and A3 uses and a more flexible approach to non A1 uses. In particular, restaurants, cinemas, businesses, community uses, banks, policing facilities, building societies, employment centres, advice centres and other health and welfare services may be appropriate.</p> <p>This does not mention A4 use, but A2 and A3, and in the list of desirable businesses does not mention pubs which gives the impression that they are at best not integral to the plan and at worst not welcome. Pubs should be actively encouraged to the area as there is already a shortage in Catford and the wider area considering the population and demand is likely to increase.</p> <p>. 2 The Council will generally support restaurants (not hot food take-aways) and family orientated developments, including appropriate leisure uses.</p> <p>As specifically 'family orientated developments' are mentioned here, and in some other places I think throughout the documents. A presumption in favour of nighttime developments that encourage young adults without children should be included in the document.</p> <p>. 2.3.2 Catford is reasonably well provided for in terms of eating and drinking establishments.</p> <p>You mention in 2.3.1 that the retail available clusters at the bottom end of the market, you have mentioned that the restaurants are mainly fast food outlets. There is a lack of provision from higher end pubs and clubs in the town centre (there's only the Tavern!).</p> <p>The document needs to include a clear reference to the need for</p>	

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>better quality pubs and clubs.</p> <p>. 4.6.1.b provides for a mix of retail uses that serve local needs and do not adversely impact on the town centre (A1, A3)</p> <p>This relates to the Catford Greyhound site....it is going to have a large number of residential units, presumably those not let as social housing will require a hefty income to rent or buy, even shared ownership. The nearest pub (and indeed the only higher end pub in the town centre) the Tavern is frequently packed out on a weekend, there is nowhere to sit and you can't get a meal. For this reason there is a need to put an A4 unit on the site as well. Currently there are only 4 pubs at all in the town centre so another would improve the community in the area. Also, although I have heard there is likely to be a community centre on the site, for a significant proportion of the population, a good local pub is far more of a community rallying point.</p>	
<b>Hot food take-away shops</b>				
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Policy Option 16 Hot food take-away shops	Comment	Agreement with the 5% rule on hot food take aways and neighbourly opening hours. The same policy provision should be introduced for, betting shops, pawn brokers and pay-day loan lenders.	<p><b>Comments in support of the 5% rule for hot food takeaways are noted. The inclusion of this policy in the Catford Town Centre Local Plan is being reviewed as it repeats Policy 18 in the Development Management Local Plan Proposed Submission Version, which applies to the borough as a whole, including Catford town centre.</b></p> <p><b>It is not straightforward to introduce such a percentage restriction to betting shops, pawn brokers and pay-day loan shops as they form part of a wider 'use class' that includes financial and professional services such as banks and building societies (A2 Use Class). Therefore any restrictive policy applying to A2 uses would impact on a wide range of premises, without being able to single out betting shops, pawn brokers or pay-day loan shops in particular.</b></p>
Miss D. Leah		Comment	Far too many fast food outlets which make the area smell awful. Small ethnic restaurants should be encouraged to improve the night time use of the town centre.	<p><b>Comment noted. The policies in the plan promote a varied evening economy including restaurant uses.</b></p> <p><b>The inclusion of this policy in the Catford Town Centre Local Plan is being reviewed as it repeats Policy 18 in the Development Management Local Plan Proposed Submission Version, which applies to the borough as a whole, including Catford town centre.</b></p> <p><b>The policy places controls on fast food takeaways to restrict opening hours and ensure that food smells from cooking are controlled. If there are takeaways or other fast food outlets that appear to be breaking the terms of their planning permission then this should be reported to the Council for enforcement action.</b></p>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
<b>Shopfronts, signs and hoardings</b>				
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Policy Option 17 Shopfront, signs and hoardings	Comment	Broad agreement with the policy. Policy should include policy restriction on using street space at the front of the store for trading for non-restaurant commercial activity.	<p><b>Many shops have forecourts and they can display whatever they want on them. However, when traders display their goods on the footway itself, the Council has powers to take enforcement action if the display is causing problems to pedestrians.</b></p> <p><b>The Council allows displays to stick out a maximum of 1.05 metres (3'6") onto the pavement, as long as pedestrians have at least 2.10 metres (7'0") clear passageway between the edge of the display and the road.</b></p> <p><b>In exceptional circumstances a greater depth of display will be allowed (for example, if the pavement is very wide) or a smaller depth of display (for example, where pedestrian footfall is very high).</b></p> <p><b>Similarly, projections such as canopies, awnings or CCTV equipment must be at least 2.75 metres above the pavement.</b></p>
S. Newton	Shop fronts	Support	I support the proposal to improve the shop fronts. Some of the shops selling meat and fish look unhygienic and stink. These need to be forced to clean up the way they operate.	<p><b>Comments noted. This is beyond the scope of the Plan. Problems with unhygienic shops are a matter for enforcement by Environmental Health and cannot be dealt with by planning means.</b></p>
E. Weidman	Retail	Comment	It is important to preserve the small businesses in Catford and try and keep things 'local'. Big chains are not going to help. It is fair enough that there is one big Tesco's but please do not damage the high street further by allowing any other 'metro' stores and please try to limit the POUND SHOPS!!! This is the demise of the high street across the uk. A massive mistake that can probably not now be reversed. Catford farmers market - brilliant.... keep this type of thing up. Cool, trendy, local bars such as the Catford Bridge Tavern are fantastic... We need a wonderful cafe too... Excellent Coffee/excellent food...	<p><b>Comments noted. CLP Option 10 will be amended to refer to encouraging new small and start-up businesses, including independent and local businesses.</b></p>
<b>Carbon Dioxide emission reduction and decentralised energy networks</b>				
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Policy Option 18 Carbon Dioxide emission reduction and decentralised energy networks	Comment	Support for micro-solar and wind generation should be included in this policy. Where possible inclusion of targets for increasing energy efficiency of redeveloped buildings.	<p><b>Support for renewable energy generation and targets for increasing the energy efficiency of buildings are included in the London Plan and the Lewisham Core Strategy. These policies apply to Catford Town Centre.</b></p>
<b>Managing and reducing the risk of flooding</b>				
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Policy Option 20 Managing and reducing the risk of flooding	Comment	Waterways development work should indicate the factor within which it would decrease the likelihood of flooding	<p><b>Development in flood risk area does not result in a change to the Flood Risk classification of an area. Development in flood risk areas manages flood risk by ensuring that any flooding is dealt with on site and that it does not increase</b></p>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
				<p>flood risk elsewhere. It should ensure that of uses considered vulnerable are located away from areas that might flood.</p> <p>Measures that would decrease flood risk are formal flood defence measures that would reduce the risk of flooding in the first place. These are put in place by the Environment Agency.</p>
<b>Design and Public Realm</b>				
Richard Parish, English Heritage	Policy Option 21 Design and Public Realm 1a.	Comment	Consider adding removing unnecessary unattractive signage and street furniture wherever possible.	<b>This issue is dealt with in the justification to CLP Option 21: Design and Public Realm.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Policy Option 21 Design and Public Realm	Comment	<p>Specific guidance should be developed as a matter of priority for a specific Catford/Rushey Green Streetscape guide. Due regard should be paid to natural light and shadow of new developments; cladding type of new agreeing height, and distance ideals for new building works would be desirous.</p> <p>Rushey Green is a ward with significant levels of crime when compared to the Borough and London averages. Thoughtful design in streetscape can significantly reduce this and proposals should look to identify how they are planning out crime opportunities from our streets.</p> <p>A review as to research into 'Secure By Design' and how they impact on social integration of communities especially between social and non-social housing development.</p>	<p><b>Natural light and shadow etc. are detailed issues and would normally be dealt with by a detailed site brief, or in relation to a specific planning proposal.</b></p> <p><b>Reduction in crime and the fear of crime is one of the aims of the Core Strategy which is the over-arching Plan for the borough. This aim is carried forward in to general design policies which require security in new development. CLP Option 21 requires all public spaces in Catford to be designed as safe, assessable, healthy, attractive and robust.</b></p> <p><b>The Council is preparing a further detailed document called the Development Management Local Plan. This document sets out more detailed policies for managing development in the borough and DM Policy 32 states that new building housing development will be required to be designed so that schemes in mixed tenure do not distinguish between public and private housing provision either in terms of quality of materials and design or in level of amenities.</b></p>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	2.76 Townscape	Comment	<p>A specific materials, colour and design palette should be agreed with local residences and used as the basis with which to judge future planning applications to ensure uniformity and aesthetic value. This should be developed beyond that of the Lewisham Streetscape guide, which is too broad.</p> <p>Agreement and policy as to the ratio of building height to distance to the property boundary should be agreed. Provision of gardens both front and back should be included in designs.</p> <p>Whilst design uniformity is essential, some consideration for local high-value 'quirks' would add to the overall environment.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted.</b></p> <p><b>There are a number of ways this could be achieved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- pre-application discussions which will be strongly encouraged by the new Statement of Community Involvement which will enable early discussions with developers that would make residents views known on these issues</li> <li>- production of a design guide which is not currently programmed and for which no resources have been identified</li> <li>- site specific design briefs</li> <li>- use policies in the Core Strategy and in the Development Management Local Plan which deal with these issues in</li> </ul>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
				some detail – albeit in a way that is not specific to Catford.
B. Gray		Comment	Designing out crime is critical for Catford Town Centre and with a strong emphasis in the plan so developers are in no doubt of their requirement in this factor. If people don't feel safe they will not come to Catford. The active frontages should be checked carefully by planners particularly through engagement and consultation with residents and business to see if they are likely to be effective and how developers might interpret and deliver them before finalising the Catford Plan.	<b>Comments noted. Designing out crime is one of the main aims of all Local Plans in Lewisham. Policy 15 (1b) of Lewisham Core Strategy specifically directs all development to ensure the design acts to reduce crime and the fear of crime.</b>
A. Dunne	Architecture	Comment	I realise that housing is at a shortage and that this is an important area for local and national government. However I also feel that due to the huge impact that architecture can have on the area and the people, residents should have a say in exactly what this architecture should look like. I would certainly like to be consulted directly on this, can residents expect a real and direct input on decisions made?	<b>The Council will re-publish a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) detailing the standards of consultation that may be expected for involvement of the community in discussion on planning applications. The emphasis on the new SCI will be for more involvement and discussion before a planning application is actually made.</b>
S. Newton	Broadway	Comment	I support the proposed improvements to the Broadway, with the proviso that the new paving and street furniture must be of a high quality – Granite or Yorkstone pavements – not concrete or reconstituted stone.	<b>The type of material used is outside the scope of this Plan. The Council has received money from the Mayor of London's Outer London fund to improve Catford Broadway and these works are soon to begin.</b>  <b>For future developments, borough-wide policy 30 in the Development Management Local Plan will require the use of high quality durable materials for streets, but will not specify the type of material to be used.</b>
Nick Jeffrey, Planning Sub-Committee of Culverley Green Residents' Association	Civic Space	Comment	A major attraction of Catford is the diversity of people living here. That goes for neighbours and it goes for the rich variety of foods for sale of international cuisine on offer, and live musical and theatrical events. Such commercial and cultural vitality is only one representation of the diverse and rich mixture of cultural background for which Catford provides a focus. It is such mixing and tension and creativity that can make a space a good space, with places for all, and crossings of many paths. This makes a place safer too. And Catford already has a memorable and loved sculpture, The Catford Cat, which needs only maintenance.  But Catford puts many off, and is a wasted opportunity. Where are the places like Ladywell and Forest Hill and Brockley have for 'yummie mummies'? Where are the music venues aside from the Theatre and pubs at some distance from the Centre? Do the new	<b>Comments noted.</b> <b>The Council has received funding from the Mayor's Outer London fund to invest in improvements to Catford Broadway which should result in the area having a more varied and attractive offer. Objective 4 of the Plan focuses on establishing Catford as a popular weekend and evening destination, building on the existing offer.</b>  <b>The Council considers the plan proposed for Catford to manage the traffic on the South Circular will result in a dramatic improvement to Catford and result in a cohesive town centre. This is detailed in CLP Option 1 and is supported by a study undertaken by SKM Colin Buchanan, entitled 'Catford Gyratory Modelling Summary, Technical Not 2, 2013'.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>plans address this? Yes. Do they offer hope to achieve this? Not in our opinion. Once again an easy way out is proposed with regard to public spaces. As in the completely ill advised Plassy Road development a few years back the easy option guarantees the less attractive aspects of Catford.</p> <p>The easy option in this plan is to abandon the longstanding proposal to repute the south Circular through the parking area behind Laurence House. In Buchanan's consultant report they don't even model the traffic flows for that option, dismissing it out of hand on spurious urban design grounds. It is said that the resultant space for a new urban square in front of the Broadway Theatre would be too big. Too big? That is without substance. It is said that it would detract form the Catford Broadway space. There is no such logic. These things reciprocate and enhance.</p> <p>It is such a civic space that Catford lacks. Such a space would help provided an attractive identity and such would enhance adjacent places, even the Plassy Road sites and their consequent property values. And so the values of property across Catford could go up. Once again Lewisham is being shortsighted.. and Catford will suffer. What is needed is for that space to be even further freed of traffic by removing not just the South Circular but also the northbound A21 traffic. This has been achieved in Lewisham and especially in Bromley with great benefit to Lewisham Market and Bromley High Street proved over the long term.</p> <p>A new Catford Square could take its place along with Peckham Square as one of London's best. My wife, the architect Judith Jeffrey, was project manager for the design and construction of Peckham Square and for the new Peckham Library there. She designed much of the square. It works, yet Catford could go one better by including a wide range of evening cafes and bars and venues.</p> <p>When I was a member of the previous London Mayor's Commission for a Spatial Development strategy for a new London plan, we recommended the creation of a hundred new squares to be made a priority. Inspired by Barcelona these were to be serving Londoners all across every type of area of this city, and places like Catford and Deptford were foremost in that vision.</p>	

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			cc Culverley Green Residents' Association	
B. Gray	Public spaces	Comment	What proportion of the properties will be flats and what additional facilities will be made available for residents to access to open space. Actual size of additional three public spaces proposed in the town centre are small compared to the extent of proposed residential growth .	<b>Comments noted. CLP Option 9(5) seeks to ensure housing mix, tenure and affordability. The justification to the policy states an appropriate mix of dwellings having regard to site characteristics, setting, surrounding housing mix and the location of schools, shops, open space and other infrastructure requirements. The policy supports the approach taken in the National Planning Policy Framework (government planning guidance) which requires local authorities to plan for mixed and balanced communities. At this stage it is not possible to predict what the proportion of various types of dwelling will be.</b>
B. Gray	Public spaces	Comment	More use of Town Squares walk along Rushey Green down to hospital and two pubs to encourage walking along an enhanced safe existing London Plane lined route or walk from and to the stations and an enhanced pedestrian route from town centre to Ladywell Fields looping back along hospital along Rushey Green back to town centre.	<b>Comments noted. CLP Option 21: Design and public realm will be amended to specifically refer to the valuable green space that the 'London Squares' provide.</b>  <b>CLP Option 1 will be amended in the proposed submission version to state that the Council will seek specific funding and deliver improvements to the walking and cycling network, including, the Waterlink Way, links through the town centre and beyond to the adjoining neighbourhoods and the provision of cycle lanes and priority at junctions.</b>
B. Gray	Public space	Comment	There is a danger that the improvements proposed will have a negative impact of restaurants around Eros House as they are extremely cut off. Original plan identified this as a food quarter with improved pedestrian and public space area. Current proposal is for improvements to encourage safe pedestrian movement could be an ideal public space outside restaurant and bars around an existing landmark.	<b>The schematic plan (Fig 4.12) for the Plassy Road Island site allows for new public space/pedestrian priority areas on the corner where the restaurants at the bottom of Eros House are located.</b>
B. Gray	Active frontages	Comment	It is difficult to know what active frontages could be in Canadian Avenue and Bromley Road at their junction with Catford Road on the site earmarked for residential at ground level. The volume of traffic and constant stream of pedestrians will result in blinds and curtains being permanent drawn to create privacy in such busy noisy locations. The new development in Plassy Road is an example of that where the street is not overlooked and feels unsafe.  Retail commercial site that backs onto Thomas Lane has no active frontage recreating the blind area identified in the Plan as an issue. This is an important pedestrian route and should be enhanced to	<b>Proposals for active frontages near the junction of Canadian Avenue with Bromley Road would depend on the detailed implementation of a scheme.</b>  <b>Policy CLP Option 2: Catford Centre proposes that much of Thomas Lane should have an active frontage.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			feel safe walking to residential area beyond. Could the leisure above with entrances not be featured on this side as there is active frontage on the other side.	
Local Resident	Visual environment	Support	I am pleased that you have identified the importance of improving the visual impression of Catford (suggestion: trees are the best way of doing this), improving pedestrian access, and improving the river surrounds.	<b>Comments noted. CLP Option 21: Design and public realm will be amended to specifically refer to the valuable green space that the 'London Squares' provide. The aim to provide attractive street trees will be referred to in the justification of the proposed submission version of the policy, alongside aims to improve the public realm overall.</b>
Mr R. Omerod	Lighting	Comment	better lighting on streets around the town centre. Other streets in Catford have had improved lighting.	<b>The Council has received funding from the Mayor of London's Outer London fund which could be used to improve lighting in the Catford Town Centre area to provide a safe well lit environment, alongside the existing joint PFI: with Croydon to improve street lighting borough wide.</b>
Francesca Barker, Natural England	Accessible natural greenspace	Comment	With regards to accessible natural greenspace, Natural England's standards (ANGSt) provides a basis to ensure new and existing housing has appropriate access to nature. More information can be found on Natural England's publication, ' <i>Nature Nearby, Accessible Greenspace Guidance</i> ' (March 2010), available on our website, publication reference NE265.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
Miss D. Leah	Greenspaces	Comment	We have some wonderful green spaces in Catford but these are not made the best of.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
A. Dunne	Allotments	Comment	Secondly, in addition to the houses being built would there be any space for initiatives such as allotments. These are at a premium in London and would be warmly welcomed I'm sure. How and when will we know if these ideas have been considered and accepted or rejected. I would hate to think that this was a fruitless exercise that didn't lead to anything.	<b>Allotments are not proposed within the town centre boundary. Allotments are a popular facility for which there is a waiting list in Lewisham.</b>
Mr P. Jones	Green link	Comment	It seems to me that there is a need to reunite Catford and its community with the landscape that has shaped it. The river guides the route for a linking of the river walk running to the south and the open areas going towards Ladywell. Both the Wickes and the old Greyhound Stadium areas provide the basis for that link. Running the two railways alongside it also provide interesting opportunities. Getting the South Circular across the link is more problematic and calls for an inspirational solution = splitting the East West, West East flows apart could provide the basis. Although this enlarges the island state, it may, nevertheless, help to harmonise the central Catford social, retail and community area.	<b>Comments noted. CLP Option 1 will be amended in the proposed submission version to state that the Council will seek specific funding and deliver improvements to the walking and cycling network, including, the Waterlink Way, links through the town centre and beyond to the adjoining neighbourhoods and the provision of cycle lanes and priority at junctions.</b>
<b>Tall buildings</b>				
Stewart Murray, GLA	Council's recommended	Comment	suggest including indicative height ranges for the three areas identified.	<b>Comments noted. The Council considers that the criteria based approach of CLP Option 22: Tall buildings, together</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
	option 22: Tall buildings		London Plan Ref: 7.7	<b>with the Tall Buildings Study evidence base document provides adequate detail regarding the approach to determining the appropriate locations and heights of tall buildings.</b>
Richard Parish, English Heritage	Policy Option 22 Tall buildings 5 c.	Comment	Be part of a varied size, scale and height of development (consider adding) <i>which makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness of Catford Town Centre</i>	<b>Comments noted. The Council will amend CLP Option 22 to reflect this comment.</b>
<b>Heritage Assets</b>				
Richard Parish, English Heritage	Policy Option 23 Heritage assets b	Comment	<i>Consider adding, developments should take the opportunity to enhance or better reveal the significance of heritage assets and their settings through sensitive and high quality design.</i>	<b>Comments noted. The Council will amend CLP Option 23 to reflect this comment.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Policy Option 23 Heritage assets	Comment	Developments including development names, new streets, etc should celebrate the heritage of Rushey Green and be sensitive to its geographical and historical significance.  Rushey Green should be the element that historical preservation activities seeks to protect.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
A. Dunne	Heritage	Comment	I would like to think that the places where the town has real character are kept. It is important to retain as much local history as possible. For example the Catford cat and the Greyhound Stadium sign are both emblems for the area, hopefully these will be kept. I would also like to think that the area can offer more than just flats and shops. The area should look toward other models for success for things that work alongside shops and housing. For example the Horniman museum is a great local museum that brings people from far and wide. We should hope to achieve a range of unique selling points to Catford beyond just shopping. A 'museum of south east London' for example or an art gallery. I think that these are things that will help Catford move forward.	<b>Comments noted. Objective 8 and CLP Option 25: Social infrastructure will be amended to strengthen the importance of social infrastructure to support the proposed levels of growth. CLP Options 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 allow for the provision of new community and civic facilities at Civic Centre, Laurence House, Plassy Road Island, Catford Greyhound Stadium and Wickes/Halfords.</b>
Richard Parish, English Heritage	Heritage	Comment	Thank you for consulting English Heritage on the London Borough of Lewisham's Draft Local Plan. As the Government's statutory adviser on the historic environment, English Heritage is keen to ensure that heritage conservation and enhancement is fully considered in all aspects of the local planning process.  Accordingly, we have reviewed this consultation in light of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which requires, as one of its core principles, that heritage assets be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations. Overall we consider the Plan to be well considered and clearly focused on the relevant local issues. We do not wish to comment in detail but offer the following comments and	<b>Comments noted.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			observations.	
Mr L. Stevens	Heritage	Comment	Please also ensure that you keep the Catford Cat as I think it cheers the place up and is a local landmark.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
<b>Sustainable Transport (see also Policy Option 1 above)</b>				
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Policy Option 24 Sustainable transport	Comment	<p>The policy should seek to support the Bakerloo line extension, noting its 1:2 cost benefit ratio as per the RUS, planning into the redevelopment the appropriate land/facilities to accommodate it in the future.</p> <p>To retain a station at Ladywell to reduce platform cram and congestion in the Catford area.</p> <p>To support the DLR extension, planning into the redevelopment the appropriate land/facilities to accommodate it in the future. Specifically favouring a subterranean/tunnelled extension from Lewisham</p>	<p><b>Comments in support of the Bakerloo line extension and the DLR extension to Catford are noted. CLP Option 1 will be amended in the proposed submission version of the Plan to refer to support, in principle, of extending Bakerloo Line and DLR through the area with a new station or stations at Catford.</b></p> <p><b>There are no plans to remove a station at Ladywell.</b></p>
<b>Social Infrastructure (see also Issues and Opportunities: Civic, Cultural and leisure Facilities)</b>				
A. Dunne	Social issues	Comment / Object	<p>In the article it states that there will be at least 800 new homes built. This seems like a dramatically large number given the strained infrastructure that the area has. The local GP's surgery that I use has between 12000 and 13000 patients. Is this going to be further strained or will there be more infrastructure to coincide with the new homes?</p>	<p><b>Comments noted. The Plan will be strengthened with additional references to social infrastructure. Objective 8 will be expanded to ensure that there is sufficient social infrastructure to support growth. CLP Option 25 recognises that growth will result in the need to provide additional social infrastructure (schools, childcare, health facilities, community facilities and leisure spaces), for the Council and developers to work alongside organisations to deliver the necessary facilities and services and to resist the redevelopment of existing social infrastructure. The justification text following CLP Option 25 will be expanded to provide greater detail regarding primary and secondary school capacities, childcare, primary health care and dentists.</b></p>
Kate Richardson, Culverley Green Residents Association	Social issues	Comment / Object	<p>Generally we welcome the objectives to improve the environment and economic prosperity of the town centre but we do have some specific concerns as follows: We are very concerned that the projected increase in town centre/edge of town population will lead to a situation where there is insufficient provision of social infrastructure to properly service all the varying needs that will arise. These include primary and secondary educational provision, a sufficient number of General Practitioners, Leisure and social facilities.</p> <p>For example the relatively recent increase in child population in the</p>	<p><b>Comments noted. The Plan will be strengthened with additional references to social infrastructure. Objective 8 will be expanded to ensure that there is sufficient social infrastructure to support growth. CLP Option 25 recognises that growth will result in the need to provide additional social infrastructure (schools, childcare, health facilities, community facilities and leisure spaces), for the Council and developers to work alongside organisations to deliver the necessary facilities and services and to resist the redevelopment of existing social infrastructure. The justification text following CLP Option 25 will be expanded</b></p>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>Catford area has already led to shortages in, and expansion of, local primary schools. These shortages of places will also feed through the system to secondary schools before long. We do not feel it is enough to say that there are enough projected primary places in the borough. The places will be needed in the Catford area and there will not be enough places as there is already a shortage, the birth rate is predicted to continue to rise in this part of the borough coupled with the obvious rise in the population with the residential units will to our mind create huge problems.</p> <p>The Local Plan is very vague on these issues and the planner at the recent Rushey Green Assembly meeting gave a less than convincing response to questions on the forward planning of these essential provisions. We would therefore like to see a greater awareness of these issues built into the future land use planning objectives for the town and local area. Local people need local services.</p>	<p><b>to provide greater detail regarding primary and secondary school capacities, childcare, primary health care and dentists.</b></p>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Social issues	Comment / Object	<p>Provision of Health services for expanding residences Provision of schools (primary &amp; secondary) for expanding residences</p>	<p><b>Comments noted. The justification text following CLP Option 25 will be expanded to provide greater detail regarding primary and secondary school capacities, childcare, primary health care and dentists.</b></p>
B. Gray	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, social infrastructure	Comment / Object	<p>There is a tension between existing facilities difficulty and lack of safety for pedestrian movement and the proposal to increase the population by an additional 3,995 people between 2011-2026 and an example of national policy not meeting local requirements. That approach is identified as the reason for the clutter and design for the A205 and A21 and should be used to mitigate against the high level of density and population growth proposed for Catford with a much lower number of high quality properties attracting a higher price and lower density.</p>	<p><b>Disagree. The Plan does not specify site densities. However, CLP Options 3(2a), 5(2d), and 6(2b and d) seek new buildings of a high design standard that take account of the scale and character of surrounding buildings, ensure that they are sympathetic to the scale and character of adjacent housing. The Sustainability Appraisal found that a restrictive supply of housing is likely to have many adverse effects for local enterprise, employment opportunities and economic growth and will have knock-on negative effect on health and well being, crime, social inclusion and reducing poverty.</b></p>
B. Gray	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, social infrastructure	Comment / Object	<p>In addition births in the borough increased by 34% in the 10 years up to 2010 demand for school places has exceeded supply since 2009/2010 and is forecast to continue with a requirement for 600+ pupils. Catchment primary schools are set to expand but will struggle to meet the demand requiring travel to other areas putting more pressure on public transport and requiring more car journeys on in an area where public transport at capacity and heavy traffic congestion. In addition detracts from well-being and health of added pressure on parents and the child having to set out earlier travel with commuter crush at the start and end of their day. There</p>	<p><b>Disagree. Objective 8 will be expanded to ensure that there is sufficient social infrastructure to support growth. CLP Option 25 recognises that growth will result in the need to provide additional social infrastructure (schools, childcare, health facilities, community facilities and leisure spaces). This will help to ensure that journeys to school are minimised.</b></p>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			are high levels of mental health issues in the area and this could add to that.	
Mr L. Stevens	2.3.2 Civic, cultural and leisure facilities, social infrastructure	Comment / Object	Any increase in the number of residential dwellings needs to be balanced out by a proportionate increase in services such as schools, healthcare and transport. It is no good building a large number of houses without increasing other service (either through the use of CIL monies or other means) as it will only serve to put increasing pressure on already overcrowded trains, buses, GP surgeries, Lewisham Hospital and local primary schools (which are already over subscribed).	<b>Disagree. The Plan will be strengthened with additional references to social infrastructure. Objective 8 will be expanded to ensure that there is sufficient social infrastructure to support growth. CLP Option 25 recognises that growth will result in the need to provide additional social infrastructure (schools, childcare, health facilities, community facilities and leisure spaces), for the Council and developers to work alongside organisations to deliver the necessary facilities and services and to resist the redevelopment of existing social infrastructure.</b>
Local Resident	Policy option 25 Social Infrastructure	Object	Recommend choosing alternative option 1.	<b>Disagree. The Sustainability Appraisal found that the alternative option 1 which restricts in the supply of housing is likely to have many adverse effects for local enterprise, employment opportunities and economic growth. A managed reduction in the supply of sufficient housing in an employment area may deter would be investors and hamper growth of the local economy and will have knock-on negative effect on health and well being, crime, social inclusion and reducing poverty.</b>
Planning prospects obo Dransfield Properties Ltd	Policy option 25 Social Infrastructure	Object	Part 2 states that in addition to paying the Community Infrastructure Levy, developers may be required, where necessary, to accommodate new facilities within their development, including the provision of appropriately designed and managed public access. Whilst this may be the case, there is no mention or linkage to viability. Developers should only be required to make a contribution if the development they are promoting is viable and therefore they are able to do so. A more realistic statement balancing economic and growth needs should be provided. The plan should be amended to present a more fair and flexible approach to developer contributions, having regard to the scale, type and, importantly, viability of development.	<b>Disagree. It is acknowledged that the scale of obligations should not threaten the viability of individual schemes and this is set out in the NPPF. The viability of different development proposals is a matter for consideration at planning application stage.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Policy option 25 Social Infrastructure	Comment / Object	That within the next year 100,000 additional children will need school places in London. This development with its proposed 1700 new dwellings plus natural increases in population size will need to start planning now to increase schooling facilities for all age groups, as bulge classes are only a temporary solution. For developments to go ahead a new school site should be identified and funding secured. 1700 new dwellings plus natural increase in population is significant. 'Monitoring' of infrastructure is not appropriate and the council should pre-emptively plan facilities to be actively included in	<b>Disagree. The identification of a new school site within the town centre is unlikely and would delay the Plan unnecessarily. The Council is actively planning to accommodate the projected increase in school places required and will work with education providers to secure necessary provision. The Plan will be strengthened with additional references to social infrastructure. Objective 8 will be expanded to ensure that there is sufficient social infrastructure to support growth. CLP Option 25 recognises</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>the process.</p> <p>Provision of community facilities within the plan should be identified and increased, there has been significant and sustained calls by residents in council forums for this.</p>	<p>that growth will result in the need to provide additional social infrastructure (schools, childcare, health facilities, community facilities and leisure spaces), for the Council and developers to work alongside organisations to deliver the necessary facilities and services and to resist the redevelopment of existing social infrastructure. The council will monitor this need and work alongside those groups and organisations that will deliver these. Appendix 3 lists committed, planned and emerging projects.</p>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Policy option 25 Social Infrastructure	Comment / Object	If we accept that the plan should include secondary developments along Rushey Green it would be desirable to decamp medical use facilities such as the methadone clinic back into the hospital footprint where possible.	<b>Disagree. This is beyond the scope of the Plan.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Policy option 25 Social Infrastructure	Comment / Object	The use of Community Infrastructure Levy (CILs)/Section 106 will be a key in funding these in the future. Residents should now be consulted as to their needs and a priority development list for using this money should be drawn up.	<b>Disagree. This is beyond the scope of the Plan. While CLP Option 25 establishes that the CIL will be used to pay for social infrastructure, further details relating to the CIL are beyond the scope of the Plan. A draft CIL will be published and consulted on in summer/autumn 2013.</b>
<b>Implementation</b>				
Planning prospects obo Dransfield Properties Ltd	Policy option 26 Implementation	Support, comment	Support part g. requiring the council to work with prospective developers in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with planning applications – in line with the NPPF. Alternative realistic options should be considered by the Council in order to fulfil the wider aspirations identified.	<b>Comments noted. The Council considers the options presented are realistic and deliverable. Appendix 3 lists committed, planned and emerging projects and identifies the responsible agency and funding sources.</b>
B. Gray	Delivery	Comment	<p>Stronger emphasis or make more obvious in Plan on what the Council is committed to do and/or will secure funding to do in addressing some of the issues identified including some recent activity to give inward investors and potential catchment area residents some confidence in the area.</p> <p>Which of the issues and opportunities will the Council be responsible for delivering in its civic capacity and community leader. This will send a clear signal and give confidence to inward investors</p> <p>Which of the issues and opportunities will the Council be in a position to commit to do in the short term, medium and long-term. This will send a clear signal and give confidence to inward investors</p>	<b>Comments noted. Appendix 3 in the plan lists the projects associated with the plan, who will be the responsible agency and funding sources identified.</b>
<b>Other</b>				
Savills (UK) Ltd obo Thames Water	Water and Wastewater	Comment	Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Thames Water) Property Services function is now being delivered by Savills (UK) Limited as Thames	<b>Comments noted.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
Utilities Ltd	Infrastructure		<p>Water's appointed supplier. Savills are therefore pleased to respond to the above consultation on behalf of Thames Water.</p> <p>Thames Water are the statutory water and sewerage undertaker for London Borough of Lewisham and are hence a "specific consultation body" in accordance with the Town &amp; Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004 (as amended in May 2008). In their role as a statutory undertaker they provide new water and wastewater infrastructure, which can include new buildings, in order to support growth and deliver environmental improvements.</p> <p>A key sustainability objective for the preparation of the Local Development Framework / Local Plan should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 156 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012, states:  <i>"Local planning authorities should set out strategic policies for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver: ... the provision of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater..."</i></p> <p>Paragraph 162 of the NPPF relates to infrastructure and states:  <i>"Local planning authorities should work with other authorities to: assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater and its treatment ... take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas."</i></p> <p>It will be essential to ensure that the introduction of a portfolio of Local Development Documents (LDDs) does not prejudice adequate planning for water and sewerage infrastructure provision as this is an essential pre-requisite for development. Water and sewerage undertakers have limited powers under the Water Industry Act to prevent connection ahead of infrastructure upgrades and therefore rely heavily on the planning system to ensure infrastructure is provided ahead of development either through phasing or the use of planning conditions.</p> <p>When carrying out the necessary early consultations with TWUL regarding the capacity of water and sewerage systems, adequate time should be allowed to consider development options and</p>	

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>proposals so that an informed response can be formulated. It is not always possible to provide detailed responses within a matter of weeks; for example, the modelling of water and sewerage infrastructure systems will be important to many consultation responses and this can take a long time to carry out (e.g. modelling of sewerage systems can be dependent on waiting for storm periods when the sewers are at peak flows).</p> <p>It is important not to underestimate the length of time required to deliver new infrastructure, for example local network upgrades can take around 18 months - 3 years to deliver, whereas more strategic infrastructure such as sewage treatment and water treatment works upgrades can take 3 - 5 years to plan for and deliver.</p>	
Savills (UK) Ltd obo Thames Water Utilities Ltd	Water and Wastewater Infrastructure	Comment / Object	<p>The coverage given to infrastructure issues in the adopted Lewisham Core Strategy is welcomed and in particular the recognition (9.8) that the Council will work with key partners including Thames Water to ensure the delivery of the Core Strategy. We note that under the CLP Policy Option 9: Providing New Homes, "Catford Town Centre will accommodate 1,750 net new dwellings for the period 2013 to 2026." Thames Water would have no objection to this level of development within Catford Town Centre, however due to the complexities of water and sewerage networks, the impact of this level of development on the capacity of existing water and waste water infrastructure networks cannot be determined at the present time. It should be anticipated however that upgrades to existing networks will be required to provide for this level of development and the need for and scale of such upgrades will be determined by the precise scale, location and phasing of the development that ultimately comes forward.</p> <p>Given that water and waste water infrastructure upgrades are likely to be necessary, it is recommended that the following text is included within the Town Centre Local Plan Document:</p> <p><i>"Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate water supply and waste water capacity both on and off site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure."</i></p>	<p><b>CLP Option 26 identifies that the Council will work with Thames Water to deliver water supply and sewerage infrastructure. The proposed text has been included within Section 6.1 sub section water supply and sewerage infrastructure. Furthermore, it states that where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the water company, then the developer needs to contact the water authority to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development.</b></p>
Savills (UK) Ltd obo Thames Water	Water and Wastewater	Support	The recognition at paragraph 5.20 that "without careful assessment, development may have the potential for short term	<p><b>Comments noted.</b></p>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
Utilities Ltd	Infrastructure		adverse impacts on the local environment through ... higher demand on water resources ...", is supported.	
Charles Muriithi, Environment Agency	Water supply	Comment	We recommend that discussions are held at an early stage with Thames Water to discuss any areas of concern or mitigation works that may be necessary in order to avoid disruption to normal water supply operations.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
S. Newton	Shopfronts and Refuse collection	Comment / Object	The refuse collection policy for the shops fronting the Broadway needs to be improved without delay. The area is an eyesore at night with piles of rubbish around the bollards and it smells. It is surely a health hazard. The shops should be forced to contain the rubbish until collection, and collection should be frequent.	<b>Disagree. This matter is beyond the scope of the Plan.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Shopfronts and Refuse collection	Comment / Object	Stronger controls and enforcement of retailers using the frontages of their premises to sell goods beyond their property boundaries should be instituted to ensure a more pleasant scene-scape etc.	<b>Development Management Policy 19 is a borough-wide policy that encourages improvements to shopfronts. CLP Option 17: Shopfronts, signs and hoardings will be amended to refer to the Development Management Policy.</b>
Charles Muriithi, Environment Agency	Soil quality, contamination	Comment/ Object	<p>In common with our previous comments on the Catford Area Action Plan, we have the following observations:</p> <p>Very little is mentioned about improving soil quality or the benefits of redeveloping brownfield land, particularly land subject to historic industrial or commercial land uses. For instance, in recent years the Environment Agency and Lewisham Environmental Health Teams have been consulted on works on sites such as former industrial laundries and the former gas works at nearby Bell Green. This shows that Catford will have a fair share of sites needing attention in terms of contamination investigations, some of which may need some remediation.</p> <p>Whilst we do not expect this document to reproduce Government Guidance on land contamination or the Lewisham Contaminated Land Strategy, we feel that this document should still recognise that brownfield regeneration and remediation of historic contamination are aspects vital to achieving sustainable development.</p>	<b>Disagree. Contamination is dealt with as a borough wide matter in Policy 28 of the Development Management Local Plan where it requires contaminated land to be fully remediated.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Name Rushey Green	Comment / Object	Finally, overall I would like to see the Catford Plan reassert the brand/identity of Rushey Green, I think it would be a more desirous way for developers to market new builds, it will help change and enhance the image of the area, and fit with the electoral name, social infrastructure and services for the Ward, and is a name that residents prefer to call this part of our town. At the recent local assembly, residents voted overwhelmingly in favour of Rushey Green becoming the predominant name for the area, and this redevelopment is a great opportunity for the area to reposition itself.	<b>Disagree. Catford is the town's long standing established name and is referred to in a range of higher level documents including Lewisham's Core Strategy and the London Plan. A change of name would cause confusion for the general public. Catford is therefore the most appropriate name to refer to in this Plan.</b>
Francesca Barker, Natural England	Sustainability Appraisal	Support	Natural England is satisfied with the conclusions reached in the Sustainability Appraisal and has no further comments to make.	<b>Comments noted.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	Sustainability Appraisal	Comment / Object	The Council should publish the risk assessments that it has undertaken to identify the impacts of this redevelopment of local residents and how it has or will plan to mitigate the negatives created by it.	<b>A Sustainability Appraisal has been prepared at each stage of the plan making process, and is made available during public consultation. It evaluates the effects of the Plan's proposals and policies against a number of sustainability objectives, assesses cumulative effects and considers ways to mitigate adverse effects.</b>
A. Dunne	Consultation	Comment	In terms of the Milford towers, the greyhound stadium and Plassy road island redevelopment this is once again something that I would like to be directly involved in shaping as I am sure many residents would. Can we hope to have direct consultation on this? I think that it is important that this is done correctly due on the rare nature of this revamp. The ideas put forward in the document seemed exciting but the exact details of appearance weren't yet available.	<b>Comments noted. There will be opportunities to comment on the soundness of the Plan at Proposed Submission Stage. There will also be opportunities to comment on planning applications for the individual sites which would contain exact details of appearance.</b>
Miss D. Leah	Consultation	Comment	There have been so many consultations over the past 10 or more years, but nothing has ever happened. When will we see any changes ?	<b>Disagree. The Plan has been drafted as a key tool to help regenerate the town centre and provides a clear steer to developers by specifying the types of development that should take place on the Major Sites, identifies transport improvements and outlines how regeneration is to be delivered. It can take a considerable time for sites to be redeveloped. The Former Greyhound Stadium has planning permission (CLP Option 6). The Council has created the Catford Regeneration Partnership Limited to progress the redevelopment of the Catford Centre (CLP Option 2) and the Council is taking steps, including entering into discussions with landowners, to progress the remainder of the sites (CLP Options 3 – 5 and 7). Section 6.1 details how the Plan will be implemented.</b>
A. Dunne	Consultation	Comment	I am writing in response to the recent article in the news shopper 'radical revamp of town'. There are a few points that I would like to put forward regarding this. I recently read your online consultation document on the consultation portal (although not back to back). There were some really interesting points that I found exciting. Clearly a lot of time and research has gone into the document. I was depressed by the lack of response from the document from readers. I didn't see one comment that had been left. Are residents being consulted in other ways?	<b>The public were consulted on the Further Options version of the Plan using a variety of methods and responses were received online, via email and letters and verbal comments made during consultation events. The Consultation Report, which accompanies the Plan during public consultation provides further details.</b>
A. Dunne	Consultation	Comment	Hopefully I can be assured that this email will be heard and that I will have the opportunity to be consulted?	<b>People who responded to the Plan and who are on the consultation database will be notified at each stage in the plan making process. There will be opportunities to comment on the soundness of the Proposed Submission version of the Plan.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
B. Gray	Consultation	Comment	Consultation should be across the Town Centre catchment area as outlined in the plan as over 90% of them don't use the town centre and they are the key to its future success. A different approach is needed to engage these people in the development of the plan and the ongoing dialogue and incremental changes in the area to encourage them to come to Catford.	<b>Disagree. Section 1.4 describes how local people and stakeholders have been consulted on the Plan, in line with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). This will be updated in the proposed submission version of the Plan. The Consultation Report provides further details.</b>
Local Resident	General	Support	I agree with almost all the other recommendations and policy options, I just haven't written that down as it has taken rather a long time to read through the report in detail and provide a consultation response. Thanks for the invitation though, and I'm really glad to see the council is so ready to improve Catford. Please bear in mind that request for more trees and less (/no) building on Catford Dog Track.	<b>Comments in support are noted.</b>
S. Newton	General	Support	The Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013 is a very comprehensive document, and I am only able to comment in general terms. Most of what is proposed is excellent will make a welcome improvement to the whole area.	<b>Comments in support are noted.</b>
Francesca Barker, Natural England	General	Support	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 25 February 2013. Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England does not consider that this Town Centre Local Plan Further Options paper poses any likely or significant risk to those features of the natural environment for which we would otherwise make further comment.</p>	<b>Comments in support are noted.</b>
James Walsh, Rushey Green Residents Association	General	Support	I write to you as Chair of the Rushey Green Residents Association, a private resident whom both lives and works in the area, and as a local community leader involved in several Rushey Green community projects. Broadly speaking it is a welcome decision for the Council to make an undertaking to significantly redevelopment Catford Civic Centre and surrounds, and that confidence can be taken that the first draft represents the direction of travel for the development of amenities and infrastructure that would be broadly supported.	<b>Comments in support are noted.</b>
S. Duncan	General	Support	Overall, this is very exciting and the plans look well thought out. As a local resident, I feel strongly that this kind of strategic thinking is needed.	<b>Comments in support are noted.</b>
Col. N. Wallace St Dunstan's College	General	Support / Comment	I write on behalf of St Dunstan's College with comments on the proposals set out in the above document. As you are aware the school is located just to the west of the area designated as being	<b>Comments in support are noted.</b>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			<p>within Catford Town Centre in the document. The school has 833 pupils aged between 3 and 18 and 180 staff, many of whom are either borough residents or travel through Catford every school day. St Dunstan's is thus a significant local facility and employer but also has a strong interest in the success of Catford as a place and its future improvement, development and regeneration. Therefore in principle the school supports the Council's objectives and aspirations set out in the Future Options document and would welcome to opportunity to work with officers in progressing the details of the options for the major sites and policy and to help where possible to secure their delivery.</p>	
B. Gray	General	Comment / Object	<p>My comments though comprehensive as the plan is extensive, make some assumptions as it has not been possible to get through the whole plan the retail study and sustainability appraisal in the time I had – they are so hard to read even for someone with some experience of them.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The structure of the Plan could start with the Vision (currently page 44), issues and opportunities, key development sites (delivering the solutions and opportunities), building a sustainable community, recent changes to enable progress, followed by the rest.</li> <li>2. The vision should be visionary – ideally written by a comms or creative person that can conjure up a picture of the buildings, layout, and general feel of the place with sense of Catford the Place its environment its offer and feel.</li> <li>3. Overall a simpler consultation document that told the story of the improvements to the town centre in everyday terms would make easier to access the information and give comments. The structure and language is too wieldy, repetitive in places which adds to the confusion.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Disagree. There are legal requirements regarding the content of the Plan. The Vision is a succinct statement that outlines the type of place Catford will be in 2026 and will be updated following the Further Options consultation. The Plan has been restructured and streamlined and is now divided into 5 sections: Context, Vision and Objectives, Key Development Sites, Area Wide Policies and Implementation Monitoring and Risk and this has reduced repetition within the Plan.</b></p>
Stewart Murray, GLA	General	Comment	<p>Thank you for consulting the Mayor of London on the further options stage of Lewisham Council's DPD document. As you are aware, all development plan documents have to be in general conformity with the London Plan under section 24 (1)(b) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, all development plan documents must be general conformity with London Plan. The Mayor has delegated authority to me to respond. There is general support for all draft policies and further representations and specific comments are attached Appendix A. In addition, general comments are also contained from TfL, also attached in Appendix A. The Mayor will issue his formal opinion on general conformity</p>	<p><b>Comments noted.</b></p>

Full Name	Part of the Catford Town Centre Local Plan Further Options 2013	Supporting, objecting or making a general comment.	Comment received	Officer Response
			when requested at the pre-submission stage. However, I hope that the policy concerns I have raised at the current stage can be resolved before then, through further informal discussions with Council officers. My colleague Lucy Bird will contact you shortly to arrange a meeting.	
A. Dunne	General	Comment	As a local resident this will have a big direct impact on me, my daily life and my home. I really feel the residents of Catford should hope for big things in the revamp. London seems to be moving on without Catford and I cannot help but feel that the area is neglected. This really is an opportunity for the area to take a step forward. I realise that some of these ideas may seem fanciful, however I feel Catford needs to think big in order to have a valuable radical revamp.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
E. Weidman	General	Comment	Thank you for the opportunity to voice our comments on how to improve Catford. As house owners and shoppers in the area we are keen for improvements to occur. We love Catford but how can we make others feel the same...! I think this is a key way to approach this.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
Miss D. Leah	General	Comment	I can confirm that the MMO has no comments on this document as the geographical area it covers does not include any area of the sea or tidal river and is therefore not within our remit.	<b>Comments noted.</b>
B. Gray	General	Comment / Object	There is some conflict between stated issues, findings and recommendations from the retail and housing studies and proposed improvements so I have some concern that the proposed changes will deliver the solutions.	<b>Disagree. The Plan has been prepared taking into account a range of evidence base documents.</b>