LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHALA
PLANNING SERVICE

DATE REC'D

1 9 MAR 2012



For official use only

# London Borough of Lewisham Republic Rep

## **Site Allocations**

Development Plan Document (DPD)

Proposed Submission Stage Representation Form

Please return your completed form to the London Borough of Lewisham by 5pm Monday 23 April 2012

By post to
 Planning Service
 London Borough of Lewisham
 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Laurence House
 1 Catford Road
 London SE6 4RU

or

By e-mail to planning.policy@lewisham.gov.uk

You may also make your representation online without the need to use this form.

Online at <a href="http://lewisham-consult.objective.co.uk/portal">http://lewisham-consult.objective.co.uk/portal</a>

For further information, or to request extra representation forms please phone 020 8314 7400 or e-mail planning.policy@lewisham.gov.uk.

This form has two parts
Part A – Personal Details
Part B – Your representation(s).

Please fill in a separate sheet (Part B) for each representation you wish to make.

### Part A

#### 1. Personal Details\*

\*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.

Title	Miss	
First Name	LUCY	
Last Name	owen	
Job Title (where relevant)	PLANNING OFFICER	
Organisation (where relevant)	PORT OF CONDON ANTHORITY	
Address Line 1	LONDON RIVER HOUSE	
Line 2	ROYAL PIER ROAD	
Line 3	GRAVESEND	
Line 4	KENT	
Post Code	DA12 286	
Telephone Number	01474 562384	
E-mail Address (where relevant)	Lucy. Owen apla.co. d	4

2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

#### Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation: 3. To which part of the Site Allocations DPD does this representation relate? SITE REF: Proposals Map\_SA 10 Paragraph Policy\_\_\_ 4. Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is: Yes □ No □ 4.(1) Legally compliant Yes □ No 🗹 4.(2) Sound\* \*The considerations in relation to the DPD being 'Sound' are explained in the notes which accompany this form If you have entered No to 4.(2), please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances, please go to Q6. 5. Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is unsound because it is not: 1 (1) Justified (2) Effective (3) Consistent with national policy

6. Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

IT IS NOTED THAT THE PROPOSED ALLOCATION INCLUDES HOUSING AND THAT THE SITE CHARACTERISTICS SECTION OF THE DOCUMENT PROMINITY OF THE SAFEGUARDED IDENTIFIES BE NECESSARY FOR AND DEVELOPMENT WILL DESIGNED TO MINIMISE ON SITE SAIO IN LINE WITH CONSON AND DISTURBANCE UJ€ SHOULD 8€ REFLECTED IN THE THIS 7.26 -AUGGATION SITE

IT NEEDS TO BE MADE CLEAR WHAT IS MEANT BY CREATING WATERSIDE ACCESS AND IMPROVING THE CREEKS ENVIRONMENT AND WALLS, IT IS NOT CONSIDERED TO REFER TO THE RINERSIDE PATH AS THIS IS THE NEXT BULLET POINT IN THE DOCUMENT, IT NEEDS TO BE REMEMBERED

THAT THERE IS A PUBLIC RIGHT TO NAVIGATE AND ANY ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS SHOULD BE DESIGNED WITH THIS IN MIND

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at point 5 above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) 7.26 OF THE LONDON REFERENCE TO POLICY INCLUDE DEVELOPHENT TO BE FOR PLAN AND of USE AND TO MINIMISE CONFLICTS DESIGNED SAFEGUARDED BREWERY WHARF DISTURBANCE CLEAR WHAT WATERSIDE ACCESS TO BE MADE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS ARE PROPOSED AND REFLECT PUBLIC RIGHT THE NEED NAVIGATE Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at this stage. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination. 8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? Topodo. **No**, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination 9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary: Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation: 3. To which part of the Site Allocations DPD does this representation relate? SITE REP : Preposals Map 57 " Paragraph \_\_\_\_\_ Policy\_\_\_ 4. Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is: Yes □ No □ 4.(1) Legally compliant Yes □ No 🗹 4.(2) Sound\* \*The considerations in relation to the DPD being 'Sound' are explained in the notes which accompany this form If you have entered **No** to 4.(2), please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances, please go to Q6. 5. Do you consider the Site Allocations DPD is **unsound** because it is not: 100 (1) Justified (2) Effective (3) Consistent with national policy 6. Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) IT IS NOTED THAT THE PROPOSED ALLOCATION INCLUDES HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS SECTION OF THE DOCUMENT THE SITE THE PROXIMITY OF THE SAFEGUARDES BREWERY WHARF. IDENTIFIES THEREFORE BE MECESSARY FOR ANY DEVELOPMENT ON DESIGNED TO HINIMUSE THE POTENTIAL SAI of use AND DISTURBANCE IN LIKE WITH FOR CONFUCTS LONDON PLAN POLICY 7.26, THIS SHOULD BE REPLECTED IN THE SITE ALLOCATION. WHATO THE BEZIEVE CERTS OF

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at point 5 above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) REFERENCE TO POLICY 7.26 COMMONI INCLUDE NEED THE DEUELOPMENT THE CONFLICTS OF USE MINIMISE DESIGNED SAFEGUARDOD THE BREWERT WHARF DISTURBANCE Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at this stage. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination. 8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination 9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary: Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature:

Date: 16/05/2012