

**From:** Nick Hill [nick@nickhill.co.uk]

**Sent:** 31 March 2010 21:29

**To:** planning policy

**Cc:** Gerald Dove; John Grosvenor

**Subject:** Core strategy proposed document Defining whether the local character is enhanced and responds to site constraints

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up

**Flag Status:** Completed

Through the document (for example, pg 70 SP5 subheading Southend Village, Bromley Road) the term "enhances the local character and responds to site constraints" is used.

There have been many examples in the borough where the views of residents have differed substantially from the borough planners whether a proposed development enhances the character and responds to site constraints. A good example of this is the Tiger's Head and What! site. Buildings which local residents consider eyesores and totally out of scale with the area were imposed on them.

For the purposes of this document, who will be the arbiter of whether a particular development does in fact enhance the local character and responds to site constraints?

How, if at all, will the needs existing local residents be safeguarded and their views accomodated?

Yours sincerely

Nicholas Hill

67 Birkhall Road  
Catford  
London  
SE6 1TF

**From:** Nick Hill [nick@nickhill.co.uk]  
**Sent:** 31 March 2010 21:49  
**To:** planning policy  
**Cc:** Gerald Dove; John Grosvenor  
**Subject:** Core strategy proposed submission policy 14 / 5

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up

**Flag Status:** Completed

Dear Sir/Madam

Regarding Core Strategy policy 14, Sustainable movement and transport.

Lewisham is a diverse borough, with marked differences in transport opportunities in different areas of the borough. From one extreme, Doggett Road being right next to two train stations and several major bus routes, to the other end, the middle of Catford south and Whitefoot, being 20 or so minutes walk from the nearest train station, serviced by a single local bus route.

I don't believe your core planning strategy encompasses the diversity of Lewisham. In the sub-urban areas of the borough, there is no option than to use private motor vehicle transport. Choking the opportunities of people in the south of the borough could not be considered a way to cater for the needs of the borough's residents.

A car-free status for new development is often simply not a sustainable policy. The core strategy section 4 seems to indicate a widespread or even a universal policy of controlled parking zones accross the borough. Such a policy is just not sustainable. The distribution of areas which may be subject to CPZs needs to be narrowed down to particular areas where such a policy may be appropriate for local residents i.e. right next to a train station, and only with the approval of the local residents most affected by such plans - in other words, motorists, many of whom may be elderly, disabled, businessmen for whom public transport is not a viable alternative. Creating CPZs restricts the access to those areas for businessmen and tradesmen, and incurs substantial additional costs for residents in those areas.

Yours sincerely

Nicholas Hill  
Gerald Dove (Chair, Southend Village Action Group)

**From:** Nick Hill [nick@nickhill.co.uk]  
**Sent:** 31 March 2010 20:57  
**To:** planning policy  
**Subject:** Proposals map 2.7 Bromley Road SSL

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up

**Flag Status:** Completed

Dear Sir/Madam

In relation to the map of the Bromley Road Strategic Industrial Location.

I notice that existing industrial locations of the Carpet Right store, Comet, Harveys and Curry's on Bromley Road are not included in the industrial area covered by the map.

I would like to suggest this is an oversight. If not, then what is the proposed designation for the areas covered by the stores?

Could you also please provide a definition for the term "Strategic industrial location", and what types of development or action by the council is it supposed to signify?

Yours sincerely

Nicholas Hill

**From:** Nick Hill [nick@nickhill.co.uk]  
**Sent:** 31 March 2010 22:35  
**To:** planning policy  
**Cc:** Gerald Dove; John Grosvenor  
**Subject:** Proposed core strategy policy 14 changes

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up

**Flag Status:** Completed

Given the lack of consultation and acute shortage of notice (1 week) and vast amount of documentation in connection with this core strategy document, we (SVAG) comprising of working residents can only hope to scratch the surface of the concerns surrounding this document.

Page 110 Core Strategy Policy 14 paragraph 4 should be re-worded thus:

4. Given that all developments should be accessible to the disabled, elderly and infirm, it is unreasonable to designate developments as car-free. Any development's transport needs should be considered with the needs of existing residents in the area such that the new residents will not be in competition with existing residents for parking spaces. The scale of a building and size of development should be limited with this in mind, with adequate parking provision on-site.

I would like to request the following point be added to Core Strategy policy 14:

9. Roads provide a vital lifeline for all residents. Lewisham's roadways must be designed to enable ambulances to take critically ill patients to hospital quickly and smoothly. Any changes to Lewisham's roadways need to be made with consideration for emergency vehicles and patients. Consideration must also be made for the ill, elderly and infirm, who are particularly disadvantaged by uneven, potholed or humped road surfaces, whether in ambulances, buses, borough transport or in private motor vehicles.

Yours Sincerely

Nicholas Hill

Gerald Dove (Chair, Southend Village Action Group).

**From:** Nick Hill [nick@nickhill.co.uk]

**Sent:** 31 March 2010 21:12

**To:** planning policy

**Subject:** Core strategy proposed submission spatial policy 1 section 2d

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up

**Flag Status:** Completed

Dear Sir/Madam

In relation to the large purple oval covering a swathe of the south of the borough with mixed use, socio-economic, and parkland.

I would like to understand the significance of the proposals for the area.

I have looked at spatial policies and in particular Spatial policy 1 section 2d to find an answer to this, but haven't been able to determine any meaning for this purple area. The paragraph d relates to the remainder of the borough, then specifically relates to the purple area. If that purple area were not on the map at all, it would still be part of the remainder of the borough, so what is the significance of the area in relation to planning policy? If there is no differing policy for the area, then why show it on the map at all?

Yours sincerely

Nicholas Hill

67 Birkhall Road

Catford

London

SE6 1TF

**From:** Nick Hill [nick@nickhill.co.uk]

**Sent:** 02 April 2010 09:58

**To:** planning policy

**Cc:** Gerald Dove; John Grosvenor

**Subject:** Re: Core strategy proposed submission spatial policy 1 section 2d

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up

**Flag Status:** Completed

Dear Matt

Thank you for clarifying this point.

Regarding Pg 70 SP5 para 2 of proposed core strategy.

Says:

Provides a coherent approach

Improves legibility

Enhances the local character

Responds to site constraints.

I have discussed this with Gerald Dove of the Southend Village Action Group, particularly interested in the area right in the middle of the pink zone. We have been to planning meetings and appeals. We realise the need to be very specific about about the meanings of the wording. If the wording isn't tightly defined, developers may spin the wording to suit themselves.

Deprivation - Local residents have fought strongly to maintain the traditional look and feel of the area, by maintaining the brewer's tudor styling at the site of the green man, and the traditional styling of the Tiger's head. Local residents feel deprived. If you ask them what they feel most deprived of, it is not of adequate housing, food or heating. It is deprivation of genuine consideration of their wishes by the planning system as a whole. They feel deprived of democracy. - Deprivation of having their wishes enacted.

I would like to suggest the following:

Provides a coherent approach -> Provides a coherent approach to preserving and developing the suburban nature of the area.

"Improves legibility"- doesn't seem to mean anything. Please delete that.

"Enhances the local character" -> Enhances and complements the character of traditional buildings in the area.

"Responds to site constraints" Responds to site constraints in the context of the express desire of residents to maintain their area as classically suburban.

It is also important to ensure the area on the map is linked with these provisions in a manner which will prevent any misunderstandings.

Kind Regards

Nicholas Hill  
CC'd Gerald Dove, Chairman, SVAG  
CC'd John Grosvenor, Secretary, SVAG

On Thu, Apr 1, 2010 at 12:17 PM, planning policy <[planning.policy@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@lewisham.gov.uk)> wrote:

Nicholas

Thank you for your comments on the Core Strategy.

The purple area of the map (page 41) responds to Members concerns that while the Core Strategy dealt with the northern part of the borough in detail there needed to be mention of the issues that needed to be addressed in the south, with a focus on the Bellingham, Whitefoot and Downham wards which are amongst the most deprived in the borough. The issues centre around the need to improve health, employment/training and housing for residents to name a few. Specific reference is included within paragraph 4.17 and page 70.

I hope this clarifies the points you have raised.

Regards

Matt Jericho

Principal Planning Policy Officer

Planning Service, Regeneration Directorate

London Borough of Lewisham

5th Floor, Laurence House

1 Catford Road, SE6 5RU

Ph: 020 8314 6540

**From:** Nick Hill [mailto:[nick@nickhill.co.uk](mailto:nick@nickhill.co.uk)]

**Sent:** 31 March 2010 21:12

**To:** planning policy

**Subject:** Core strategy proposed submission spatial policy 1 section 2d

Dear Sir/Madam

In relation to the large purple oval covering a swathe of the south of the borough with mixed use, socio-economic, and parkland.

I would like to understand the significance of the proposals for the area.

I have looked at spatial policies and in particular Spatial policy 1 section 2d to find an answer to this, but haven't been able to determine any meaning for this purple area. The paragraph d relates to the remainder of the borough, then specifically relates to the purple area. If that purple area were not on the map at all, it would still be part of the remainder of the borough, so what is the significance of the area in relation to planning policy? If there is no differing policy for the area, then why show it on the map at all?

Yours sincerely

Nicholas Hill

67 Birkhall Road  
Catford  
London  
SE6 1TF

## DISCLAIMER

This message is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity it is addressed to. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the e-mail. Please note that we may monitor and check emails to safeguard the Council network from viruses, hoax messages or other abuse of the Council's systems. To see the full version of this disclaimer please visit the following address: <http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/AboutThisSite/EmailDisclaimer.htm>

For advice and assistance about online security and protection from internet threats visit the "Get Safe Online" website at <http://www.getsafeonline.org>

