

Representation Database

Objector Reference	Rep-resentation Reference	Reasons	Changes	Officer Comments
2346	5882	<p>Conrad Phoenix generally supports the overall objectives of the SPG to create a high quality urban environment to act as a new focus for community and commercial activity for the Rotherhithe Peninsula. However, since the proposals for the redevelopment of this area remain at an embryonic stage we do not believe that an SPG just be overly prescriptive but should establish a broad policy framework within which more detailed proposals can be brought forward.</p>		<p>Accept in part. The SPG strikes a balance between providing planning guidance for development in the Canada Water Action Area, and providing flexibility for more detailed individual proposals to be brought forward.</p>

Representation Database

2346	5883	<p>Figure 2 depicting preferred land uses actually shows existing land uses. The SPG does not contain an plan showing preferred land uses although Section 3 deals with key development sites. Para 3.1.3 refers to sites C,D and E and states that they provide an opportunity for redevelopment in that considerably more efficient use could be made of these sites. We concur with this statement. However, the paragraph continues by simply setting out the planning consents which have been granted (or resolved to be granted) on sites D and E. In view of the overall aims of the area we believe that it should be made clear in the SPG that these sites (including site C) are suitable for a variety of uses including residential, commercial, retail and community uses, and that on Site E, in particular, residential use is acceptable. This would also accord with the policies contained within the adopted Southwark UDP.</p>		<p>Accept. Figure 2 - Land Use Map has been replaced by a Key Diagram (Figure 2) which shows preferred urban design structural elements. Section 8 of the revised SPG provides additional planning guidance for the key development sites (including C, D and E). This outlines the expected uses of the sites.</p>
2346	5884	<p>Final sentence of 2.4.2 suggests that the existing commercial accommodation should be maintained which could hinder the development of considerable office development.</p>	<p>Remove the last sentence in 2.4.2.</p>	<p>Accept. Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the revised SPG discuss the need to both protect employment use and also provide scope for additional office and commercial floor space in the Canada Water Action Area. Redevelopment of existing commercial accommodation is acceptable provided that the employment use is protected on the site.</p>

Representation Database

2346	5885	Para 2.5.1 deals with the form of the new retail development and requires a more traditional street form rather than an indoor shopping centre scheme. We feel that it is premature at this stage to be prescriptive on the form of the new retail development which is largely a matter for the detailed design stage.		The revised SPG maintains that there are key structural elements which need to be adhered to in the Canada Water Action Area in order to create a vibrant and sustainable town centre. Retail development should be designed to integrate with the surrounding streets with active uses externalised to the street frontage. Internalised shopping centres and retail sheds will not be supported.
2346	5886	Paragraph 2.6.5 sets out the Council's requirement for affordable housing in schemes of over 14 units or 1000 square metres. However, paragraph 2.6.6 goes on to state that schemes should also have an element of intermediate affordable housing. As currently worded this appears to be a requirement.	We believe that the final sentence of this paragraph should be reworded to read: 'Developments should, wherever possible, also include an element of intermediate housing such as shared ownership housing and housing for key workers.'	The split between forms of tenure of affordable housing is a requirement. This has been clarified in the revised SPG.
2346	5887	Two options are shown for the route of the north/south spine connecting, inter alia, Canada Water Station and Surrey Quays Station. While we recognise that these routes are only indicative our preference is for Option A since this would ensure that the maximum use is made of Canada Water dock basin which will form a focus to the redevelopment of the area.		Note.

Representation Database

2346	5888	<p>Paragraph 2.9.11 states that:</p> <p>"All buildings on the primary street network must contribute to the interest and vitality of the street through 'live frontages'. This includes shopfronts on buildings capable of accommodating ground floor uses such as shops, studios and restaurants."</p> <p>While we agree with the objective of creating interesting street scenes we have two concerns with the above statement. First, the primary street network is not defined in the SPG and second Surrey Quays is identified as a town centre in both the SPS and UDP. The inclusion of shops (and leisure uses) away from the primary retail area would be contrary to policy and moreover given the close proximity of the shopping centre such shops are unlikely to be successful. This in turn could result in a dead frontage rather than the live frontage the SPG seeks to achieve.</p>	<p>We believe that the above paragraph should be removed from the SPG and that this matter should more properly be dealt with at the detailed design stage once the overall framework for the development has been established.</p>	<p>Accept in part. The revised SPG requires that all buildings which front a street have an active frontage which is intended to avoid the use of blank walls. However, areas of retail, food, drink, civic and leisure uses are required to have lively internal uses visible at street level. The key active frontages are illustrated in Figure 2 - Key Diagram.</p>
------	------	--	---	---

Representation Database

2151	5889	Objection is made as proposals are too prescriptive in 2.9.3 and 2.9.4. Flexibility should be allowed. It is too rigid to fix a north/south spine and to state that a continuous main street extending lower road shopping up to Canada Water is required.	To exclude reference to a north/south spine. Allow flexibility to design.	Accept in part. The north/ south spine is a key pedestrian and cycle route which is essential for accessibility and permeability within Canada Water Action Area. However, the location is indicative only and a precise location will be determined as part of development applications. The revised SPG does not prescribe how roads should be realigned, but does recognise the need to ensure better linkages between Lower Road shopping area and Canada Water.
2151	5890	Objecting to reference to development brief as confusing and unclear as to what this document is and if it forms part of the SPG. Also for the same reasons, objecting to reference to 'preferred development partner' and 'masterplan'. Too prescriptive.	To remove reference to the 'development brief', 'preferred development partner' and 'masterplan' or clarify their status.	Accept. These references have been removed from revised SPG.
2151	5891	The parking standards are not consistent with current government guidance contained within PPG 13. This could therefore, frustrate/ deter beneficial proposed retail development. Any large retail led mixed use development would necessitate parking in excess of the guidelines set out in Appendix 5 of the draft Southwark Plan (2002).	To be consistent with current government guidance contained within PPG13. Redevelopment for retail led mixed use purposes should be treated on its planning merits with respect to car parking standards.	The parking standards referred to in Section 5.6 of the revised SPG are consistent with the London Plan standards. In addition, the SPG encourages reduced car usage in favour of public transport due to the good public transport accessibility enjoyed within the Canada Water Action Area.
2151	5892	We support Canada Water's Action Area status, where 'significant change is expected in the coming years.'		Note.

Representation Database

2151	5893	The spine is too prescriptive.	Remove figures or allow flexibility/ amend plan.	Accept in part. The north/ south spine is a key pedestrian and cycle route which is essential for accessibility and permeability within Canada Water Action Area. However, the location is indicative only and a precise location will be determined as part of development applications.
2151	5894	Objection is made as Figure 2 sets out the SPG boundary. However, the proposed north/south spine extends beyond this boundary (in Fig 2). Confusing and inconsistent.	Remove Figures 3 and 4 or reduce to keep within the proposed boundary . Clarify.	The key pedestrian and cycle routes are intended to improve access within the Canada Water Action Area and to create links with other areas and accessways outside of the Action Area, particularly with areas of open space or existing accessways.
2151	5895	The design guidelines are too prescriptive and inflexible. Reference in 2.9.7 to the 'masterplan' is confusing and inappropriate.	To allow greater flexibility, delete reference to 'masterplan'.	Accept. The reference to 'masterplan' has been deleted.
2233	5897	Strongly support creation of traditional street form and revitalisation of existing shops in Lower Road and Albion Street.		Note.
2355	5913	The owners support the reference in paragraph 3.1.5 that effectively allocates the Leisure Park within the District Centre. The shopping centre on its own would not provide the full range of town centre uses set out in the PPG6. This would be achieved by including the Leisure Park within the District Centre and as such, Surrey Quays Leisure Park fully support the UDP designations.		Note.

Representation Database

2355	5924	Surrey Quays Leisure Park welcomes the designation of the area as a District Centre within both the 1st deposit Draft of the Southwark UDP and the draft London Plan.		Note.
2355	5934	Currently, the site cannot achieve a high public transport modal split because the public transport interchange is too far away. If the bus station were to be relocated to the centre of the Action Area, a higher modal split would be more achievable and would increase pedestrian connectivity between the shopping centre and the Leisure Park. Only then, would the dependence upon the private car be addressed and opportunities for sustainable travel be maximised.		The revised SPG recognises that the bus routing within the town centre needs to be improved. Changes to the transport network will need to be addressed as part of an overall review of public transport accessibility in Canada Water in consultation with Transport for London.
2361	5952		Creation of Canada Water as a District Centre (on substantially less scale of development than the Elephant and Castle and London Bridge City).	Accept. Canada Water is a District Centre which is consistent with the London Plan's hierarchy of town centres.
2361	5954		Adherence to the London Plan concepts of housing densities in Rotherhithe and the peninsula that is suburban category 2/3. A limit should be set on the number of new units and residents permitted.	Accept.
2361	5956		All new housing built in the Rotherhithe Peninsula to be affordable housing to rent.	Section 4.4 of the revised SPG states that 50% of all new housing in the Canada Water Action Area should be affordable housing. Of this new housing, 70% should be social rented while the remaining 30% may be for intermediate forms of tenure.

Representation Database

2361	5958		All new building development in the Rotherhithe Peninsula to be energy efficient and environmentally sustainable.	Accept.
2361	5962		There is no mention of school, health and other social and community provision. Any residential developments must include these provisions. Even the current provision needs to be addressed by any development plan for the area.	Accept. Section 4.5 of the revised SPG discusses the need for community facilities in the Canada Water Action Area. The adverse effects of developments that cannot be addressed by planning conditions may be required to provide a contribution secured via a planning obligation. Section 9.0 of the revised SPG includes social, economic, cultural and leisure related facilities as priorities for Canada Water.
2361	5963		<p>The area now has excellent public transport provision. I am concerned that road-building schemes such as the proposed spine road will put the focus back on private cars/ I also do not think the Canada Water Basin should be surrounded by roads on all sides and for these reasons I reject the spine road proposal.</p> <p>In stead of a spine road connecting Canada Water to Rotherhithe Village I would like to see improved walking and cycling paths incorporating the current Albatross Way.</p>	Accept. The north/south spine is intended to be used for pedestrian and cycle access primarily. It is not intended to allow the Canada Water Basin to be surrounded by roads.

Representation Database

2361	5965		Retention of existing protections under the 1906 Public Open Spaces Act for all public open space [on the Rotherhithe Peninsula].	The designation of Open Spaces as Borough Open Land does not alter the status of any Open Space created under the 1906 Public Open Spaces Act as they operate under separate pieces of legislation.
2361	5966	The current draft plan primarily focuses on shopping provision and seems to be geared towards making the area a more shopping-oriented part of South London. This is not simply a matter of local provision but raises important questions about social and transport infrastructure. More car traffic to Rotherhithe is not desirable or possible with the recent increase in the use of the Tunnel. There should also be careful investigation of the capacity of the underground to bring shoppers from all over South and East London. The potential demand for more shopping provision should be considered in the light of the experience of Lewisham town centre which is also accessible from gentrified areas in South and East London.		Accept in part. The revised SPG is not primarily focussed on shopping provision, but on encouraging a mixed use centre with improved retail provision. The SPG encourages reduced use of carparking in favour of other forms of sustainable transport.
2390	6223	We are concerned that much of the emphasis and detail of the policies are included within the SPG and are not contained within the plan itself. We understand that the plan holds significantly more weight than the SPG and therefore feel that more of this detail should be included in the plan itself.		All policies stated in the SPG are referenced from the UDP (both the adopted 1995 UDP and the second draft 2004 UDP) and/or from the London Plan. Section 9.4 of the second draft UDP (2004) has been revised to include more detail on the Canada Water Action Area.
2390	6224	Any improvements to interchanges should include provision for disabled access.		Accept.

Representation Database

2391	6226	<p>I want to know why a road running from the river to Surrey Quays station does anything to facilitate peninsula links. Basically the Rotherhithe Peninsula runs SW to SE. Where would through traffic run ? If still on Lower Road there would be no integration of the shops there. You should remember that the Rotherhithe Peninsula is a Dormitory for inner London. We don't want more than local shopping here. If you mean that you want to integrate poorer and richer communities why don't you say so? The car parking is fine as it exists.</p>		<p>The revised SPG encourages improvements to traffic congestion within the Canada Water Action Area but does not specify the exact routes that new roads should take. The north/ south spine is a pedestrian and cycle access. The SPG also encourages a reduction in car usage in favour of public transport.</p>
2392	6227	<p>I think the Council needs to update its profile records on Canada Water and Rotherhithe. Majority of people own properties or rent privately. Are working professionals Not just along Riverside but at Canada Water and around the station etc. I cannot see how Rotherhithe can be considered a 'deprived area'. We need more facilities like food shopping, libraries, offices, secondary schools, more health care/ GP surgery NOT more housing around Canada Water.</p>	<p>The Planning and Policy department should update their demographic data for Canada Water</p>	<p>Accept. The demographic data has been updated.</p>
2393	6228	<p>The SPG seeks to include the Canada Water area with other Action Areas identified in the draft London Plan.</p>	<p>Locally determined development areas should not be confused with areas designated in the London Plan and as such should be designated 'Borough Action Areas.'</p>	<p>The London Plan requires LPAs to identify where changes are expected in the coming years to work towards meeting London's strategic objectives. The second draft UDP (2004) and Canada Water SPG are consistent with this approach.</p>

Representation Database

2393	6229	While the Canada Water Consultative Forum has spent time formulating a Master Developer Brief for sites around Canada Water tube station, the SPG covers some of these sites but excludes the other non-residential sites. This is a mis-match and either the SPG should include all the commercial, leisure and non-residential sites in the area or focus on the sites that have been considered by the Consultative Forum and included in the Master Developer Brief.	The current industrial sites provide a source of local employment and should remain designated as industrial sites.	The SPG encourages the protection of employment uses on existing industrial sites. However, mixed uses are also encouraged on some sites where appropriate.
2393	6230	The paragraph 2.9.9 sets out proposed building heights ranging from 6-12 storeys on Surrey Quays Road. However, 12 storeys would be out of keeping with those current buildings located on Surrey Quays Road which rise to 9 storeys at key points.	Therefore, maximum heights should be 9 storeys.	The revised SPG does not specify building heights. It provides guidance on heights of buildings based on the site's public transport accessibility, proposed design and site specific assessment of the site's location and surrounds.
2393	6231	Considerable discussion has taken place about the accessibility of public transport, which has a direct effect on building densities. Proposals advanced by the Council place the whole of Canada Water in the highest PTAL band, however from the details of PTALs in the London Plan the Canada Water is in a lower category that would indicate a substantially lower density level.		The Canada Water Action Area is designated as a Public Transport Accessibility Zone in the second draft deposit UDP. Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTALs) as determined by Transport for London (TFL) vary within the Canada Water Action Area. The revised SPG clarifies that while densities may be increased above Urban Zone densities in a PTAZ, the actual building density will be determined on a site by site basis, taking PTALs into account.

Representation Database

2393	6232	The SPG outlines the designation of Canada Water, Albion Channel and part of Albatross Way as Borough Open Land. However, Canada Water, Albion Channel and all walkways were transferred to Southwark as Public Open Space under 1906 Act and as such are held in trust and should remain designated as Public Open Space, which places maximum safeguards on the land.		The designation of Open Spaces as Borough Open Land does not alter the status of any Open Space created under the 1906 Public Open Spaces Act as they operate under separate pieces of legislation.
2233	6233	The map is useless as a means of identifying the extent of the Action Area. I had to walk the area in order to clarify the boundaries.	Do the map again, naming key streets and features (e.g. leisure park, shopping centre, car park, waste ground) and deleting redundant items from the legend.	Accept. The revised SPG includes a new map which includes key streets and features.
2233	6234	It seems to be suggested that the two priority neighbourhoods mentioned are in, or adjacent to the Rotherhithe Peninsula	The location of these neighbourhoods relative to the Peninsula should be spelt out.	This statement has been removed from the revised SPG.
2233	6235	Para 2.6.1 gives the borough-wide target for new homes. But neither 2.6.2 or 2.9.9 give even an approximation of how many new homes are envisaged. Without this figure it is impossible to get one's head around the proposal.	The SPG must be amended to include an approximate figure preferable a maximum figure i.e. up to).	The revised SPG does not state a maximum figure for new units or number of residents. Instead it provides density guidelines. This is consistent with the approach promoted by the London Plan.
2233	6236	The percentage of affordable housing should be 50 per cent, as Ken Livingstone wants. This 50 per cent to include shared ownership and other intermediate tenures. In this way the development will help those in the most acute housing need and create a balanced community.	For 25 per cent substitute 50%.	Accept. This amendment has been made.

Representation Database

2233	6237	These paragraphs are far too vague.	There needs to be an explicit commitment to providing educational, medical and social welfare facilities for the new residential population and for these to be planned in now not bolted on afterwards.	Accept. The revised SPG clearly states that community facilities will be required for the new residential population.
2233	6238	I strongly support the principles of the redevelopment in terms of urban design [except point ii of 2.9.1 which I don't understand].	I support these principles for the reasons given in 2.9.2.	Note.
2233	6239	Para ii needs clarification. What is an 'integrated movement strategy?' How will it differ from what we have now?	Let's have plain English instead of jargon.	Accept. The reference to an integrated movement strategy has been removed.
2233	6240	2 points 1) the map is inadequate in making out the route of the road. 2) a motor route that encloses Canada Water on 4 sides will not make for the quiet enjoyment talked about in 2.10.2 regarding the dock.	1) identify landmarks, especially Canada Water basin and Canada Water tube, and name Swan Road 2) Abandon this as a vehicular option.	Accept. The revised SPG includes a new map with clear features. The north/south spine is intended to be used for pedestrian and cycle access primarily. It is not intended to allow the Canada Water Basin to be surrounded by roads.
2233	6241	I see the value of a new through route as a structuring element but am strongly against drawing motor traffic through the heart of the site.	Planners should give active consideration to making the spine a through-route for cyclists and pedestrians only though obviously residents will need a vehicular access	Accept. The north/south spine is intended to be used for pedestrian and cycle access primarily. It is not intended to allow the Canada Water Basin to be surrounded by roads.
2233	6242	Strongly support the proposed fine grain approach as a means of encouraging architectural diversity.		Note.

Representation Database

2233	6243	I have an open mind on building heights but they are determined ultimately by the number of new residents on new units envisaged. For example, you would not build a tower block to house 10 families. So we need this figure before we can decide whether the heights (and densities) proposed are reasonable. This figure is controlled by what the transport infrastructure can support.	This figure must form the basis of the SPG when it is revised, and building heights and densities adjusted round it.	The SPG does not put a limit on the number of units and residents but does provide guidance on expected residential densities. This approach is consistent with the London Plan.
2233	6244	Strongly support live frontages		Note.
2233	6245	You've got the message at last [maintaining the dock as a significant place with provision for the tranquil enjoyment of the wildlife].		Note.
2233	6246	No space that is used can get by with minimum maintenance which is what they get anyway from Southwark's abysmal services.	The final sentence should be amended to conclude and should expect active maintenance.	This reference to 'minimal maintenance' refers to the need to ensure that new public open spaces are designed so that minimal maintenance is required to ensure their upkeep. The reference has been replaced with 'be designed to the highest standard and be easy to maintain' (Section 5.2 Public Realm).
2233	6247	These questions are crucial (objectives for Canada Water), but we need some answers.	Include answers in the revised version. These will help define the optimum residential population.	Note.
2233	6248	The information given is inadequate. How will cars be accommodated with new office development, expanded retail provision and x thousand new residents ? The present enormous parking lot will have to go (very good) when the building is expanded.	Car parking allocation will have to be spelt out in the revised version.	The revised SPG refers to the car parking provisions in the second draft UDP (2004) and the London Plan.
2233	6249	Strongly support reduction in surface car parking.		Note.

Representation Database

2233	6250	Strongly support safe and convenient routes for cyclists and pedestrians.		Note.
2151	6251	The design guidelines in 2.9.5, 2.9.7, 2.9.9, 2.9.10 are too prescriptive and inflexible. The reference in 2.9.7 to the Masterplan is confusing and	To allow greater flexibility. Delete reference to masterplan.	Accept. References to master plan have been removed from the revised SPG.
2151	6252	Objection is made as Figure 2 sets out the SPG boundary. However, the proposed north/south spine extends beyond this boundary (Figure 2). This is confusing and inconsistent.	Remove figures 3 and 4, or reduce to keep within the proposed boundary. Clarify.	The key pedestrian and cycle routes are intended to improve access within the Canada Water Action Area and to create links with other areas and accessways outside of the Action Area, particularly with areas of open space or existing accessways.
2151	6253	Objecting to reference to development brief as confusing and unclear as to what this document is and if it forms part of the SPG. Also for the same reasons, objecting to reference to 'Preferred development partner' and 'masterplan'. To prescriptive.	To remove reference to the 'development brief', 'preferred development partner' and 'masterplan', or clarify their status	Accept. These references have been removed from the revised SPG.
2151	6254	The Spine is too prescriptive.	Remove figures or allow flexibility/ amend plan.	Accept. The location of the north/south spine is indicative only.
2279	6374	Objection Although the concept of a north/south spine through the area is supported, attention also needs to be paid to east/west links through large sites.	Add new sentence 'East/west links should also be improved when large sites are redeveloped.'	Accept. The revised SPG supports both a north/ south spine and east/west accessways.
2397	6442	Existing protection of public open space should be retained (under the 1906 Public Spaces Act).	As above	Accept.
2397	6447	The SPG should adhere to London Plan concepts of housing densities in Rotherhithe, i.e. Suburban category 2/3. The "Low, Clean and Green" suburban character of Rotherhithe should be maintained.		The area covered in the SPG is the Canada Water Action Area only. This provides for higher residential densities than in the Rotherhithe peninsula due to being zoned a Public Transport Accessibility Zone.

Representation Database

2397	6448	Canada Water should be a district centre, on substantially less scale of development than the Elephant & Castle and London Bridge.		Accept. Canada Water is a District Centre in line with the London Plan hierarchy of town centres.
2398	6455	<p>We would like to register the following details as a matter for consideration with the SPG.</p> <p>1. Establishment of a Community Trust (Voluntary/Community Sector): This would create a fund to finance the development and maintenance of community facilities identified by local people and groups as necessary. It would be in addition to major community facilities that should be provided as a central part of the main development (e.g. library, multi-purpose conference/performance space accessible and affordable to local voluntary sector groups). A community trust would thus provide a sustainable and flexible source of income for the future. It could include the gifting of land and/or premises to the community trust from which it could derive sustainable revenue. It is recommended that the trust be inaugurated in this way as soon as possible, and augmented whenever section 106 contributions are considered in the future for all development sites within the Canada Water Area.</p>		Accept. These comments have been taken into account in the revised SPG (Section 9 Planning Obligations)

Representation Database

2398	6455	<p>This would provide co-operative working, maximise the use of any central resources built within the development, avoid duplication and make the best use of existing resources of community plant and people.</p> <p>2. Specific issues raised by the local community are as follows:</p> <p>A) Environmental:In conjunction with Thames 21 conduct an environmental study of the improvements and enhancements that could be made to Albion Channel, Surrey Water and Canada Water to encourage and sustain wildlife. Erect signboards providing details of the local wildlife habitat and how it can be nurtured and encouraged.</p>		
2398	6455	<p>B) Local history:Institute and encourage local history projects that can educate and promote the area's history including the funding of an oral history project and preserving builidngs of historical interest on the peninsula.</p>		

Representation Database

2398	6455	<p>C) Recreational use of Land PRIOR to commencement of building works on sites A & B</p> <p>Youth provision - a skateboard facility located close to Canada Water tube station readily visible to passers by, the police and covered by CCTV cameras. Levelling some of the land and provision of temporary goal posts for football practice and netball/basketball posts for informal use. Swing park or small playground with seating and toilets (preferable beside Albion Channel) for mothers and toddlers. Temporary gardens (as was done in Islington on brown land prior to construction commencing).</p>		
2398	6455	<p>D) And longer term as part of the overall development All of the recreational points in 2c above plus: Paddling pool or play area with seating and toilets for young families, possibly refreshment facilities. Creche facilities are a constant concern in the community. Initially perhaps within a local voluntary organisation - e.g. Time & Talents and in the longer term close to the bus and tube stations. Provision for youth facilities - to use up energy via sport but also to help youth inclusion into society via arts, drama, a mini theatre, t.v. studio</p>		

Representation Database

2398	6455	E) Council and public service support to the community Certain key function in the council might be relocated here or new State of the Art green buildings, with multi community use, e.g. new town hall alongside Canada Water. New premises for Southwark News with new equipment and workers to teach skills to local youths for more community pages relating to different environment/community resources.		
2398	6455	F) Medical and community health facilities A constant concern is for improved and vastly increased public health provision via additional dentist, doctor and community health facilities - the transit time to the local emergency unit at St Thomas's is a disgrace. Some daytime minor injury cover would support community needs.		

Representation Database

2398	6455	<p>G) Voluntary Sector Support Several of the existing local groups need major contributions to the repair, improvement or redevelopment of their premises, and it is recommended that this, too, should be a priority to which section 106 contributions should be applied via a community trust.</p> <p>I) Bede House Association - Major building development to extend and improve facilities planned.</p> <p>Ii) Brunel Engine House - Hard landscaping of the square outside Brunel Engine House to remove pedestrian barriers and safety hazard and install wheelchair ramps and seating in preparation for children's art installation and other events during this years Summer Playscheme (2003).</p> <p>Iii) Lavender Pond Pumphouse Educational Museum - Major repair and redecoration of the building. Purchase of professional displays for artifacts used by children for National Curriculum, older people for reminiscence, and visitors.</p>		
------	------	--	--	--

Representation Database

2398	6455	<p>iv) Surrey Docks Farm - The farm needs sponsorship to secure adequate infrastructure (human and material) to capacity build a wide variety of programmes of use in sustainable ways, which are not detrimental to/but enhance - current programmes of use</p> <p>v) Dockhands Settlement - The Dockhands Settlement should be re-established and given support. This area has social housing and a need to bring benefit to a deprived area within the peninsula. Links around and within the area be strengthened along lines go Rotherhithe and Bermondsey Dev. Partnership.</p> <p>Vi) Time & Talents Association - Repair and Redecoration, contribution to core funding.</p>		
2398	6455	<p>In addition to the above groups, the Waterside Workshops, the London Bubble Theatre and Tideway Sailability have a range of issues with plant and tenure and various revenue projects, all of which require funding and for which a community approach via the proposed trust would be appropriate.</p>		
2348	6730	<p>Any improvements to interchanges should include provision for disabled access</p>		Note.

Representation Database

2219	6731	Para 1.3.2 refers to Lordship Lane. Is this a mistake?		Note. This has been amended.
2361	6732		All development in relation to roads should make buses and bicycles a priority	Accept. This is clearly stated as a priority in the revised SPG.
2361	6733		A limit should be set on the numbers of new units and residents in the area	The SPG does not put a limit on the number of units and residents but does provide guidance on expected residential densities. This approach is consistent with the London Plan.
2361	6734	The area now has excellent public transport provision. I am concerned that road-building schemes such as the proposed spine road will put the focus back on private cars. I also do not think the Canada Water basin should be surrounded by roads on all sides and for these reasons I reject the spine road proposal.	Instead of a spine road connecting Canada Water to Rotherhithe Village I would like to see improved walking and cycling paths incorporating the current Albatross Way.	Accept. The revised SPG provides a north/south spine for pedestrian and cycle access only.
2426	6735	I am objecting to the designation of the Rotherhithe peninsular as an urban area. ON page 74-75 are the descriptions of the urban and suburban zone, bar the strip along the river front at either end of the peninsular, the description of the suburban zone describes the peninsular exactly "predominantly houses with gardens, this could include some detached houses"	I would like to see the Rotherhithe Peninsular re-designated a suburban zone.	The area covered by the revised SPG is the Canada Water Action Area only and not the wider Rotherhithe peninsula. The Action Area has been zoned a Public Transport Accessibility Zone in the second draft UDP (2004) which provides for urban zone residential densities and above, due to the higher levels of public transport accessibility.

Representation Database

2430	6757	<p>The proposals seem to treat Canada Water as being in the same category as London Bridge as far as development and housing density is concerned, this is plainly not only a flawed proposal due to inferior public transport provision, but is totally contrary to the wishes of local people as has already been expressed on numerous occasions. The Canada Water area is suburban in nature and residents wish it to remain so, this has been made more than clear at consultations over an extended period involving all the stakeholders. The local stakeholders area united in their vision, a master development brief has been agreed, only Southwark seems to be out of line in re-presenting their original (widely rejected) vision within the draft Southwark Plan. Canada Water could usefully become a district centre, but nothing on the scale that might be seen at London Bridge.</p>		<p>Accept. This has been redrafted.</p>
2430	6758	<p>I am unclear as the effect of the documents on protection of Open Spaces since any change of legal status is not made clear. Any proposed changes resulting in reduced protection (including dilution of protections included in 1906 Public Spaces Act) are unacceptable.</p>		<p>The designation of Open Spaces as Borough Open Land does not alter the status of any Open Space created under the 1906 Public Open Spaces Act as they operate under separate pieces of legislation.</p>
2430	6759	<p>Protection of Strategic Views is not clear on the map provided. It is not always clearly apparent which side of the line the protected area lies. This requires addressing in the final draft.</p>		<p>The revised SPG includes a new map with the Strategic Viewing Corridor clearly shown.</p>

Representation Database

2430	6760	On the plus side there are some positive aspects to the documents, I am glad that the draft proposals encourage waste recycling. The provision of more local, and better managed facilities cannot come soon enough.		Note
2435	6776	I wish to say regarding this consultation, that the Council should ensure protections under the 1906 Public Spaces Act on the Rotherhithe Peninsula and Canada Water of all open spaces, green spaces, docks, canals and woodlands. It is my main concern that all wooded areas, docks and canals, as any green spaces should be protected.		The designation of Open Spaces as Borough Open Land does not alter the status of any Open Space created under the 1906 Public Open Spaces Act as they operate under separate pieces of legislation.
2435	6777	I wish to comment on the density of population and development of the mentioned open spaces: Regarding the density of development I agree that the same can be higher without touching any green spaces or docks or canals. It is my view that we can't ask the poor people of Brazil not to chop down their rain forest, while we continue to built on our green belt. It is my opinion that there is a great waste of precious space in this area of Rotherhithe using only ground floors, such as the acres of space of the shopping centre. There could be many homes and offices above without touching any green or open space.		Note.

Representation Database

2435	6778	<p>In London there are so many old dilapidated properties that could be redeveloped by properly benefiting the world and environment, and of course those who need affordable homes. By putting great limitations on the density of population we are also undermining our ability to have more properties on the market at a lower price. The more properties available would normally mean that their price should tend to fall. Unfortunately there is a big demand for homes and we can only build sideways, upwards or downwards, and upwards is the less damaging proposition.</p>		<p>Note.</p>
2438	6787	<p>We would like to add our support to the Canada Water Campaign, the Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Development Partnership and the Canada Water Consultative Forum in objecting to the current drafts of the Southwark Plan and Canada Water Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p>	<p>We seek the retention of existing protections under the 1906 public open spaces act for all public open space.</p>	<p>The designation of Open Spaces as Borough Open Land does not alter the status of any Open Space created under the 1906 Public Open Spaces Act as they operate under separate pieces of legislation.</p>
2438	6788	<p>We hope that this area can remain unique, with a distinctive centre, and retain a sense of pride and continuity and reference to its historic background and to the thoughtful and elegant work of the London Docklands Development Council which respected this. Also hope that this distinctiveness is not sacrificed so that Bermondsey and Rotherhithe become yet another highly congested, high density and anonymous extension of London.</p>	<p>Adherence to the London Plan concepts of housing densities in Rotherhithe that is suburban category 2/3.</p> <p>Maintenance of the "Low, clean and green" suburban character of Rotherhithe.</p>	<p>The area covered by the revised SPG is the Canada Water Action Area only and not the wider Rotherhithe peninsula. The Action Area has been zoned a Public Transport Accessibility Zone in the second draft UDP (2004) which provides for urban zone residential densities and above, due to the higher levels of public transport accessibility.</p>

Representation Database

2438	6789		Creation of Canada Water as a District Centre (on substantially less scale of development than the Elephant and Castle and London Bridge City).	Accept. This has been redrafted.
2438	6790	The assumption that Canada Water provides excellent accessibility is not supported. Concerned that this area is already suffering from serious transport and parking problems and the location of this area on the boundaries of the new congestion zone to be initiated in February can only increase the scale of the problems. The siting of the congestion zone perimeters also implies that Bermondsey and Rotherhithe are not considered to be part of central London.	Rejection of the assertion that transport links to Canada Water are excellent.	Accept. This has been redrafted.
2390	6858	I am writing on behalf of Surrey Docks Farm Provident Society Ltd to add our support to the Canada Water Campaign, the Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Development Partnership and the Canada Water Consultative Forum in objecting to the current drafts of the Southwark Plan and Canada Water Supplementary Planning Guidance.	We seek the retention of existing protections under the 1906 public open spaces act for all public open space.	The designation of Open Spaces as Borough Open Land does not alter the status of any Open Space created under the 1906 Public Open Spaces Act as they operate under separate pieces of legislation.
2390	6859	We object to the designation of this area and the Rotherhithe Peninsula as Urban category and we feel that the suburban nature of the peninsula should be retained.	Adherence to the London Plan concepts of housing densities in Rotherhithe that is suburban category 2/3. Maintenance of the "Low, clean and green" suburban character of Rotherhithe.	The area covered by the revised SPG is the Canada Water Action Area only and not the wider Rotherhithe peninsula. The Action Area has been zoned a Public Transport Accessibility Zone in the second draft UDP (2004) which provides for urban zone residential densities and above, due to the higher levels of public transport accessibility.

Representation Database

2390	6860		Creation of Canada Water as a District Centre (on substantially less scale of development than the Elephant and Castle and London Bridge City).	Accept. This has been redrafted.
2390	6861		Rejection of the assertion that transport links to Canada Water are excellent.	Accept. This has been redrafted.
2457	6864	I reject the assertion that transport links to Canada Water are excellent. The jubilee Line underground service is frequently overcrowded when I use it to travel to and from work, and this will only get worse with the continuing development of Canary Wharf and the extension of the East London Line. The bus service suffers from similar congestion levels to cars, and the bus I use most frequently (the 381 either to Peckham or to Waterloo) take an incredible time to cover this route.		Accept. This has been redrafted.
2457	6864	The road system is congested in all directions (to Greenwich, London Bridge or Limehouse) and this will get worse with the introduction of the congestion-charging zone. There are particular problems of cars trying to enter and leave the surrey Quays shopping centre next to Canada Water – 30 minutes to travel a few hundred yards is not unknown. I believe that transport for London's analysis of the public transport accessibility index will confirm that this is not excellent. The housing densities in Rotherhithe should follow this index, reflecting the reality of the current and future position [TfL's PTALs].		

Representation Database

2457	6865	<p>I object to Canada Water being designated as 'central' with its consequences for density purposes. Not only do the transport links fail to justify this, but it is also irrational in geographic terms, being a considerable distance outside London's inner ring. Where I live, the feel is more suburban, with the area being based in single family houses with gardens.</p> <p>It is clear that all my neighbours have cars (as I do) and many have more than 1 (which I do not); and any attempt to restrict residential car parking provision to less than 1 place per unit will fail, leading to more on-street parking - and even worse, it could encourage people to drive to work rather than facing parking problems at home. Future parking provision in Rotherhithe should reflect the likely future residents, who will be more typical of current Rotherhithe residents than of the Southwark average.</p>		<p>The area covered by the revised SPG is the Canada Water Action Area only and not the wider Rotherhithe peninsula. The Action Area has been zoned a Public Transport Accessibility Zone in the second draft UDP (2004) which provides for urban zone residential densities and above, due to the higher levels of public transport accessibility. Car park standards provided are consistent with the London Plan's guidelines for car parking in town centres and are related to levels of public transport accessibility.</p>
2457	6865	<p>Similarly, any assessment of the current parking use either in the Surrey Quays shopping centre and leisure park or the Harmsworth Quays print works will show that restricting off-street parking will not only cause major problems for local residents but also undermine the local economy.</p>		

Representation Database

2457	6866	<p>The statement "Canada Water contains a number of development opportunities of London-wide strategic significance" is apparently not based on the Mayor of London's SDS, but is instead an attempt to enable an excessive density of development on the various sites. Canada Water should not be treated in the same way as the Opportunity Areas in the London Plan, since it is not one.</p>		<p>Accept. This has been redrafted.</p>
2457	6867	<p>I believe that the UDP should explicitly retain the existing protections under the 1906 public open spaces act for all public open space, especially that transferred by the LDDC. I also believe that there should be a protection of the open nature of the Rotherhithe peninsula against threats to block existing access routes for pedestrians: in particular while the north east Deal Porters Walk between Surrey Water and Canada Water is shown on the map as Borough Open Land (and should be public open space). The south west continuation of the route into Canada Water bus station (which has identical LDDC street lighting installed) should have the same status – instead it has been blocked.</p>		<p>The designation of Open Spaces as Borough Open Land does not alter the status of any Open Space created under the 1906 Public Open Spaces Act as they operate under separate pieces of legislation. The revised SPG supports the protection and creation of open space and public accessways.</p>

Representation Database

2457	6867	<p>In the same vain, the continuation of Canada Street from the junction with Surrey Quays Road to Canada Water between the 2 Decathlon shops has street lighting and benched but this route (popular with parents who walk their children to Alfred Salter or St Johns Schools and then walk to the underground station on the way to work) is under threat from development and should be protected in the UDP. Similar routes that encourage walking and access the public transport should be opened up and protected.</p>		
2457	6868	<p>Believe that the preferred industrial locations in the peninsula should remain, and attempts to change them to office or housing use should be resisted. A diversity of employment in the area is essential to reflect the diversity of its residents. Mixed use including light industrial use and workshops in other parts of the peninsula would also help.</p>		<p>The revised SPG supports the protection of employment use and the establishment of new employment uses. However, the SPG also encourages a mix of uses on appropriate sites.</p>
2460	6877		<p>The documents were discussed at a recent meeting of the Bermondsey & Rotherhithe Development Partnership and the following resolutions were unanimously agreed: The BRDP resolves that any open land currently designated under the 1906 Act protecting open spaces should have no worse protection within the new Southwark Plan.</p>	<p>The designation of Open Spaces as Borough Open Land does not alter the status of any Open Space created under the 1906 Public Open Spaces Act as they operate under separate pieces of legislation.</p>

Representation Database

2460	6878		<p>The documents were discussed at a recent meeting of the Bermondsey & Rotherhithe Development Partnership and the following resolutions were unanimously agreed: The BRDP resolves that land designations contained in the Spatial London Plan for the Rotherhithe Peninsular (Suburban Category 2/3) and the Canada Water development area be retained in the Southwark Plan.</p>	<p>The area covered by the revised SPG is the Canada Water Action Area only and not the wider Rotherhithe peninsula. Accept in part. The Action Area has been zoned a Public Transport Accessibility Zone in the second draft UDP (2004) which provides for urban zone residential densities and above, due to the higher levels of public transport accessibility. The area outside the Action Area has been designated a Suburban Zone.</p>
2460	6878		<p>The documents were discussed at a recent meeting of the Bermondsey & Rotherhithe Development Partnership and the following resolutions were unanimously agreed: The BRDO rejects the assertion that transport links are excellent. It is noted that underground</p>	<p>The area covered by the revised SPG is the Canada Water Action Area only and not the wider Rotherhithe peninsula. The Action Area has been zoned a Public Transport Accessibility Zone in the second draft UDP (2004) which provides for urban zone residential densities and above, due to the higher levels of public transport accessibility.</p>
2460	6879		<p>Furthermore that Canada Water should be considered a "district centre" and trend neutral. In addition, the whole of the peninsula should retain the protection and development levels afforded by their suburban nature.</p>	<p>Accept. This has been redrafted.</p>

Representation Database

2431	6761	I/we would like to add my/our support to the Canada Water Campaign, the Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Development Partnership and the Canada Water Consultative Forum in objecting to the current drafts of the Southwark Plan and Canada Water Supplementary Planning Guidance.	1) I/we seek the retention of existing protections under the 1906 public open spaces act for all public open space.	The designation of Open Spaces as Borough Open Land does not alter the status of any Open Space created under the 1906 Public Open Spaces Act as they operate under separate pieces of legislation.
2432	6765			
2433	6769			
2434	6772			
2436	6779			
2437	6783			
2439	6792			
2440	6796			
2441	6800			
2442	6803			
2443	6806			
2444	6810			
2445	6814			
2446	6817			
2447	6820			
2448	6824			
2449	6828			
2450	6832			
2451	6835			
2452	6839			
2453	6843			
2454	6846			
2455	6850			
2456	6854			
2458	6869			
2459	6873			

Representation Database

2431	6762	I/we would like to add my/our support to the Canada Water Campaign, the Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Development Partnership and the Canada Water Consultative Forum in objecting to the current drafts of the Southwark Plan and Canada Water Supplementary Planning Guidance.	3) Creation of Canada Water as a District Centre (on substantially less scale of development than the Elephant and Castle and London Bridge City).	Accept. This has been redrafted.
2432	6767			
2433	6771			
2434	6774			
2436	6781			
2437	6785			
2439	6794			
2440	6798			
2441	6802			
2442	6805			
2443	6808			
2444	6812			
2445	6816			
2446	6819			
2447	6822			
2448	6826			
2449	6830			
2450	6834			
2451	6837			
2452	6841			
2453	6845			
2454	6848			
2455	6852			
2456	6856			
2458	6871			
2459	6875			

Representation Database

2431	6763	I/we would like to add my/our support to the Canada Water Campaign, the Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Development Partnership and the Canada Water Consultative Forum in objecting to the current drafts of the Southwark Plan and Canada Water Supplementary Planning Guidance.	4) Rejection of the assertion that transport links to Canada Water are excellent.	The area covered by the revised SPG is the Canada Water Action Area only and not the wider Rotherhithe peninsula. The Action Area has been zoned a Public Transport Accessibility Zone in the second draft UDP (2004) which provides for urban zone residential densities and above, due to the higher levels of public transport accessibility.
2432	6768			
2434	6775			
2436	6782			
2437	6786			
2439	6795			
2440	6799			
2443	6809			
2444	6813			
2447	6823			
2448	6827			
2449	6831			
2450	6834			
2451	6838			
2452	6842			
2454	6849			
2455	6853			
2456	6857			
2458	6872			
2459	6876			

Representation Database

2431	6764	I/we would like to add my/our support to the Canada Water Campaign, the Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Development Partnership and the Canada Water Consultative Forum in objecting to the current drafts of the Southwark Plan and Canada Water Supplementary Planning Guidance.	2) Adherence to the London Plan concepts of housing densities in Rotherhithe that is suburban category 2/3. Maintenance of the "Low, clean and green" suburban character of Rotherhithe.	The area covered by the revised SPG is the Canada Water Action Area only and not the wider Rotherhithe peninsula. Accept in part. The Action Area has been zoned a Public Transport Accessibility Zone in the second draft UDP (2004) which provides for urban zone residential densities and above, due to the higher levels of public transport accessibility. The area outside the Action Area has been designated a Suburban Zone.
2432	6766			
2433	6770			
2434	6773			
2436	6780			
2437	6784			
2439	6793			
2440	6797			
2441	6801			
2442	6804			
2443	6807			
2444	6811			
2445	6815			
2446	6818			
2447	6821			
2448	6825			
2449	6829			
2450	6833			
2451	6836			
2452	6840			
2453	6844			
2454	6847			
2455	6851			
2456	6855			
2458	6870			
2459	6874			

Representation Database

2461	6880	<p>Ampurius is concerned that the SPG/UDP do not take sufficient account of the strategic planning framework set out in the Draft London Plan of 2002. The Draft London Plan places greatest emphasis on the office sector to provide for employment growth in London. It requires new commercial use to form part of mixed use developments so as to also contribute towards London's urgent requirement for housing growth. Much less emphasis is placed on the industrial sectors and no Strategic Employment Locations are identified in Southwark.</p>	<p>Delete PIL at Quebec Way entirely or amend its boundaries so as to remove Ampurius' site.</p>	<p>Accept in part. In accordance with the designation of Canada Water as a town centre, the Preferred Industrial Location designation in Canada Water has been deleted. A mix of uses are required/supported on the majority of sites within the Canada Water Action Area.</p>
2461	6880	<p>Ampurius is concerned that the SPG/UDP policies place too much reliance on protection of industrial land. The inflexible nature of the policies will prevent existing brownfield land being put to most effective use and could cause significant supply-side problems for other uses over the course of the Plan. Furthermore, no policy distinction is made between local and strategic Preferred Industrial Locations. The UDP and SPG should be amended to provide a hierarchy of policies distinguishing between the functions of Strategic and Local sites.</p>		

Representation Database

2461	6880	<p>The criteria set out in paragraph 5.1.2 of the SPG provides the basis for formulating such a hierarchy.</p> <p>Criteria I classifies strategic sites as those referred to in the London Plan (or in earlier LPAC advice).</p> <p>Criteria II - IX refer to lesser forms of classification than envisaged for SELs in the London Plan. These are therefore appropriate criteria for identification of Local sites. In accordance with the London Plan, detailed policies should be formulated by the Boroughs for the management, protection and releas or enhancement of Local employment sites.</p> <p>The first step in this process should be whether existing employment areas meet the criteria set out in II - IX above.</p>		
------	------	---	--	--

Representation Database

2461	6880	<p>Ampurius is the owner of existing warehouse properties in Quebec Way. The site fails to meet the key criteria of SPG policies. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The previously designated Employment Area at Quebec Way has become fragmented since publication of the first UDP in 1995. ii) This part of Rotherhithe does not have good access to the strategic road network. iii) The site is sandwiched between the designated Action Area and open space. iv) There is no existing or proposed infrastructure which will assist economic development or regeneration of the site. 		
------	------	---	--	--

Representation Database

2461	6881	<p>SPG/UDP policies for mixed use development should accord more closely with the strategic framework of the London Plan.</p> <p>Ampurius supports the objectives of paragraph 5.3.3 of the SPG which encourages mixed use development. Redevelopment of the Quebec Way site offers the opportunity to deliver all the objectives set out in this paragraph. However, the draft policy is framed so as to require no net loss of floorspace in Class B use which could place obstacles in the way of redevelopment of large floorplate buildings, such as at Quebec Way where existing warehouses provide very little employment.</p>	<p>Since the objective of the policy is to protect sites for employment purposes, it should be amended to require redevelopment to provide for an increase in employment levels of the site irrespective of the floorspace.</p>	<p>The support for mixed uses is noted. Policy 1.5 (Mixed Uses) has been redrafted to ensure that employment uses are retained only on those sites which are suitable. The reference to no net loss has been deleted. On suitable sites, 30% of the gross floor area should be provided for employment uses.</p>
2461	6882	<p>Ampurius supports the designation of an Action Area at Canada Water. Paragraph 1.7 defines the characteristics of the Action Area. However these extend beyond the boundaries of the Action Area. In particular the Ampurius site contribute the problems listed in the paragraph. Redevelopment of the site would allow these problems to be resolved and would provide an important link with amenity spaces.</p>	<p>Extend the boundaries of the Action Area to include land along Quebec Way (Ampurius' site).</p>	<p>Accept. The boundaries of the Canada Water Action Area have been extended to include Ampurius' site.</p>

Representation Database

2461	6883	<p>Ampurius supports LB Southwark's vision for Canada Water as a high quality mixed use development designed to create a town centre to serve the local community and to provide new housing.</p> <p>Ampurius supports the sustainability criteria set out in part 2.2 of the SPG.</p> <p>The development of Quebec Way can provide for increased open space, sustainable transport routes, public realm improvements, community facilities, employment and housing.</p>		<p>The support for the vision for Canada Water is noted. The boundaries of the Action Area have been extended to include Ampurius' site.</p>
2461	6884	<p>Ampurius support the urban design objectives set out in paragraph 2.9.1 of the SPG. However, the proposed guide for storey heights in para. 2.9.9 may impose unnecessary constraints on the potential for development. While strategic views may impose constraints, there may be potential to accommodate taller buildings than specified in the SPG.</p>	<p>Full consideration should be given to the potential role of taller buildings, especially in areas undergoing regeneration.</p> <p>The SPG should also be drafted to accommodate potential changes in the strategic views framework.</p>	<p>The support for the urban design objectives is noted. The text relating to building heights has been redrafted. Canada Water is generally not considered to be a suitable location for tall buildings. Criteria are set out against which appropriate heights can be assessed.</p>