

## Appendix 10: Draft Revised Canada Water AAP: Additional written comments submitted during informal consultation

Representation Ref	Objector Ref	Document	Details of Representation
341	967	Review informal consultation	<p>Sorry I cannot make this meeting. However I am concerned at the size and scale of current developments.</p> <p>The area around Canada water tube is a prime example of an oversized, profit driven development offering no benefit to existing residents.</p> <p>A key feature of the peninsula is the low buildings &amp; green areas and no overpopulation.</p> <p>We do not want the area overpopulated – especially with high rise buildings everywhere that are so expensive local people cannot afford them.</p> <p>The council should be ensuring that buildings fit in with the existing local area ( eg no more than 4 storeys max )</p> <p>They should be priced so that local people ( not investors from the far east ) can actually buy them ( eg under 100K for a 1/2 bed ).</p> <p>My children are 20 &amp; 22 and have no chance of staying in the area they grew up in.</p> <p>People – not profits should be top priority for the council</p>

Representation Ref	Objector Ref	Document	Details of Representation
342	191	Review informal consultation	<p>I would like to attend the planning Harmsworth Quays workshop on Saturday 17th November.</p> <p>If you are testing scenarios with us, do you have some kind of action plan or something already? If so, a copy would be welcome asap. King's have put out various drawings whereas British Land have been silent.</p> <p>But there is not much meat on the bone in front of us - not much for the public to be informed about in order to comment on any draft scenarios or other ideas. The silence about money for all kind of infrastructures (including the Mayor of London's office and TFL etc.) is hardly helpful or encouraging.</p> <p>It would be odd to jump straight to scenario testing, and residents in this area might expect some participation / involvement in a pretesting stage in a spirit of productive collaboration. Rather than testing something that Planning, or someone else, has already come up with that needs testing. I think it is important for us to know what content in models, scenarios or policy etc. has been fed in by developers, landowners, BLCQ, associates etc.</p> <p>In a some ways, it is not just scenarios we need, but some kind of smart informed genuine modelling (not something cobbled together or faked). Scenarios and models that local people can understand, and endorse them, because they participated and were involved in their creation (prior to testing).</p> <p>Something that can intelligently indicate what might happen if we flood the area with student accommodation for example - and predict how many local jobs might end up taken by students... or how many more 'family homes' might be occupied by sharers, and so on.</p> <p>And a model / scenarios that links to the proposed CIL / s106 - how it will all pan out coherently. Something that can help us understand how proposals will help improve the most deprived areas of Rotherhithe Ward / Surrey Docks and impact on the 21% approx. area of our local land that is roads that are so important for London and development the A200 etc.</p> <p>And overall Southwark has poor ward level negative wellbeing scores over many years now, except one or two wards, one being Dulwich, which makes me think that the benefits of development / growth are not being adequately and fairly shared out.  <a href="http://data.london.gov.uk/datastore/package/london-ward-well-being-scores">http://data.london.gov.uk/datastore/package/london-ward-well-being-scores</a> (2012)</p> <p>While that is a partly a political problem it is also a practical problem for progress because the matters and issues raised by the Rotherhithe and Surrey Docks communities need to be properly and comprehensively addressed and solutions delivered.</p> <p>Please add me to the planning policy email list.</p>

Representation Ref	Objector Ref	Document	Details of Representation
343	968	Review informal consultation	<p>I would love to attend this workshop please. I would like to attend as a mother, resident and business development consultant. I have a wonderful vision of how that space could be used to benefit the community of all ages, create local employment and be economically viable if it is not too late. In summary it is something like the Eden project with large glass pods, with a plant nursery, loads of healthy activities for kids, stores, community projects and so much more. My thinking is to create indoor space which feels like outdoors but is not subject to rain or weather. And overall keep it in line with nature conservation theme which runs through this beautiful area.</p> <p>I would be very happy to share more of this thinking with you if you are interested, either to feed into or as a project manager or as someone who could run the business which brings together many organisations, both public, charity and private sector.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you for confirmation of attendance and/or if you have any more questions. You can see a high copy of my 'cv' on Linked In if you are interested.</p>
345	207	Review informal consultation	<p>I concur with the main thrust of Jerry's mail below. I did ask our facilitator at the very outset whether the results of "The Game" were intended to be fed back into planning policy adding any influence? The response was "No it's just a game to help participants/Residents get a better understanding of both sides of the argument" I was partially ok with that in one sense because it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1...gets people together and understanding other residents view as well as your own.</li> <li>2...educates people in local planning ( to a certain degree)</li> <li>3...lets the LPA know more about local peoples views and demands ( which is just as important)</li> </ol> <p>Other than that I think it was something that was of some benefit going forward, but should have taken place 5 or 6 years ago.</p> <p>The one overwhelming outcome from the well attended meeting was that residents favour KCL on the land as opposed to British Land ...Flats Flats and More Flats + Broken Promises.</p>
346	970	Review informal consultation	<p>I agree, the aim of the game was to get 100 points on the site which meant that our group ended up with 4 tall buildings!!! Much better would have been to end up with say 50 points, then we wouldn't have to cram so much in. The preset parameters dictated the game rather than the needs of the local residents. Reminded me of rearranging the deckchairs on the titanic.</p> <p>Kings should be encouraged in every way by Southwark Council, it is exactly what the area needs.</p>

Representation Ref	Objector Ref	Document	Details of Representation
347	191	Review informal consultation	<p>I am writing to ask that Southwark Council and it's agent / advisors etc. make no further use of any data / information / photographs etc.. collected during the scenario "game" that I participated in today. At the start of the meeting there was a request to use photographs / videos for future training etc. It was not made clear that periodically taken photographs (and the final spreadsheet/s etc.) would be used for activities other than training, including plan making and planning policy. Participants of our "game" (the scenario group with no university) were informed that it was just a game - and at no point were we informed that our game play would be used (influence. or otherwise feed into) planning policy. If our activity was to impact on planning policy then that should be made clear, and not the opposite.</p> <p>Steve Cornish and Anastasia both sought clarification and assurances on purpose / use etc. from our game facilitator.</p> <p>I had already written my concern about using pre structured and pre formed scenarios, and approach etc., on 17th November. And of course I attempted to raise serious issues about evidence during CW AAP.</p> <p>It really does not help that residents still do not have an embedded withit fully independent advisor to help us navigate these complex planning issues. Someone who is not bound by the legal agreements Southwark has made including with BLCQ. That might have saved me from writing this email to you, and help your team with this consultation. (I have also made this request with Peter John).</p> <p>If the 'game' today was not just an educational tool (for us to understand constraints / trade off's etc), then what are it's other purposes? And how will our game play decisions be used? Or the snapshots of them? It is difficult for me to gauge how seriously I should treat this matter because of uncertainty over purpose and use of the data / information collected today.</p> <p>I was under the impression that it was just a game, a pretty meaningless activity, that would help us better understand the issues, choices and challenges. Which is valuable, but not that same as taking snapshot photographs of tall building markers to inform policy.</p> <p>I'm sure you'll agree that It is not good or proper planning, or even decent behaviour, to obtain and use data collected by way of mistake, falsehood, dishonesty etc. and not Southwark Council policy to treat residents disrespectfully (including the time they give free) : the policy tends to be respect, honesty, decency, openness, transparency etc. Any image of fiddling or gerrymandering needs to be removed and not reinforced.</p> <p>I also noticed that the outcome boards of both groups were different in an important respect. The with university group had clearly been required by their facilitator to place their markers within the yellow lines whereas our group covered the green links with more open space! The result is rather invalid given the limited number of green space markers available! Had the green links been kept clear a different board would be produced. These type of errors muck things up even if the game had any validity to start with.</p> <p>It would have been helpful to have a map that showed the full Town Centre boundary and the complete CW AAP Core Area.</p>

Residents have properly asked questions the validity and sense of excluding other sites in the area from the analysis today. These sites are extremely important such as the failing to deliver TESCO / British Land car park and shopping centre. Other sites also provide opportunity to deliver commitments already made to the community. And there needs to be overall coherence.

It was very clear the legitimate expectation of all buildings and developments in the area (not just tall buildings) being of high quality, excellent and exemplary design. Southwark's Planning Committee (as advised by Officers) with TESCO / British Land have already run a coach and horses through "design" and severely damaged trust and grounds for further policy.

How much did event all cost? Why were residents not involved in the selection and appointment of consultants? (There has been no shortage of time). Having residents involved in selecting advisors etc. helps reduce opportunity to comment about clientism and dependency on Council work etc. or rent-a-result comments.

Residents are always available to come to the Ivory Tower of Planners and test / comment on resources at the design stage rather than have resources go too far, and before too much public money is spent on them. Help has been repeatedly offered to the Council by residents willing to help make good and proper progress so we get the right developments in the right place, that are well supported. And that do not further enrich the lawyers.

We have to wait to see planning policy outcomes (e.g. a draft report) before knowing if comments on the earlier discursive session today have been properly collected and fed into the process. There was no opportunity to agree the notes taken by the facilitator as being complete, true, fair, accurate and proper. I hope that you will publish notes and the spreadsheet files as public information in due course. And photographs that do not identify participants.

I think also that when designing these games it would help a great deal if the designers teamed up with neighbourhood residents to ensure that the specific game / scenarios are based on reality (and neighbourhood knowledge) and lead to sensible sound well supported results. One of the first decisions by our group was to stack markers one upon the other. This was deemed to be against 'the rules'. I note that the other group did the same thing! It might be better if Southwark got hold of some experts in scenario planning and how to do it properly (to produce good and proper planning policy).

Our facilitator from this morning failed to feedback some important issues raised by out table however I decided to leave saying anything during the meeting since time was short and I did not want to be disruptive.

One issue raised is that King's proposes to provide student accommodation for about 2,000 students (which I expect will be rented to others in the holidays). These rooms tend to be 5 to 6 sqm rooms with high quality communal areas. Clearly, we need to think innovatively how we can provide homes for people (including young single people and childless couples, and the elderly). Cannot similar communal modes of accommodation be provided to non-students? (To avoid the rabbit hutch issue).

---

348	191	Review informal consultation	<p>Any impression that Harmsworth is not for us needs to be addressed, so it becomes a development for all. Not just built around us, but also for us (in all kinds of ways). The danger of the 'us' and 'them' of a campus really needs to be addressed. It was lurking in the room today.</p> <p>I recall you words about "long term" in regards to the leisure centre and I am not sure how this coheres with the Council's evidence (and assurances) given to the CW AAP EIP. The refurbishment of the Leisure Centre is many years over due many years ago, along with the refurbishment of 1'000s of Council managed and owned flats in the area. It's not fair (and wrong) to expect residents around here to wait even longer - if there is no genuinely prospect of a committed delivery date for a new centre then the existing one should be done up without further delay. I am sure you have not forgotten that ideas for the new leisure centre have already been trundled around the Hawkstone etc. The trundling about really needs to stop because it's becoming like pass the parcel and residents just get justifiably angry when commitments and promises are repeatedly broken.</p> <p>I also notice that an infant / baby attended the event and would like to ask if any effort was made to find out if a crèche / child care was needed?</p> <p>I am sorry Tim if as an Officer you get more flack than you should. Several of us try very hard to try and flag up issues proactively although it seems to be to no avail most of the time.</p> <p>Dear Tim, please see message from Kath Whittam. I send it direct to you because I found out a few years ago that some councillors and officers don't bother with stuff c.c. to them, and Kath's comments are important about this.</p> <p>I do not disagree with Kath's summary about King's - that's a fair widely held collective conclusion - however, there are some big questions to be answered (some are in the CIL submission I made). Such as - how many of the 'new' permanent jobs will be taken by King's students? And other jobs in the area too? (Students tend to have huge debts). How will housing c.2000 students affect reduction in doorstep green space provision? (less children = less green space, poss trojan horse for +density -open space). And relationship with the area resources, like the woodlands. Or, how does King's being a charity and also building an educational campus affect proposed CIL revenue? I think we should ask questions of King's in the same way as questions are asked of the others and if they've got it sussed they'll have good answers.</p> <p>And so on. For many more pages - but perhaps not as many as the Council expect us to read and comment on.</p> <p>Time to watch Xfactor and read some more Gary Rice tweets.</p>
-----	-----	------------------------------	--

Representation Ref	Objector Ref	Document	Details of Representation
349	191	Review informal consultation	<p>I shall reflect on what you (team) say. However, I think an internal Stage 1 complaint is appropriate. And will give the Council a more formal opportunity to think carefully, investigate and respond. Your explanation does not cohere well enough. I consider this matter extremely important and particularly in view of Hawkins &amp; Brown's involvement in controversial schemes - they come with a history littered across the Internet. And I gather that attention is coming to bear: whether it is from work in Peabody, Elephant or Deptford.</p> <p>I understand that a resident has a tape of the proceedings and Game 1 proceedings however I have not obtained it yet - including the responses and remarks of the Hawkins &amp; Brown Game 1 facilitator. So we might be able to deal with a transcript of facts later on if that becomes necessary - which I am sure you will agree is better than wasting time swapping narratives.</p> <p>That Southwark chooses to continue with dishonest consultation practices even after March 2010 is a great disappointment to many.</p> <p>If you wish to come back, and do something again properly, this time working with residents in a decent, respectful, open and honest way, then I am sure people will be happy to help.</p> <p>Please do not make any use of the data collected in such an unethical and improper way. Hawkins &amp; Brown or Southwark. Or academic use by Hawkins &amp; Brown staff: chances are that as an academic that I'll come across it.</p> <p>I have copied this also to Cllr Veronica Ward who was a Game 1 participant.</p> <p>We have asked, perhaps demanded, repeatedly, no more gerrymandered dishonest consultations. And indeed, given the importance of these sites to Southwark, no more muck ups in regards to consultation or anything else for that matter. We have repeatedly offered help and assistance.</p> <p>So again, please raise Southwark Policy Planning standards and cease disrespecting me, other residents and our community.</p> <p>Please consider this and correspondence below as evidence for CW AAP Review and possible Judicial Review of that outcome</p>

Representation Ref	Objector Ref	Document	Details of Representation
350	971	Review informal consultation	<p>By way of introduction, I am the Chairperson of the TMHRA. I attended the 'Harmsworth Quays Consultation' on Saturday 17th of November, 2012. I was one of the people that raised my hand and requested that no tape recordings (film or photo) be undertaken of me during the second half of the session. As a courtesy, I would like to receive your assurance that none were taken and/or will be used in the future.</p> <p>In my opinion, the Workshop session 2 relating to the 'testing scenario game' was unsatisfactory.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What is the benefit of including the testing scenario game as part of the consultation process?</li> <li>- Why did the leisure facilities (which are integral to any community) score so negatively in the game?</li> <li>- Why did the open (green) space only have +1 point attached to this?</li> <li>- Why were there not enough cards for green space and leisure facilities?</li> <li>- Why did the 'high rise' density buildings score so positively in the game?</li> </ul> <p>In my opinion, there should have been more time dedicated to Q&amp;A and that all 'stakeholders' interested in this site should have been invited to present their intention (if any) for this area of land.</p> <p>During the testing scenario game: It should be noted that I had the 'portfolio of a young mum with children'. In my view, although I presented valid and appropriate feedback, I was extremely disappointed that I was told by a representative from 'Hawkins' "that leisure facilities and open space were not desirable and that they came at a cost."</p> <p>In our opinion, leisure facilities and open space are extremely important and integral to our enjoyment as a local community.</p> <p>In our opinion, given the importance of this consultation, we would like to request that the testing game scenario is not included as part of the process. That you invite all 'interested stakeholders' (developers and teaching institutions) to 'present their intention and/or interest in the Harmsworth Quays Site'. In our opinion, this will allow us to raise questions and provide feedback which may assist the Council during this consultation process.</p>



<b>Representation Ref</b>	<b>Objector Ref</b>	<b>Document</b>	<b>Details of Representation</b>
351	971	Review informal consultation	<p>Thank you for your reply.</p> <p>We note your response but we remain unclear about some of the points. To what extent, could we meet with you to discuss the Harmsworth Quays Site. Alternatively, to arrange a telephone call.</p> <p>We would like to clarify if we can forward your response to our members.</p> <p>We would be very happy to liaise with the other buildings and their nominated representatives and look to arrange a meeting in due course and as required. As requested, we would like to be kept in communication of any further consultations, meetings or updates as we would like to attend these community meetings.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing from you</p>