



## Key points

### IMPORTANT NOTE:

This is not full response and may not contain all key points and will not include the detailed responses to policies. Reference should be made to our full response dated 2 April 2021 and cross references to the main paragraphs in our response referring to each issue are given below.

## Overall points about the Vision for Lewisham and the Plan

	Paragraphs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lewisham should state a vision about Lewisham and what Lewisham wants to be not what the Mayor of London (from time to time) wants Lewisham to be.</li> </ul>	3-13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All the points in a Lewisham vision may not be achievable given the current London Plan, the Lewisham plan therefore needs to set out what it would lobby to change whilst working towards the London Plan as far as it has to by law.</li> </ul>	5,9, 71
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan needs to get away from Lewisham being a dormitory suburb and focus more on jobs and workspace than on housing.</li> </ul>	6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan needs to define what success looks like, with metrics and goalposts in order to measure progress towards that success.</li> </ul>	7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan needs to take into account how things will change to 2040 based on a post-COVID-19 environment. In particular the idea of "growth" needs reconsideration.</li> </ul>	8,29,31
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan needs to focus on the idea of a 15 minute city and get away from centralised services and centralised shopping centres.</li> </ul>	10,164-173, 182
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan needs to be responsive to what residents want and community-led; design-led is producing unhealthy, unsightly developments that are unliked by existing and potential residents</li> </ul>	11,30, 42-43, 63-66
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan should set out how the Council itself will contribute to the Vision. However, if the Plan is simply meant to be a Development Plan, then the Vision and the approach to achieving it should be set out in a separate document and the Vision, as far as a development plan is concerned, relegated to explanatory notes.</li> </ul>	12-13, 58-61
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tower blocks and higher density and more flat conversions will not achieve strategic objectives involving better or healthier living nor will they make for a borough where people can live for their whole lives.</li> </ul>	18,31
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposals in the Plan for protecting green space are welcome, but do not go far enough: the Plan needs to defend green space including all gardens and work to increasing the per capita green space available.</li> </ul>	20-21,32
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Mayor of London's plans with regards to cars are unrealistic and unworkable in the shorter term, the Borough's plan needs to acknowledge this and work with cars rather than against them until public transport is much better.</li> </ul>	53-56, 181-182, 199-222



## Key points

### A few of our detailed points on development policies

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better design principles, particularly for large buildings, and a fundamental reconsideration of the need for massive tower blocks.</li> </ul>	63-66, 77-102, Appx 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We strongly support the policy on the protection of back gardens, but there is need for greater protection for all gardens, particularly corner-sites which appear under threat.</li> </ul>	115-122
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better protection for Conservation Areas, particularly from inappropriate extensions (with a reconsideration of the current SPD), and including detailed design guides.</li> </ul>	111- 114, 131- 148, 258
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A commitment is needed to <u>increasing</u> green space per capita, particularly in the north of the Borough.</li> </ul>	115- 122, 184-197
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Back-land and infill development should be confined to brownfield sites.</li> </ul>	57, 115- 129
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stronger policies are needed on consultation, delivery, monitoring and enforcement, required to stop inappropriate development.</li> </ul>	259-268
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Borough should undertake to abide by the policies in respect of its own works (it is creating more damage to our Conservation Area than developers), particularly as regards roads, pavements, street trees and parks.</li> </ul>	195, 208- 210, 265
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better liaison and discussion and involvement with community groups and residents in a resident-centric process rather than a developer-centric process.</li> </ul>	269-270

### Specifics regards Telegraph Hill

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Telegraph Hill is not a regeneration area and the northern part of Telegraph Hill is not an Opportunity Area.</li> </ul>	28,46- 50
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan misunderstands Telegraph Hill as a neighbourhood. It splits the Hill between North and (mainly) West Areas: but predominantly residents of the Hill look to New Cross not Brockley and are affected by what goes on there. Telegraph Hill Conservation Area, Hatcham Conservation Area and the A2 through New Cross/New Cross Gate need to be looked at holistically.</li> </ul>	225-244
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposals for "Hatcham Works" are fundamentally wrong and need re-thinking at a lower density; 20-30 storey towers are not appropriate for the site; an optimum height is no more than 7 to 10 storeys.</li> </ul>	245- 254, Appx. 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any new proposals for "Hatcham Works" need to be considered in conjunction with new ideas for off-A2 shopping and more employment particularly around the cultural sector.</li> </ul>	170-173
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We support the proposals relating to the BLE. No development should take place on the "Hatcham Works" site unless at a low density until the BLE is built.</li> </ul>	215



## Key points

---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Car free proposals for “Hatcham Works” should be resisted in view significant concerns over the potential impact of a Controlled Parking Zone.</li></ul>	216-220 Appx 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Any further residential development on any scale requires the provision of a new park.</li></ul>	251
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Any proposals for developments or traffic calming measures should not drive more traffic through residential roads across Telegraph Hill.</li></ul>	53-56 254
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The proposal for removing restrictions on conversion of properties into flats, with a limit set just below the size of a property on Telegraph Hill needs a re-think. It has the potential to destroy the community with the area becoming a dormitory suburb or a student accommodation for Goldsmiths, rather than family homes.</li></ul>	149-158
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• More could be done in the Plan to increasing employment sites and new workspace around New Cross and New Cross Gate particularly given the creative industries which could surround Goldsmiths, with redesignation as a Mixed-use Employment Area.</li></ul>	163