




# Lee Neighbourhood Plan Section 14 Consultation

## 1. Lee Draft Neighbourhood Plan

## 2. Retail and Local Employment Areas

**Do you agree with Policy 1: Maintain, Improve and Sustain the Diversity, Vitality and Viability of Retail Sites? A. The retail sites within the Lee Forum area form vibrant hubs of local activity. Proposals which will improve the range of shops and social infrastructure within the sites, as defined in Figure 6, will be supported. Proposals should: 1.Retain or support an increase in the range of retail, employment, socio-cultural and leisure uses. 2.Encourage the use of vacant properties and land for pop-ups or meanwhile uses for retail, cultural and creative activities in order to stimulate and promote diversity of businesses and shops within the retail sites. 3.Respect and protect the character and heritage of the town centre, helping to create an attractive, welcoming and inclusive environment. 4. Promote the day and night time economy. B. Change of use resulting in the loss of retail, employment, socio-cultural and leisure services will not be supported.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above policy		83.50% 86
2	I agree with the above policy and but would like to see amendments		13.59% 14
3	I disagree with the above policy		2.91% 3
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.19	Std. Deviation: 0.46
	Variance:	0.21	Std. Error: 0.05
		Satisfaction Rate: 9.71	answered 103
			skipped 9

Please explain any points you would like addressed (27)

1	
2	There are more attractive options to shop locally now which is good for both the local economy and the bigger picture for example shopping on foot vs car emissions from delivery
3	The potential loss of metropolitan open land on the Bowrings sports ground if the new school gets the go ahead.
4	Where is the industry and so employment in the area. Retail premises will not last forever.  Lewisham council has a policy of turning the borough into a dormitory town to maximise council tax, parking and other income, this policy must be reversed
5	The town centre has some characterless buildings eg Lee Gate Centre and there should be an emphasis on improving the area rather than repeating the errors of poor planning control of previous eras.  We would not want to see Lee Green go the same way as the centre of Blackheath - with drunkenness and general anti-social behaviour late into the evening. So we'd like to see some restrictions on the types of 'night time' economy that is approved. Lee Green is inhabited by mainly families so family friendly should be a yard stick. economy.
6	The current retail sites have a village charm being small and adhoc. I would be concerned about sites being being/developed that did not conserve the heritage of the town centre for example a large shopping mall etc.
7	Respect the character of Lee Green shopping centre?  Why would you seek to do that?

**Do you agree with Policy 1: Maintain, Improve and Sustain the Diversity, Vitality and Viability of Retail Sites? A. The retail sites within the Lee Forum area form vibrant hubs of local activity. Proposals which will improve the range of shops and social infrastructure within the sites, as defined in Figure 6, will be supported. Proposals should: 1.Retain or support an increase in the range of retail, employment, socio-cultural and leisure uses. 2.Encourage the use of vacant properties and land for pop-ups or meanwhile uses for retail, cultural and creative activities in order to stimulate and promote diversity of businesses and shops within the retail sites. 3.Respect and protect the character and heritage of the town centre, helping to create an attractive, welcoming and inclusive environment. 4. Promote the day and night time economy. B. Change of use resulting in the loss of retail, employment, socio-cultural and leisure services will not be supported.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
8			
	Would like to ensure that opportunities for locally owned businesses are prioritised over nationwide retail chains.		
9			
	Change of use should be supported even if it does result in some losses (as listed) if this means an overall improvement to the area. Leegate and Lee Green currently have little character to preserve and one of the few buildings with heritage, The New Tigers Head pub, has been empty and in a sorry state for many years!		
10			
	It is not a fully formed idea, but could these pop up opportunities perhaps be community led in some cases or offered out to local community members or causes?		
11			
	I like the idea of protecting the character and heritage but some of the Lee Green estate could be aesthetically improved as well as structurally - it's not very inviting for local residents, dark, obscured, needs to feel safer. I'd like to see some of the vibe of Brockley and Blackheath to be reciprocated.		
12			
	I don't believe there should be interference about what shops and social infrastructure sites are held within the Lee forum area. If a landlord wants to let to a business and the business wants to set up in the Lee forum area then let them. Why should anyone have a right to intervene? If a business wants to set up in the Lee forum area they clearly think there is demand for it.  If a prperty owner wants to change the use then this would suggest that there is greater economic (and therefore social) benefit to the new proposed useage.		
13			
	The night time economy has to respect the need for residents to enjoy a peaceful sleep and avoid antisocial behaviours associated Any increase in food takeaway premises should include conditions about litter and waste container disposal		
14			
	Retail is dying many shops are underutilised and remain either empty or an eyesore and could be changed to increase housing		
15			
	I encourage the use of vacant properties or land for permanent, sustainable uses, over temporary pop-up uses		
16			
	Neglected properties are an issue locally, eg multiple use/mixed use buildings such as ground floor shop with flats above. In the Forum area there is a long-term empty shop with occupied flats above (Greenwich side of Lee Road) and a Chinese takeaway with badly maintained and seemingly empty floors above (Lewisham side of Lee Road). Local councils need to be more proactive in terms of enforcement, with greater use of S215 of the Town & Country Planning Act etc. So often they say that the issue isn't serious enough, knowing that it will only get worse over time.		
17			
	There is already a lot of traffic, I'd like to see reductions in traffic and parking. Don't support car based retail		
18			
	Any increase in footfall or people frequenting the area should be supported by appropriate traffic and air pollution controls so that the quality of life for residents is not adversely affected.		
19			
	I have no idea what this policy means as I don't know what is being proposed.  You need another option " I don't understand this policy".		




**Do you agree with Policy 1: Maintain, Improve and Sustain the Diversity, Vitality and Viability of Retail Sites? A. The retail sites within the Lee Forum area form vibrant hubs of local activity. Proposals which will improve the range of shops and social infrastructure within the sites, as defined in Figure 6, will be supported. Proposals should: 1.Retain or support an increase in the range of retail, employment, socio-cultural and leisure uses. 2.Encourage the use of vacant properties and land for pop-ups or meanwhile uses for retail, cultural and creative activities in order to stimulate and promote diversity of businesses and shops within the retail sites. 3.Respect and protect the character and heritage of the town centre, helping to create an attractive, welcoming and inclusive environment. 4. Promote the day and night time economy. B. Change of use resulting in the loss of retail, employment, socio-cultural and leisure services will not be supported.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
20	I think some of loss of retail could be considered if it results in an increase in residential units		
21	Premises remain empty for too long and flats above shops (example being at Lee Green) are allowed to remain empty and fall into disrepair. I particularly would like to see facilities being made available for young people and people who are disabled.		
22	I do not agree with the promotion of the "night time economy" We are already regularly disturbed by noise and antisocial behaviour There are already enough problems with alcohol misuse leading to poor public health and drug misuse and the night time economy by definition is increasing those problems which the community and local authority should be contributing to treating not encouraging profiteering through making them worse		
23	I have heard from several businesses over the years - including one currently in the process of getting set up and opening - that Lewisham Council is less than helpful when it comes to supporting businesses especially when it comes to change of use and/or extensive renovations of premises. It makes me so cross to hear that businesses that are investing time and significant money that will improve our community and increase business and retail options - and reduce the number of vacant premises - are not actively supported and effort made to make their lives MUCH easier, rather than harder. The impression I get often is that the Council can be incredibly bureaucratic in their response, rather than taking a more proactively supporting role in ensuring regulatory procedures are carried out as swiftly as possible for these businesses. The council should be looking after those who choose to invest in our community, not making their life miserable and more difficult!		
24	Please take steps to reduce traffic and air pollution in the area		
25	I'd love the Leegate Centre to be refurbished with its original character retained and optimised retail and social use and night time economy. I'd prefer this rather than have the current centre razed to the ground and replaced with a far larger less interesting development.		
26	Officers welcome the draft Plan's support of its town centres and employment areas. The Plan could encourage residential development within its town centres where this does not affect the vitality of the centre. Officers welcome the proactive Recommended further actions set out in the draft Plan.  In this regard, in conjunction with the borough, it should be considered whether the industrial areas should be referred to as Locally Significant Industrial Sites in line with draft London Plan policy E6. Draft London Plan policy E4 seeks to ensure no net loss of London's industrial capacity to enable London to continue to function. Industrial areas should not only be protected for their employment capacity but to ensure there is a wide range of industrial, logistics and related uses that are essential to the functioning of London's economy and for servicing the needs of its growing population.  In this regard the neighbourhood plan policy should ensure no net loss of industrial capacity in the forum's designated Local Employment Locations as detailed in Table 1. This should also be reflected in any site allocation containing industrial uses.  This section should refer to the Agent of Change principle as set out in draft London Plan policy D12.		

**Do you agree with Policy 1: Maintain, Improve and Sustain the Diversity, Vitality and Viability of Retail Sites? A. The retail sites within the Lee Forum area form vibrant hubs of local activity. Proposals which will improve the range of shops and social infrastructure within the sites, as defined in Figure 6, will be supported. Proposals should: 1.Retain or support an increase in the range of retail, employment, socio-cultural and leisure uses. 2.Encourage the use of vacant properties and land for pop-ups or meanwhile uses for retail, cultural and creative activities in order to stimulate and promote diversity of businesses and shops within the retail sites. 3.Respect and protect the character and heritage of the town centre, helping to create an attractive, welcoming and inclusive environment. 4. Promote the day and night time economy. B. Change of use resulting in the loss of retail, employment, socio-cultural and leisure services will not be supported.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
27	Certain circumstances might be best suited through the provision of equal, or additional replacement uses, or inclusion within mixed use developments of higher density which seek to balance growth with economic and cultural uses. However, certain buildings will have historic associations or be best suited to continued use in established functions. Policies should therefore help to set out where and how this is best achieved and a characterful and economically vibrant environment delivered.		

**Do you agree with Policy 2: Improve Design and Cohesion of Retail Sites? A. Councils should be encouraged to work together to create design codes and a masterplan to guide future development in the retail sites so that an integrated approach is adopted to the development of individual sites, with an emphasis on sustainable design that is accessible by all. B. Shopfronts, including signage and illumination, should complement and enhance the character, proportions, materials and detailing, wider streetscene, and the building of which it forms a part. C. Canopies, blinds and security shutters, where acceptable in principle, must be appropriate to the character of the shopfront and the surrounding context within which it is located. Large illuminated fascias and external security grilles should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances.**

			Response Percent	Response Total				
1	I fully support the above policy		84.31%	86				
2	I agree with the above policy and but would like to see amendments		11.76%	12				
3	I disagree with the above policy		3.92%	4				
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.2	Std. Deviation:	0.49	Satisfaction Rate:	9.8	answered	102
	Variance:	0.24	Std. Error:	0.05			skipped	10




Please explain any points you would like addressed (16)

1	I support this, but would like to mention the overuse of night lighting from business, it can be intrusive to nearby residents
2	Lee shopping centre is voted as the worst in the UK  Lee Green is divided by the arterial A20 and so can never be a cohesive centre and has absolutely no character or welcoming environment  Who decides acceptability, what criteria is there for decision and more importantly what are the qualifications of the deciders. Lewisham council clearly will only ever hold a neutral view based on national rules and party policy.  Bulldoze and start again,, if you want Poundbury you need to loose the arterial roads

**Do you agree with Policy 2: Improve Design and Cohesion of Retail Sites? A. Councils should be encouraged to work together to create design codes and a masterplan to guide future development in the retail sites so that an integrated approach is adopted to the development of individual sites, with an emphasis on sustainable design that is accessible by all. B. Shopfronts, including signage and illumination, should complement and enhance the character, proportions, materials and detailing, wider streetscene, and the building of which it forms a part. C. Canopies, blinds and security shutters, where acceptable in principle, must be appropriate to the character of the shopfront and the surrounding context within which it is located. Large illuminated fascias and external security grilles should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
3	I love canopies attractive shop fronts.		
4	security shutters/grilles probably keep bus. premiums down, suggest internal shutters to the building that should be subsidised in order to encourage retailers.		
5	I think it is perhaps too restrictive. I would rather have a vibrant and varied selection of retail outlets that have shutters than have a collection of soulless cookie cutter shops that can be found on any High Street but adhere to this policy.		
6	What is meant by sustainable design? Presumably businesses are already required to be accessible by all (I am assuming you are referring to physical access).  I believe business owners should be allowed to have their shop fronts as they want it. It is in their interests for it to be tasteful and fit i with the surrounding area. If not, so be it.		
7	Pavement space must allow for access along the walkway and not encroach and hinder pedestrians		
8	Security shutters are sadly a necessity, and may be required for a business to be insured. I think therefore your wording should be amended.		
9	I would rather it was worded... should complement OR enhance the character, so as to allow for a range of designs rather than a homogeneous design response, e.g. the use of universal fonts, colour schemes etc.		
10	I have less association with shopfronts. As long as they are keen and well kept I have no issue with security grilles etc		
11	As an aspiration this is fine, but where there are additional costs to achieving these outcomes this may be problematic for small traders struggling in a challenging retail environment		
12	There has to be some individuality		
13	It sounds reasonable.		
14	As a leasee in the leegate centre, and in view of recent thefts and damage to property, external shutters need to be considered and necessary. Whilst I wish they were not needed, sadly they are.		
15	Good in principle but how would Council take action against contraventions to this. Big retail companies and developers know that it is easy to swamp Councils with development plans, I would like the Council to be better funded and staff to adequately implement a well intentioned approach.		
16	Page 53 Policy R2. We would support the intention to work with the local authorities to guide future retail development and the use of design codes. However, it is unclear whether there are sufficient large scale sites which would benefit from or justify a full masterplanning approach. We do however note the identification of the sizeable Sainsbury's site and car showroom site and consider these might benefit from the requirement to prepare a planning-brief on the principles set out in the site allocations in the event of the site/s becoming vacant. This would help ensure that development is complementary in respect of design, use and public realm. We would suggest that consideration be given to an area strategy to illustrate and inform how future change should be managed. However, we would accept that an illustrative masterplan focused on improving connectivity, identifying opportunities and sites for enhancement could be a useful tool for steering positive change.		

**Do you agree with Policy 3: Improve and Enhance the Public Realm of Retail/Cultural Activity Sites A. Development should seek to provide public realm improvements that enhance the vitality of the retail sites. In addition to Policy C13, proposals in respect of retail sites should: 1. Improve the public realm through the provision of infrastructure that helps to link sites and aid connectivity. 2. Incorporate best practice in inclusive design to facilitate mobility and accessibility for all. 3. Give priority to pedestrians and cyclists. 4. Provide an appealing, healthy space with provision for green outdoor infrastructure.**

					Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above policy				89.11%	90
2	I agree with the above policy and but would like to see amendments				8.91%	9
3	I disagree with the above policy				1.98%	2
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.13	Std. Deviation:	0.39	Satisfaction Rate:	6.44
	Variance:	0.15	Std. Error:	0.04		
					answered	101
					skipped	11




Please explain any points you would like addressed (20)

1	I do not think we should penalise drivers with draconian traffic measures.
2	3. Cyclists must not be given any priority, until there is sufficient legislation to govern the way they ride vehicles (cycles), carry insurance and can be traced in case of accidents and law breaking.  This aim for policy 3 is far to encompassing and cannot be supported because it give 'carte blanche' for outlandish ideas.
3	Focus on plenty of cycle stands!
4	This is better
5	Giving even more priority to pedestrians and cyclists could cause even more problems with snarling the traffic up than it is already. Pedestrians and cyclists are important but most residents need to drive around as well and there are enough problems with slow traffic as it is. Please do not slow the traffic down or close roads off or it will be even more difficult for residents than it already is. However, please sort the commuter parking out and restrict people from having more cars than they need or bigger cars than they need. Taxing the physical width of cars would help immensely as cars are far wider than they used to be and this means that cars can no longer pass each other in streets where this was easily possible 20 years ago.
6	I partially agree that priority should be given to pedestrians and cyclists but I also think that reasonable parking should be provided to encourage use of the area. I'm sure lack of parking or prohibitively expensive parking is one of the main causes of the demise of our high streets and local shopping areas.
7	I do agree with number 4, but disagree with 1,2 and 3.  I do not see why priority should be given to pedestrian and cyclists (note - I personally do not own a car) I believe existing laws are more than sufficient to ensure mobility and accessibility for all I don't see why developers need to provide infrastructure that helps link sites - to some extent it is in their interests to do so.
8	Allowing traffic to flow freely, particularly along the high road is necessary to dissipate air pollution, rather than having a long line of traffic idling. Too many traffic calming schemes have had the effect of causing a traffic jam. A good example is the narrow gates at the junction of Leahurst and Ennersdale Rd, which at school pick up time causes a line of traffic 200 yards along Leahurst road. Giving priority to pedestrians and cyclists needs to be done in a way that doesn't cause traffic jams and worsen the air pollution in this area.
9	A green belt from Manor House Gardens to Lee Park/Dacre Park/Lee Church Street with maybe paving stones so that cars slow down - 20/h limit in that specific area to be able to cross safely on Lee High Road and have less pollution

**Do you agree with Policy 3: Improve and Enhance the Public Realm of Retail/Cultural Activity Sites A. Development should seek to provide public realm improvements that enhance the vitality of the retail sites. In addition to Policy C13, proposals in respect of retail sites should: 1. Improve the public realm through the provision of infrastructure that helps to link sites and aid connectivity. 2. Incorporate best practice in inclusive design to facilitate mobility and accessibility for all. 3. Give priority to pedestrians and cyclists. 4. Provide an appealing, healthy space with provision for green outdoor infrastructure.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
	It would be good to get another entrance/exit for Platform 6 over the trees with a glass/wood environmental construction and safer for children - please fund a feasibility study on this. The security in the station cannot be guaranteed as is, corridors are scary and cold and sometimes you're facing dogs not in leash when turning towards the exits.		
10	there should be increased provision to enhance health via sporting activities of all kinds		
11	With regard to this something has to be done about the tiger junction- it is terribly designed and could take you as many as four waits to get across. It's so pedestrian unfriendly. My six year old asked the other day- why do they only care about cars and not people. Is that the message you want to send to the younger generation?		
12	I'm reluctant to fully support point number 3. Whilst the idea of giving priority to pedestrians and cyclists over vehicles sounds good in principle I feel somewhat nervous about this. We cannot change the fact that the A20 is the main thoroughfare to London and keeping the traffic moving on this road rather than sitting with engines running is important. I know the better the traffic flows the more vehicles are likely to use a road so it never solves the problem, but giving pedestrians and cyclists priority which in turn causes more jams and frustrated drivers is not something I support at such a busy and important junction. I do however support this policy in theory in other parts of the Lee Forum area.		
13	Having nearly come to grief several times, on my own doorstep with cyclists heading towards me on the pavement - this must be avoided. The elderly and infirm do not move as fast. Tiny children, women with buggies, those with support walkers or trolleys are equally vulnerable. The supervision is required for those on e-scooters, scooters, skateboards etc etc.		
14	Point 3. Am worried such ABSOLUTE priority may prove counter-productive to the principle of total cohesion to the area. It needs careful consideration and thought.		
15	This consultation is unnecessarily wordy		
16	The road crossings with raised kerbs at the Tiger's Head junction are not pedestrian friendly. They are a trip hazard, and make it more difficult to cross the road.		
17	Why priority to cyclists? Point 2 says "for all".		
18	The main point should be the safety and enhancement of walking and cycling		
19	Please take specific steps to reduce the number of cars and trucks in the area		
20	Please see Historic England's webpages on public realm in the historic environment.  <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/streets-for-all/heag149-sfa-national/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/streets-for-all/heag149-sfa-national/</a>		

**Do you agree with Policy 4: Protect and encourage local employment sites? A. Proposals for regeneration of retail sites should protect existing businesses and incorporate them wherever possible into new developments. B. Proposals will be resisted which would prejudice the continuing industrial and commercial use of designated Local Employment Locations as detailed in Table 1, unless it can be demonstrated that existing uses are unviable and the premises have been vacant for a period of at least 2 years, with past efforts to market them and bring them into active use having failed to generate any interest. C. Permitted uses to include flexible B1c/B2/B8 uses, including related SME businesses compatible with its designation, where it can be demonstrated that the local economy will be diversified, enhanced and promoted. D. The change of use of disused lockup garages to B1c/B2/B8 uses will be supported where this will not impact upon residential amenity and subject to an appropriate design and layout, parking provision and access arrangements.**

						Response Percent	Response Total	
1	I fully support the above policy					82.83%	82	
2	I agree with the above policy and but would like to see amendments					13.13%	13	
3	I disagree with the above policy					4.04%	4	
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.21	Std. Deviation:	0.5	Satisfaction Rate:	10.61	answered	99
	Variance:	0.25	Std. Error:	0.05			skipped	13

Please explain any points you would like addressed (14)

1	To campaign Parliament/London Mayor and British Transport Police to enforce the law with regard to criminal damage/graffiti on both railway and private property including listed railway arches and new structures.
2	A cannot be supported because under current EU rules this would be considered as state aid. B Does not go far enough. There must be designated industrial areas that cannot be used for housing under any circumstance C, This must be fully explained to form part of a general survey, so is not a valid question. D, priority for these premises must go to non-retail sources of employment.
3	I don't fully understand what is described. However, I am concerned about environment and air pollution, 'industrial' just makes me think of pollution. I have been living in the area for only a few months but there have been several occasions where I saw my neighbours burning large amount of trash in the garden and the smell and the smoke getting into my house and triggering my asthma. The council has not done much about it.
4	I think 2 years vacant is too long, I would rather it say more about making a prolonged effort to bring them into active use (even if it says 2 years effort, I just think 2 years vacant doesn't push them to make much of an effort)
5	Why does local employment need to be encouraged? If businesses do not want to set up in Lee then they clearly don't want to. If it makes more economic sense to use a business site for another purpose then this should be encouraged.
6	Garages should be authorised to be converted into nano houses in the whole area, even in the conservation area, as long as it fits within the architectural rules and has planning approval of course (but possibly authorising some modern and nice designs though) - Probably not appropriate in Policy 4 but somewhere else.
7	I think I support this but do not know what B1c/B2/B8 means (no explanation provided) so this part of the document is not accessible to me.
8	I live on the Courtlands Estate and would have concerns on any change of use proposals regarding the garage areas. (At 199 pages the Consultation document is too much to contemplate reading 'on screen' so I'm unsure whether this is the correct segment to make the above comment.)




**Do you agree with Policy 4: Protect and encourage local employment sites? A. Proposals for regeneration of retail sites should protect existing businesses and incorporate them wherever possible into new developments. B. Proposals will be resisted which would prejudice the continuing industrial and commercial use of designated Local Employment Locations as detailed in Table 1, unless it can be demonstrated that existing uses are unviable and the premises have been vacant for a period of at least 2 years, with past efforts to market them and bring them into active use having failed to generate any interest. C. Permitted uses to include flexible B1c/B2/B8 uses, including related SME businesses compatible with its designation, where it can be demonstrated that the local economy will be diversified, enhanced and promoted. D. The change of use of disused lockup garages to B1c/B2/B8 uses will be supported where this will not impact upon residential amenity and subject to an appropriate design and layout, parking provision and access arrangements.**



		Response Percent	Response Total
9	The issue of poor ongoing management of sites is a major one, ie the Leegate, meaning that B could be seen as a get out clause for the developer		
10	Hard to understand		
11	Isn't converting garages into businesses simply infill. It will inevitably lead to more building.		
12	Leave private lock-up garages alone. This is draconian.		
13	Other uses should also be considered (D) to encourage a full range of local small businesses and a diverse range of services for local people		
14	I assume that change of use of disused lockups will not take place until owners and residents have had time to be involved in ideas for development opportunities.		

### 3. Green and Blue Spaces

**Do you agree with Policy 1: Protection and Enhancement of Green Spaces? A. All Green Spaces, as shown above, should be protected and enhanced. Development which results in the encroachment, loss or deterioration of an existing green space and/or its biodiversity value will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that this would result in public benefits which would outweigh any adverse impacts. Only developments that give due regard to the following stipulations shall be considered: 1. Replacement green space and infrastructure should be provided in the vicinity of the site as a priority, or elsewhere in the Lee Forum area to address deficiencies, to ensure that there would be no net loss of green space across the Lee Forum area. 2. The benefits of the scheme can be demonstrated to outweigh the loss that is to be suffered in terms of the natural capital value of green space. B. Proposals that achieve improvements in terms of the following criteria will be supported: 1. A net gain in biodiverse green space. 2. Improvements to the landscape setting with no net loss of permeable ground. 3. Improved access to existing or new green spaces. C. Developments of 10 dwellings or more should draw up a landscape scheme to demonstrate how improvements are to be achieved. D. Development adjacent to green space should ensure that any active frontages onto the space are maintained in order to provide natural surveillance. E. Development will not be supported that would result in the loss of, or would prejudice the use of, all or part of an existing playing field or land which has been used as a playing field (in public or private ownership), in line with Sport England policy guidance.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
1		86.41%	89

**Do you agree with Policy 1: Protection and Enhancement of Green Spaces? A. All Green Spaces, as shown above, should be protected and enhanced. Development which results in the encroachment, loss or deterioration of an existing green space and/or its biodiversity value will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that this would result in public benefits which would outweigh any adverse impacts. Only developments that give due regard to the following stipulations shall be considered: 1. Replacement green space and infrastructure should be provided in the vicinity of the site as a priority, or elsewhere in the Lee Forum area to address deficiencies, to ensure that there would be no net loss of green space across the Lee Forum area. 2. The benefits of the scheme can be demonstrated to outweigh the loss that is to be suffered in terms of the natural capital value of green space. B. Proposals that achieve improvements in terms of the following criteria will be supported: 1. A net gain in biodiverse green space. 2. Improvements to the landscape setting with no net loss of permeable ground. 3. Improved access to existing or new green spaces. C. Developments of 10 dwellings or more should draw up a landscape scheme to demonstrate how improvements are to be achieved. D. Development adjacent to green space should ensure that any active frontages onto the space are maintained in order to provide natural surveillance. E. Development will not be supported that would result in the loss of, or would prejudice the use of, all or part of an existing playing field or land which has been used as a playing field (in public or private ownership), in line with Sport England policy guidance.**

					Response Percent	Response Total
2					11.65%	12
3					1.94%	2
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.16	Std. Deviation:	0.41	Satisfaction Rate:	7.77
	Variance:	0.17	Std. Error:	0.04		
					answered	103
					skipped	9




Please explain any points you would like addressed (17)

1	The parks and green spaces in this area are important for leisure, health and well-being.  That said, where priorities such as the International School proposes a permanent site on the nearby green space, this should be considered equally important to provide much needed quality school places in the area.
2	D - define an 'active' frontage
3	Regarding point C, I would suggest that even smaller development be subject to this requirement e.g 5 or more dwellings.
4	Consultation from residents should be required where green space may be affected
5	I would like it to simply say that no green space will be built on and that building projects that incorporate green space and improvement in access to public green spaces and the biodiversity of the area will be prioritised. I think this policy leaves it open for us to lose chunks of green space that are then moved to other areas resulting in a number of incredibly small green spaces instead of one large one which is better suited both to public use and enjoyment and the sustaining of plant and animal life.
6	On E-I am not sure if this applies for the school IAG or not but this school should be built - maybe an alternative would be to have that school in the "new" Leegate centre.
7	Where construction of a facility, e.g. a school, changing rooms or sports club enhances and increases the use of existing sports fields, then some loss of part of an existing playing field should be considered.
	"Development of 10 dwellings or more....." That's a bit dated now. Developments seem to be tower blocks for 100+ residences - with no allowance for car ownership. I hope the Forum will be able to successfully oppose any such schemes.

**Do you agree with Policy 1: Protection and Enhancement of Green Spaces? A. All Green Spaces, as shown above, should be protected and enhanced. Development which results in the encroachment, loss or deterioration of an existing green space and/or its biodiversity value will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that this would result in public benefits which would outweigh any adverse impacts. Only developments that give due regard to the following stipulations shall be considered: 1. Replacement green space and infrastructure should be provided in the vicinity of the site as a priority, or elsewhere in the Lee Forum area to address deficiencies, to ensure that there would be no net loss of green space across the Lee Forum area. 2. The benefits of the scheme can be demonstrated to outweigh the loss that is to be suffered in terms of the natural capital value of green space. B. Proposals that achieve improvements in terms of the following criteria will be supported: 1. A net gain in biodiverse green space. 2. Improvements to the landscape setting with no net loss of permeable ground. 3. Improved access to existing or new green spaces. C. Developments of 10 dwellings or more should draw up a landscape scheme to demonstrate how improvements are to be achieved. D. Development adjacent to green space should ensure that any active frontages onto the space are maintained in order to provide natural surveillance. E. Development will not be supported that would result in the loss of, or would prejudice the use of, all or part of an existing playing field or land which has been used as a playing field (in public or private ownership), in line with Sport England policy guidance.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
	What is "natural surveillance"?		
	The Bowring Sports Field in particular needs to be protected as Metropolitan Open Land - it's a relief that the recent plan to build a school was rejected, for many different reasons (environmental, transport, impact on nearby residential properties, etc).		
	Height restrictions for our limited green spaces should also be put in place. Many locals overlook these spaces and although we recognise it is difficult to protect all open land and green spaces, the impact to quality of life for neighbours should be taken wholeheartedly into consideration.		
	Promises have been made in the past and then broken e.g the Lewisham gateway		
	Increase viable sporting facilities in the area		
	The open area at Leegate should be "greened". There should be a set limit on the proportion of green space in developments of 10 dwellings or more.		
	Again, without knowing what will be done how can amendments be proposed? But yes, green space is important.		
	As long as what is currently outdoor space is not encroached on by commercial or semi commercial pay to use indoor sports facilities or car parking as has happened in Sutcliffe Park		
	I don't think there should be any ability for existing green spaces to be diminished in any way. This is a slippery slope and phrases such as " it can be demonstrated that this would result in public benefits which would outweigh any adverse impacts" is far too nebulous and open to exploitation. There is no excuse at this time with the levels of pollution we are experiencing and the issues of climate change to be entertaining any reduction of green spaces. They, and permeable ground in general, should actively be being increased, along with tree planting. This hedging aspect of this policy on green spaces is unacceptable to my mind.		

**Do you agree with Policy 2: Achieving a Green Infrastructure-Led Development Approach A. Development will be required to make a positive contribution to the quality of the public realm through biodiversity green infrastructure provision and permeable surfaces wherever possible. The scale of green infrastructure provision should be proportionate to the size of the scheme and demonstrate how it meets the following criteria: 1. A net greening of the Lee Forum area, avoiding where possible any areas of hard landscaping. 2. Demonstrate how wider ecosystem services, particularly for climate adaptation, are being met, such as addressing the Urban Heat Island, air quality, management of storm-water runoff and promoting the wellbeing of inhabitants. 3. Enhanced biodiversity through the provision, where appropriate, of multi-layered green infrastructure such as green roofs, green walls, trees, shrubs, hedges, swales, rain gardens and community planting areas, which will benefit visual amenity and wildlife value. 4. Incorporate appropriate landscape buffers between highways and pedestrian areas where viable, and seek to use tree and shrub planting as a means of slowing down traffic and addressing poor air quality. 5. Provision for new green infrastructure should be accompanied by a management and maintenance plan which outlines how the green space will be maintained and managed, where appropriate in agreement with local stakeholders and through covenants. 6. Provide evidence for the appropriate selection and design of green infrastructure, including the selection of appropriate tree species, hedges and grasses to address wider issues like air pollution or avoiding allergy hotspots. 7. Ensure adequate grey water harvesting schemes from green roof provision are incorporated where possible into new development proposals.**

					Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above policy				87.13%	88
2	I agree with the above policy but would like to see amendments				10.89%	11
3	I disagree with the above policy				1.98%	2
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.15	Std. Deviation:	0.41	Satisfaction Rate:	7.43
	Variance:	0.17	Std. Error:	0.04		
					answered	101
					skipped	11




Please explain any points you would like addressed (14)

1	Green roofs are not in keeping with the character of the area  5 & 6. far to wide ranging what is 'green' infrastructure ( not the loose example of one form mentioned in 3, The comment about trees and shrubbery is distracting the principle issue.  4. traffic slowing will increase pollution as traffic selects lower higher revving gears to maintain speed. Also will provide a false sense of security against speeding cyclists.
2	What you're suggesting prohibits any developments.
3	In item 7, what does 'where possible' mean. In most cases it is technically possible but often the developers come up with a reason of cost not to do it. I suggest this requirement needs to be firmer.
4	I disagree with point 4 about the slowing of traffic. Thr 20mph limit already in place is to slow - and I am a non car driver. More often than not it is not even possible to drive vry fast in the borough as it is.
5	Again, schemes that slow down traffic run the risk of causing localised traffic jams which actually worsen air pollution.
6	This is ok for public areas but you should consider the concept to divide current lands privately owned into 2 with the possible addition of a new dwelling/Nano house as long as architectural rules are followed. The pressure on prices and cost of living make it highly possible that people would be interested to build a second small house for their adult children in their garden when big enough.
7	All should be considered, where practicable

**Do you agree with Policy 2: Achieving a Green Infrastructure-Led Development Approach A. Development will be required to make a positive contribution to the quality of the public realm through biodiversity green infrastructure provision and permeable surfaces wherever possible. The scale of green infrastructure provision should be proportionate to the size of the scheme and demonstrate how it meets the following criteria: 1. A net greening of the Lee Forum area, avoiding where possible any areas of hard landscaping. 2. Demonstrate how wider ecosystem services, particularly for climate adaptation, are being met, such as addressing the Urban Heat Island, air quality, management of storm-water runoff and promoting the wellbeing of inhabitants. 3. Enhanced biodiversity through the provision, where appropriate, of multi-layered green infrastructure such as green roofs, green walls, trees, shrubs, hedges, swales, rain gardens and community planting areas, which will benefit visual amenity and wildlife value. 4. Incorporate appropriate landscape buffers between highways and pedestrian areas where viable, and seek to use tree and shrub planting as a means of slowing down traffic and addressing poor air quality. 5. Provision for new green infrastructure should be accompanied by a management and maintenance plan which outlines how the green space will be maintained and managed, where appropriate in agreement with local stakeholders and through covenants. 6. Provide evidence for the appropriate selection and design of green infrastructure, including the selection of appropriate tree species, hedges and grasses to address wider issues like air pollution or avoiding allergy hotspots. 7. Ensure adequate grey water harvesting schemes from green roof provision are incorporated where possible into new development proposals.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
8	Would it be helpful to achieving better priority for pedestrians and cyclists and increased street tree planting if more one way streets were created in residential areas? I'm thinking of the streets around Manor Park up to Manor House Gardens but I'm sure there will also be other suitable ones like around Micheldever Road and so on. Then trees could be planted out into the road space creating more pavement space for pedestrians and cyclists.		
9	We need as much 'green' as possible, to absorb CO2, and to ensure a more 'human' environment.		
10	So generic		
11	What about solar panels on new developments?		
12	Potential use of landscape buffers; trees and shrubs to help reduce traffic noise along major roads within the Area.		
13	Remember our green spaces also include lots of gardens. There are large gardens in our area with mature trees. These help water absorption and reduce pollution. We are in a high risk area for flash (rainwater) flooding and medium risk for river flooding (Environment Agency). Front gardens are being converted to car parks. Back gardens are being built on: big extensions, non permeable patios, and garden rooms. This must increase flood risk. Any new individual residential development should have to take flood risk into account, including for permitted development, and planning authorities should take this into account. To my certain knowledge, flood risk assessments are currently waived by the planning authorities in high risk areas in the Lee Forum area. I remember significant flash flooding. It happens!		
14	The historic environment is often considered a barrier to delivering greener infrastructure. However, the historic environment is a key element of a sustainable planning approach as set out in the NPPF, and should be protected and enhanced alongside the delivery of other environmental improvements and as such we support a balanced approach which addresses the significance of the historic environment while delivering mutually beneficial changes.  <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/research/current/threats/heritage-climate-change-environment/reponses/">https://historicengland.org.uk/research/current/threats/heritage-climate-change-environment/reponses/</a>		

**Do you agree with Policy 3: Designation of Nature Improvement Areas shown in map above? A. Two Nature Improvement Areas (NIAs) are to be designated NIA 1 The River Quaggy Trail and NIA 2 Hither Green Nature Trail Link. New development in the vicinity of these areas should seek opportunities to improve green infrastructure and provide opportunities for nature conservation. B. NIA 1 The River Quaggy Trail: The trail will be designated as a local green chain link and form an ecological corridor between Sutcliffe Park towards Lee Green District Town Centre and beyond, linking the Forum area's local parks towards Lee High Road. This will form an extension of the South East London Green Chain Walk. Proposals should: 1. Support infrastructure and facilities to improve walking and cycling provision, linking the different stages of the route. 2. Maintain the ecological network by contributing to the creation of a linear park along the River Quaggy to create a natural parkland setting that provides access to the Quaggy and meets the deficiency for access to local parks in the Forum area. 3. Ensure the natural banks and flood plain of the River Quaggy are maintained. 4. Seek to improve the ecological status of the river and enhance ecosystem service provision, particularly the role of the natural environment for flood risk management. C. NIA 2 Hither Green Nature Trail Link: Any future development or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity should maximise the opportunities to create a nature trail, linking it to the proposed nature trail south of St Mildred's Road. Proposals should: 1. Maintain the ecological network by creating a linear nature trail that connects south of St Mildred's Road. 2. Manage the area for Nature Conservation purposes in line with its Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) designation.**

					Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above policy				91.18%	93
2	I agree with the above policy but would like to see amendments				5.88%	6
3	I disagree with the above policy				2.94%	3
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.12	Std. Deviation:	0.4	Satisfaction Rate:	5.88
	Variance:	0.16	Std. Error:	0.04		
					answered	102
					skipped	10




Please explain any points you would like addressed (10)

1	B 1. Not until there is sufficient national regulation to control law-breaking cyclists and this puts pedestrians at risk of serious injury. B 2, Will this include the bulldozing of adjoining property ?
2	I don't think there is a deficiency of access for local parks in the forum area. Also not a great fan of linear nature trails - having recently lived in Melbourne where most of the inner city green areas were linear trails I missed the large green parks of London
3	Prioritise school accesses as much as possible + link to Blackheath for the green belts
4	Have you considered enlisting the support of The Ramblers Association (Ramblers) for the walkways?
5	I would like to see nature reserves at Hither Green station more open to the public
6	Very important to achieve these policies.
7	Great idea!
8	Whilst I agree with the concept. The proposal for the quaggy walkway will need amending as this currently opens onto Millers meadow, which is a privately owned road. Opening up our road (which we part own, so not sure you can legally do it anyway) increases security risk to our houses and space where children currently play safe and securely by allowing access to strangers and those with no right of way across our private road.

**Do you agree with Policy 3: Designation of Nature Improvement Areas shown in map above? A. Two Nature Improvement Areas (NIAs) are to be designated NIA 1 The River Quaggy Trail and NIA 2 Hither Green Nature Trail Link. New development in the vicinity of these areas should seek opportunities to improve green infrastructure and provide opportunities for nature conservation. B. NIA 1 The River Quaggy Trail: The trail will be designated as a local green chain link and form an ecological corridor between Sutcliffe Park towards Lee Green District Town Centre and beyond, linking the Forum area's local parks towards Lee High Road. This will form an extension of the South East London Green Chain Walk. Proposals should: 1. Support infrastructure and facilities to improve walking and cycling provision, linking the different stages of the route. 2. Maintain the ecological network by contributing to the creation of a linear park along the River Quaggy to create a natural parkland setting that provides access to the Quaggy and meets the deficiency for access to local parks in the Forum area. 3. Ensure the natural banks and flood plain of the River Quaggy are maintained. 4. Seek to improve the ecological status of the river and enhance ecosystem service provision, particularly the role of the natural environment for flood risk management. C. NIA 2 Hither Green Nature Trail Link: Any future development or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity should maximise the opportunities to create a nature trail, linking it to the proposed nature trail south of St Mildred's Road. Proposals should: 1. Maintain the ecological network by creating a linear nature trail that connects south of St Mildred's Road. 2. Manage the area for Nature Conservation purposes in line with its Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) designation.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
9	I agree with this on the whole but views of residents but be sought to ensure that other areas are not overlooked and those with good local knowledge are fully involved with the development of such schemes.		
10	We would also encourage the opportunity to incorporate heritage interpretation strategies with new initiatives to increase the interest, understanding and enjoyment of the historic and natural landscape.		

**Do you agree with Policy 4: Protection and Increase of Tree Cover? A. Development will not be supported where this would result in an unacceptable loss of, or damage to, existing trees and canopy cover of significant amenity, biodiversity or natural capital value, including both trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders and mature trees (Aged 10+ years). B. Where existing trees are impacted by the development, a tree survey report and Tree Protection Study should be provided as part of a development scheme. C. Part of both councils' validation criteria should include a requirement to work with the respective tree officers and Lee Forum at the earliest opportunity to ensure the protection of trees as part of the Forum area's wider Green Infrastructure contribution. Decisions should be minuted as part of any pre-application discussions or other decisions. D. Proposals should demonstrate how: 1. The design options have carefully considered how to creatively incorporate existing trees into the scheme. 2. The design has maximised the potential for new trees and hedges to be planted, especially where they can benefit air quality along major routes, car parks and public realm or to achieve other ecosystem services. 3. New pavements laid around new or existing trees will have permeable square surrounds and sufficient drainage to avoid damage to pavements. 4. An appropriate type/species has been used and the strategic placement of trees will not adversely affect amenity, allergy sufferers or cause unintended pollution corridors. 5. In instances where new trees cannot be planted as a result of underground utilities, the scheme offers creative alternative green infrastructure provision in line with Policy GB2, to be of equal or improved biodiversity value. 6. The adequate provision of root protection areas is in place to avoid tree damage. E. The removal of trees subject to Tree Protection Orders (TPOs) and any mature tree should be avoided and exceptional circumstances must be justified where such trees are proposed to be removed. Where the removal of existing trees cannot be avoided, the proposal should: 1. Replace trees at a ratio of 3:1 and be of equal or greater corresponding value (quantity, maturity and biodiversity). 2. Consider the lag time in the establishment of a new canopy cover when selection of tree type and age is made. Proposals should include a species that is of equal merit, or one that delivers enhanced habitat or, if strategically placed (for example in a pollution hotspot), is better at absorbing pollutants. 3. Ensure that vacant tree pits should not be tarmaced, and should instead be replaced with new trees or other appropriate shrubs or flowers pending replacement. 4. Offer the remains of removed trees to the community in the first instance for the creation of benches, sculptures, mulch or other useful items, thereby maintaining a legacy of use within the same neighbourhood. 5. Show how every effort has been made to incorporate the trees into proposals, including drawings from the earliest conception of those proposals. 6. Show how tree officers in the councils have been engaged in meaningful and collaborative consultation from the earliest stages and during all stages of proposal developments.**

					Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above policy				89.11%	90
2	I agree with the above policy but would like to see amendments				8.91%	9
3	I disagree with the above policy				1.98%	2
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.13	Std. Deviation:	0.39	Satisfaction Rate:	6.44
	Variance:	0.15	Std. Error:	0.04		
					answered	101
					skipped	11

Please explain any points you would like addressed (12)

1		In such a high traffic polluted are, maintaining trees and green spaces is critical for the environment
2		D 2. Trees with roots that lift pavements must be avoided so blind and disabled people are protected D.3 No open grids are a danger to wild and other animals where feet can be trapped in a grid and



**Do you agree with Policy 4: Protection and Increase of Tree Cover? A. Development will not be supported where this would result in an unacceptable loss of, or damage to, existing trees and canopy cover of significant amenity, biodiversity or natural capital value, including both trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders and mature trees (Aged 10+ years). B. Where existing trees are impacted by the development, a tree survey report and Tree Protection Study should be provided as part of a development scheme. C. Part of both councils' validation criteria should include a requirement to work with the respective tree officers and Lee Forum at the earliest opportunity to ensure the protection of trees as part of the Forum area's wider Green Infrastructure contribution. Decisions should be minuted as part of any pre-application discussions or other decisions. D. Proposals should demonstrate how: 1. The design options have carefully considered how to creatively incorporate existing trees into the scheme. 2. The design has maximised the potential for new trees and hedges to be planted, especially where they can benefit air quality along major routes, car parks and public realm or to achieve other ecosystem services. 3. New pavements laid around new or existing trees will have permeable square surrounds and sufficient drainage to avoid damage to pavements. 4. An appropriate type/species has been used and the strategic placement of trees will not adversely affect amenity, allergy sufferers or cause unintended pollution corridors. 5. In instances where new trees cannot be planted as a result of underground utilities, the scheme offers creative alternative green infrastructure provision in line with Policy GB2, to be of equal or improved biodiversity value. 6. The adequate provision of root protection areas is in place to avoid tree damage. E. The removal of trees subject to Tree Protection Orders (TPOs) and any mature tree should be avoided and exceptional circumstances must be justified where such trees are proposed to be removed. Where the removal of existing trees cannot be avoided, the proposal should: 1. Replace trees at a ratio of 3:1 and be of equal or greater corresponding value (quantity, maturity and biodiversity). 2. Consider the lag time in the establishment of a new canopy cover when selection of tree type and age is made. Proposals should include a species that is of equal merit, or one that delivers enhanced habitat or, if strategically placed (for example in a pollution hotspot), is better at absorbing pollutants. 3. Ensure that vacant tree pits should not be tarmaced, and should instead be replaced with new trees or other appropriate shrubs or flowers pending replacement. 4. Offer the remains of removed trees to the community in the first instance for the creation of benches, sculptures, mulch or other useful items, thereby maintaining a legacy of use within the same neighbourhood. 5. Show how every effort has been made to incorporate the trees into proposals, including drawings from the earliest conception of those proposals. 6. Show how tree officers in the councils have been engaged in meaningful and collaborative consultation from the earliest stages and during all stages of proposal developments.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
	<p>are a total menace to white stick users  D4 as D2 Trees with roots that lift pavements must be avoided so blind and disabled people are protected  D6 as D2 Trees with roots that lift pavements must be avoided so blind and disabled people are protected</p> <p>E3, cannot be sustainable as this will restrict the provision of a nearby tree, not common sense</p> <p>E4, just bonkers, disease, benches - really what about health and safety</p> <p>E.6. and the properties in the vicinity of such developments</p>		
3	<p>The Lee Manor Society have done a huge amount of work on maintaining mature trees in the area and it might be useful to include them in Paragraph C above as a group who should be consulted and asked for their expertise, unless they have said they don't want to be mentioned. They don't cover the whole Forum area but have a lot of knowledge of the Lee Urban District town centre.</p>		

**Do you agree with Policy 4: Protection and Increase of Tree Cover? A. Development will not be supported where this would result in an unacceptable loss of, or damage to, existing trees and canopy cover of significant amenity, biodiversity or natural capital value, including both trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders and mature trees (Aged 10+ years). B. Where existing trees are impacted by the development, a tree survey report and Tree Protection Study should be provided as part of a development scheme. C. Part of both councils' validation criteria should include a requirement to work with the respective tree officers and Lee Forum at the earliest opportunity to ensure the protection of trees as part of the Forum area's wider Green Infrastructure contribution. Decisions should be minuted as part of any pre-application discussions or other decisions. D. Proposals should demonstrate how: 1. The design options have carefully considered how to creatively incorporate existing trees into the scheme. 2. The design has maximised the potential for new trees and hedges to be planted, especially where they can benefit air quality along major routes, car parks and public realm or to achieve other ecosystem services. 3. New pavements laid around new or existing trees will have permeable square surrounds and sufficient drainage to avoid damage to pavements. 4. An appropriate type/species has been used and the strategic placement of trees will not adversely affect amenity, allergy sufferers or cause unintended pollution corridors. 5. In instances where new trees cannot be planted as a result of underground utilities, the scheme offers creative alternative green infrastructure provision in line with Policy GB2, to be of equal or improved biodiversity value. 6. The adequate provision of root protection areas is in place to avoid tree damage. E. The removal of trees subject to Tree Protection Orders (TPOs) and any mature tree should be avoided and exceptional circumstances must be justified where such trees are proposed to be removed. Where the removal of existing trees cannot be avoided, the proposal should: 1. Replace trees at a ratio of 3:1 and be of equal or greater corresponding value (quantity, maturity and biodiversity). 2. Consider the lag time in the establishment of a new canopy cover when selection of tree type and age is made. Proposals should include a species that is of equal merit, or one that delivers enhanced habitat or, if strategically placed (for example in a pollution hotspot), is better at absorbing pollutants. 3. Ensure that vacant tree pits should not be tarmaced, and should instead be replaced with new trees or other appropriate shrubs or flowers pending replacement. 4. Offer the remains of removed trees to the community in the first instance for the creation of benches, sculptures, mulch or other useful items, thereby maintaining a legacy of use within the same neighbourhood. 5. Show how every effort has been made to incorporate the trees into proposals, including drawings from the earliest conception of those proposals. 6. Show how tree officers in the councils have been engaged in meaningful and collaborative consultation from the earliest stages and during all stages of proposal developments.**




		Response Percent	Response Total
4	Trees should be protected as much as possible, but not at the risk of causing damage to existing buildings or people's homes. Where trees need to be removed for this reason, they should certainly be replaced with appropriate greenery		
5	Too stringent - sometimes you need to get rid of a tree Also there are some in Manor House Gardens that look dangerous, like the one opposite the 60/62 Manor Lane. They have to be checked on a yearly basis to ensure there is no danger for the population.		
6	I think Lewisham must increase capacity at tree officer level or these plans will not be carried through due to lack of capacity that currently exists. I also think considerations of street tree planting need to be linked to development of a more enabling street furniture policy in Lewisham where we have too many signs/poles on unnecessarily on curbsides meaning that tree planting is obstructed and not being given due priority.		
7	I do like no.4 and would like to explore how this could be achieved.		

**Do you agree with Policy 4: Protection and Increase of Tree Cover? A. Development will not be supported where this would result in an unacceptable loss of, or damage to, existing trees and canopy cover of significant amenity, biodiversity or natural capital value, including both trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders and mature trees (Aged 10+ years). B. Where existing trees are impacted by the development, a tree survey report and Tree Protection Study should be provided as part of a development scheme. C. Part of both councils' validation criteria should include a requirement to work with the respective tree officers and Lee Forum at the earliest opportunity to ensure the protection of trees as part of the Forum area's wider Green Infrastructure contribution. Decisions should be minuted as part of any pre-application discussions or other decisions. D. Proposals should demonstrate how: 1. The design options have carefully considered how to creatively incorporate existing trees into the scheme. 2. The design has maximised the potential for new trees and hedges to be planted, especially where they can benefit air quality along major routes, car parks and public realm or to achieve other ecosystem services. 3. New pavements laid around new or existing trees will have permeable square surrounds and sufficient drainage to avoid damage to pavements. 4. An appropriate type/species has been used and the strategic placement of trees will not adversely affect amenity, allergy sufferers or cause unintended pollution corridors. 5. In instances where new trees cannot be planted as a result of underground utilities, the scheme offers creative alternative green infrastructure provision in line with Policy GB2, to be of equal or improved biodiversity value. 6. The adequate provision of root protection areas is in place to avoid tree damage. E. The removal of trees subject to Tree Protection Orders (TPOs) and any mature tree should be avoided and exceptional circumstances must be justified where such trees are proposed to be removed. Where the removal of existing trees cannot be avoided, the proposal should: 1. Replace trees at a ratio of 3:1 and be of equal or greater corresponding value (quantity, maturity and biodiversity). 2. Consider the lag time in the establishment of a new canopy cover when selection of tree type and age is made. Proposals should include a species that is of equal merit, or one that delivers enhanced habitat or, if strategically placed (for example in a pollution hotspot), is better at absorbing pollutants. 3. Ensure that vacant tree pits should not be tarmaced, and should instead be replaced with new trees or other appropriate shrubs or flowers pending replacement. 4. Offer the remains of removed trees to the community in the first instance for the creation of benches, sculptures, mulch or other useful items, thereby maintaining a legacy of use within the same neighbourhood. 5. Show how every effort has been made to incorporate the trees into proposals, including drawings from the earliest conception of those proposals. 6. Show how tree officers in the councils have been engaged in meaningful and collaborative consultation from the earliest stages and during all stages of proposal developments.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
8	The importance of council officer input is crucial and we have to be aware of the professionalism, local knowledge and availability required. Local residents should be encouraged (recruited?) to help in their own streets.		
9	Policy 4 E is too onerous. The policy needs to reflect a " right tree in the right place " policy		
10	No trees should be removed		
11	The relevant council should pay for removal of any trees with TPOs that care causing damage to residential properties		
12	Officers welcome the protection and support for the enhancement of green and blue spaces and biodiversity across the forum area. The specific measures identified for enhancement could be identified as priorities for the expenditure of Community Infrastructure Levy funds.		

#### 4. Heritage and Design

**Do you agree with Policy 1: Designation, Conservation and Enhancement of Heritage Assets** The Lee Neighbourhood Development Plan seeks to protect and conserve the unique contribution afforded by the area's designated and non-designated built heritage assets in order to maintain the consistent and harmonious character of the neighbourhood. Development proposals should: 1. Protect, conserve and enhance the architectural authenticity of heritage assets and their contribution to the area's townscape quality and character. 2. Ensure that design of future developments respect, enhance and utilise the heritage assets and their features in order that they sympathetically integrate into the local character and identity. 3. Justify any alterations or additional enhancements through a heritage statement that is proportionate to the significance identified for the asset. 4. Ensure that any additional enhancements take every opportunity to sympathetically incorporate sustainable design features which enhance the building's energy efficiency whilst protecting its character and heritage value. 5. Protect buildings' principal facades, especially where impact to the public realm can be demonstrated, and where the façade is of architectural and townscape merit that contributes to the heritage value and local distinctiveness of the location. 6. Where possible demonstrate that opportunities have been taken to reinstate particular design features where these have been removed, to minimise any disruptions to the streetscape character 7. Support the retention wherever possible of public realm heritage features such as street lights, pillar boxes, public phone boxes, shop signage and street name signage.

					Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above policy				84.31%	86
2	I agree with the above policy and but would like to see amendments				13.73%	14
3	I disagree with the above policy				1.96%	2
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.18	Std. Deviation:	0.43	Satisfaction Rate:	8.82
	Variance:	0.18	Std. Error:	0.04		
					answered	102
					skipped	10




Please explain any points you would like addressed (13)

1	
2	1. Does this include Leegate and Sainsburys ? 2 The Holy Trinity school and the opposite housing estate are both disasters in this respect
3	The planning process is currently too prohibitive.  It is forces people to appeal to Bristol (and normally win) but at added cost.  It is driving families away
4	Suggest deleting the 'where possible' from item 6. This should be demonstrated.
5	I have read the relevant section of the plan and strongly oppose the following two points: 1. Work with New Tigers Head working group to create community hub there. Look for funding. Cultural Quarters of London Plan and Borough of Culture bid. Bid for community shares funding <a href="http://locality.org.uk/news/3m-boost-local-people-wanting-businesscommunity-hands/">http://locality.org.uk/news/3m-boost-local-people-wanting-businesscommunity-hands/</a> 2. Work with cinema and arts providers to bring about desired diversity into the empty areas of the Lee District Town Centre
6	We should also consider the creating of new heritage with design that is bold and striking.
7	Modern (glass-type/zinc) additional enhancements through a heritage statement could be considered as long as nice with the environment - This is very frequent in North London and very beautiful.

**Do you agree with Policy 1: Designation, Conservation and Enhancement of Heritage Assets** The Lee Neighbourhood Development Plan seeks to protect and conserve the unique contribution afforded by the area's designated and non-designated built heritage assets in order to maintain the consistent and harmonious character of the neighbourhood. Development proposals should: 1. Protect, conserve and enhance the architectural authenticity of heritage assets and their contribution to the area's townscape quality and character. 2. Ensure that design of future developments respect, enhance and utilise the heritage assets and their features in order that they sympathetically integrate into the local character and identity. 3. Justify any alterations or additional enhancements through a heritage statement that is proportionate to the significance identified for the asset. 4. Ensure that any additional enhancements take every opportunity to sympathetically incorporate sustainable design features which enhance the building's energy efficiency whilst protecting its character and heritage value. 5. Protect buildings' principal facades, especially where impact to the public realm can be demonstrated, and where the façade is of architectural and townscape merit that contributes to the heritage value and local distinctiveness of the location. 6. Where possible demonstrate that opportunities have been taken to reinstate particular design features where these have been removed, to minimise any disruptions to the streetscape character 7. Support the retention wherever possible of public realm heritage features such as street lights, pillar boxes, public phone boxes, shop signage and street name signage.

		Response Percent	Response Total
	Again nano-houses should be authorised - It is better to have a proper planning process and nice projects for nanohouses than ugly garages.		
8	<p>Some explicit licence for the protection and enhancement of heritage assets through the use of high quality modern interventions, in order to encourage the creation of an ongoing history, avoiding leading building owners to immediately resorting to pastiche, or not developing heritage assets at all.</p> <p>The character of existing buildings may be far better preserved and enhanced by creating a legible distinction between the original historic asset, and any extension.... as opposed to the creation of a pastiche, which distorts the history of the overall development.</p>		
9	I would give priority to street trees over preserving items in point 7 if they are on a curbside (see my previous comments)		
10	Not all of the area has great character. There is a trend for 3 storey housing so an extension to a row of two storey houses would not fit policy B4. Many houses in the area have a low sloped roof so cannot extend so a third storey would be good for these houses.		
11	There has been an erosion in how local councils view heritage, which has recently included installation of inappropriate UPVC windows in at least one 19th century property. The owner of one property (Greenwich side of Lee Road) had not even put in planning permission for replacement windows, so it was a 'fait accompli', and when the planning application was submitted retrospectively, it was simply waved through, with no concern about the inappropriate appearance of the new windows, or the fact that curved frames and panes of glass should have been installed on the curved corner of the building, whereas completely flat windows were installed, which clashes with the style at the other end of the terrace.		
12	I do not see how 'wherever possible' is relevant to point 7. - again this seems a little nebulous as to what constitutes being possible.... there was, to my understanding, no good reason that we had all our heritage streetlight removed from Murillo Road yet it went ahead and was a real shame in terms of heritage preservation.		
13	<p>Page 69. Policy HD1. Policy HD1 A 5. We would suggest slightly amending the wording to read "especially where this makes a demonstrable positive impact on the public realm".</p> <p>You may wish to consider undertaking a streetscape audit to assist with the identification and retention of such features.</p> <p>Policy HD1 A6. Consider amending to say "where proposed works allow, the opportunity to repair and reinstate lost or damaged architectural features which contribute to the integrity of the townscape should be given due consideration".</p>		

**Do you agree with Policy 2: Design and Scale of New Development? All new development will be required to complement and enhance local character and identity. New development will be required to: 1. Have regard to the form, function, structure and heritage of its context. The scale, massing and orientation of surrounding buildings, streets and spaces must be taken into account. 2. Incorporate colour, materials, architectural design and scale which are in harmony with the spatial context.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above policy		87.13% 88
2	I agree with the above policy and but would like to see amendments		10.89% 11
3	I disagree with the above policy		1.98% 2
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.15	Std. Deviation: 0.41
	Variance:	0.17	Std. Error: 0.04
		Satisfaction Rate:	7.43
		answered	101
		skipped	11

Please explain any points you would like addressed (13)

1	ALL new development? including lampposts, de-minimus development, paving, telecoms ( especially antenna and satellite dish development ?) , GLA development and all statutory development
2	We'd like to see particular attention paid to the nature and quality of the external building materials as this is what local residents will have to live with for decades to come. And again an emphasis on enhancing rather than using older poor planning decisions as the low bar to which to aspire. Also in favour of rejecting pressure for high rise homes.
3	See above - too restrictive
4	Loss of light to surrounding homes should be taken into account.
5	I think it is too restrictive. More flexibility should be allowed for property owners.
6	In the Lee conservation area strict observation of the rule banning UPVC windows replacing original wooden sash windows is meant to be strictly adhered to. Unfortunately the only houses which have had all their windows replaced with UPVC windows are Council owned properties. Why is their one rule for residents and another for the Council. In Micheldever Road several properties were extensively refurbished taking several months and all windows were replaced by UPC. Similarly in Handen Road. I have read the relevant Proposed Area Design Guidance
7	It is very important that high rise is not taken as the answer to achieving higher density. Developments should reflect the human scale so people feel connected to their surrounding.
8	I hope we never have to see a monstrosity like Trinity School built again.
9	Just to ensure that modern (glass-type/zinc) additional enhancements through a heritage statement could be considered as long as nice with the environment - This is very frequent in North London and very beautiful.
10	Some explicit licence for the protection and enhancement of the character of an area through the use of high quality modern interventions, in order to encourage the creation of an ongoing history, avoiding leading building owners to immediately resorting to unimaginative pastiche, and the creation of a 'faux' historic development.
11	Point 2. Mixtures of heritage materials in to ultra modern structural designs can prove to be offensive to the eye. Design features 'Of TheirTime' are much better when including materials matching that criteria.
12	New developments should incorporate solar panels or other renewable energy generation
	It can be helpful to provide illustrative examples of positive new design, and to demonstrate how this supports local character and identity. The requirement for a heritage/ character led design statement is sensible and can reference the attached Annexe 2 guidance.

**Proposed Area Design Guidance appears in an 31 page Appendix to the Draft Plan. You can read this by clicking here. If you wish to comment on this please do so using the box below.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	9
1	What is the explanation for Cambridge Drive becoming a conservation area? Are some of the residents influential within the Lee Forum committee?		
2	<p>Pages 12 and 14, Leegate. We need to stop delaying the development of Leegate. It has been an embarrassment to the area for far too long. The design is currently infinitely better than what is there now and if we keep delaying things there is a risk that St Modwen never develop it, especially with the excuse of Brexit. Please can we actually encourage them to get it built.</p> <p>Pages 12 and 14, Sainsburys. Yes, I agree that the Sainsburys is ugly and any improvements are welcome provided it remains as a supermarket as it is the best one we have in the area.</p> <p>Page 24, East lee. I disagree that the area consists mostly of terraced housing. I would suggest that there is more semi-detached housing than terraced and possibly more detached houses as well</p> <p>Page 26, East Lee. Most of East Lee is not a preservation area so, in such areas, people should be allowed to fit uPVC windows provided they are not inappropriate colours and the same with rendering and rooves.</p>		
3	To restrictive.		
4	Please ensure the Council adhere to the Proposed Area Guidance re replacing wooden sash windows with UPVC. It is not the developers who are doing this it is the Council themselves who are not following the rules and no action is taken against them. Is there anything that can be done about this.?		
5	<p>By way of correction it is Manor House Gardens that is designated as a listed landscape</p> <p>in this area much of the housing is Victorian/ Edwardian and perhaps the conservation area should be extended</p> <p>Loft Conversions are everywhere and with the planning laws as they stand not much can be done</p> <p>There has been some unsympathetic infill that was approved</p>		
6	will review later		
7	Just wondering whether the proposed designation of Manor Park as a CA is going to be consulted, also will this be with a view to applying an Article 4 direction on the area?		
8	I am totally in favour of the designation of new Conservation Areas, as identified in the Plan, as this will help to protect heritage buildings and the general appearance of the area.		
9	Another consideration you may wish to consider is the impact of development within the setting of heritage assets and significant views. We also publish substantive advice in respect of the setting of heritage assets which is available to download here. <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/</a>		
		answered	9
		skipped	103

## 5. Community Infrastructure

**Do you agree with Policy 1: Protection, Enhancement and Provision of Community Buildings? A. The Lee Neighbourhood Development Plan identifies its key community buildings as shown above. Development which would result in the change of use/loss of a community building, whether land or premises, currently or last used as a community facility, will not be supported unless it can be fully demonstrated that:**




- 1. The space is under-utilised and the use no longer serves the needs of the community.**
- 2. There is adequate alternative provision or the same or similar activities within the Forum area which has the capacity to meet the needs of the community.**
- 3. There is no net loss or deterioration in the overall space or service provisions to serve the current and future populations arising from new developments.**

**B. Redevelopment or intensification of sites in existing community use may be permitted, subject to:**

- 1. An appropriate alternative community space or equivalent provision being provided as part of the development within 500m of the original site.**
- 2. Proposals for the shared use of community buildings demonstrating that the primary need as a community space is met.**

**C. New schemes should support the development of new or improved community facilities where there are identified local needs, especially to address gaps in accessibility, providing a range of community services including youth facilities, art, culture, health and wellbeing and entertainment uses.**

**D. New facilities should be located in or near the local retail hubs (see Table 1 and Figure 6) and on ground floor level to benefit from footfall and accessibility (unless it can be demonstrated that there is a special need for a standalone location elsewhere).**

					Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above policy				88.89%	88
2	I support the above policy but would like to see amendments				9.09%	9
3	I disagree with the above policy				2.02%	2
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.13	Std. Deviation:	0.39	answered	99
	Variance:	0.15	Std. Error:	0.04		

Please explain any points you would like addressed (11)




1	Lee green has such a vibrant and involved community, areas to encourage this should maintained and increased if anything
2	No loss whatsoever to community space unless it is to provide sustainable non-retail employment
3	Where it says 'the space is under utilised' I think you need to include something to say that efforts have been made to increase utilisation over a period.
4	I do not agree with C. If the Council or Governemnt or private organisations are not prepared to fund community facilities to meet local needs, why should a dveloper? Developers already have the burden of s106 monies which is there to benefit the local community. If there is a desperate need for such facilities then why haven't they been provided already? Also D - surely it depends on the nature of the facility whether it would benefit from footfall.
5	Transport links to new facilities and existing ones should be considered
6	Could we try crown fundiing for a community owned cinema and community space in the New Tigers Head?
7	account should be taken of how residents can get to facilities - especially by public transport or by other non-poluting modes of transport
8	I would like to see height restrictions as per previous comment.
9	I don't see pubs as having any of the importance of these other public services/buildings
10	I would like further clarification of point 1. how is is proved that it is under utilised? Especially when community centres (such as the Lee Centre where I volunteer) have been run into the ground and - numbers will have dwindled in line with massively reduced services.....



**Do you agree with Policy 1: Protection, Enhancement and Provision of Community Buildings?** A. The Lee Neighbourhood Development Plan identifies its key community buildings as shown above. Development which would result in the change of use/loss of a community building, whether land or premises, currently or last used as a community facility, will not be supported unless it can be fully demonstrated that: 1. The space is under-utilised and the use no longer serves the needs of the community. 2. There is adequate alternative provision or the same or similar activities within the Forum area which has the capacity to meet the needs of the community. 3. There is no net loss or deterioration in the overall space or service provisions to serve the current and future populations arising from new developments. B. Redevelopment or intensification of sites in existing community use may be permitted, subject to: 1. An appropriate alternative community space or equivalent provision being provided as part of the development within 500m of the original site. 2. Proposals for the shared use of community buildings demonstrating that the primary need as a community space is met. C. New schemes should support the development of new or improved community facilities where there are identified local needs, especially to address gaps in accessibility, providing a range of community services including youth facilities, art, culture, health and wellbeing and entertainment uses. D. New facilities should be located in or near the local retail hubs (see Table 1 and Figure 6) and on ground floor level to benefit from footfall and accessibility (unless it can be demonstrated that there is a special need for a standalone location elsewhere).

		Response Percent	Response Total
11	Page 88 5.4 The Localism Act enables communities to nominate assets of community value which then places specific requirements on potential sale. The nominations of community buildings do not appear to form a formal submission for community right to buy but in respect of the application of wider policies to safeguard community provision. It may therefore be helpful to clarify that these policies are not specifically related to community right to buy in this instance, if this is the intention.		

**Do you agree with Policy 2: Protection, Enhancement and Provision of Social Infrastructure?** The Lee Neighbourhood Development Plan identifies its wider social infrastructure provision as illustrated above. Major New Development will need to demonstrate that there will be no impact on the provision, quality or capacity of social infrastructure, and may need to address any gaps in provision necessary to support and serve the new community. New development will be required to address the design of new community facilities in a way that secures the best use of land and a suitably planned, well designed, accessible and integrated sustainable neighbourhood.

			Response Percent	Response Total				
1	I fully support the above policy		92.00%	92				
2	I agree with the above policy and but would like to see amendments		7.00%	7				
3	I disagree with the above policy		1.00%	1				
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.09	Std. Deviation:	0.32	Satisfaction Rate:	4.5	answered	100
	Variance:	0.1	Std. Error:	0.03				




Please explain any points you would like addressed (4)

1	Unfortunately Social infrastructure can be very widely defined and so the question of new provision would be widely sidestepped eg we are providing a litter bin on our premises !
2	Don't think that new development should be required to enhance existing social infrastructure. If we need new social infrastructure, then build it (assuming the need is such that funding can be obtained). Why should new development mean new social infrastructure is built over the existing infrastructure? The only exception would be if a development was so large that it greatly increased the existing Lee Green population - say by at least 5%.

**Do you agree with Policy 2: Protection, Enhancement and Provision of Social Infrastructure? The Lee Neighbourhood Development Plan identifies its wider social infrastructure provision as illustrated above. Major New Development will need to demonstrate that there will be no impact on the provision, quality or capacity of social infrastructure, and may need to address any gaps in provision necessary to support and serve the new community. New development will be required to address the design of new community facilities in a way that secures the best use of land and a suitably planned, well designed, accessible and integrated sustainable neighbourhood.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
3	Any big development should offer a community facility of some sort		
4	I think new development absolutely MUST rather than MAY address gaps in provision to support the community. All these caveats just make it possible for developers to hold the council to ransom and pressure it to not hold them to these policies. I think we need a MUCH greater emphasis and prioritisation on community needs and infrastructure.		

**Do you agree with Policy 3: Enhancement of Public Realm Facilities? A. The installation and future management of public drinking water and water refill stations in appropriate locations should be provided for in all new development plans and renewal proposals for public realm. B. Large scale commercial developments that include public realm should provide proposals for, and secure the future management of, publicly accessible toilets C. Development proposals that lead to the protection and upgrading of all public litter bins in the Forum area will be supported. Proposals that support the following aims will be encouraged: 1. The number of publicly accessible litter bins in the Forum area should be maintained and increased where appropriate. 2. All publicly accessible litter bins in the Forum area should discourage the proliferation of litter due to weather or animal disturbance. 3. All retail sites and large public realm areas should provide access to recycling facilities. D. Development plans and proposals regarding street lighting in the Forum area should ensure that the lamps used are in keeping with the character of the area, unobtrusive and take advantage of modern energy saving technology. Proposals should: 1. Correspond and adhere to current British Standards with particular attention to avoiding intrusive glare on residential properties. 2. Incorporate the highest levels of energy efficiency technology. 3. Incorporate electric vehicle charging points wherever possible. E. Development plans and proposals should incorporate rest points or seating areas within the public realm aspects.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above policy		89.11% 90
2	I support the above policy but would like to see amendments		9.90% 10
3	I disagree with the above policy		0.99% 1
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.12	Std. Deviation: 0.35
	Variance:	0.12	Std. Error: 0.04
		Satisfaction Rate:	5.94
		answered	101
		skipped	11

Please explain any points you would like addressed (14)

1	<p>A &amp; B this has potential to become drug dealing centres</p> <p>D, must not become masts for telecommunications purposes</p> <p>D3, will require a parking permit for charging ???</p> <p>D3, Lamposts require a very small amount of power to run a light however a vehicle charge is very</p>
---	---

**Do you agree with Policy 3: Enhancement of Public Realm Facilities? A. The installation and future management of public drinking water and water refill stations in appropriate locations should be provided for in all new development plans and renewal proposals for public realm. B. Large scale commercial developments that include public realm should provide proposals for, and secure the future management of, publicly accessible toilets C. Development proposals that lead to the protection and upgrading of all public litter bins in the Forum area will be supported. Proposals that support the following aims will be encouraged: 1. The number of publicly accessible litter bins in the Forum area should be maintained and increased where appropriate. 2. All publicly accessible litter bins in the Forum area should discourage the proliferation of litter due to weather or animal disturbance. 3. All retail sites and large public realm areas should provide access to recycling facilities. D. Development plans and proposals regarding street lighting in the Forum area should ensure that the lamps used are in keeping with the character of the area, unobtrusive and take advantage of modern energy saving technology. Proposals should: 1. Correspond and adhere to current British Standards with particular attention to avoiding intrusive glare on residential properties. 2. Incorporate the highest levels of energy efficiency technology. 3. Incorporate electric vehicle charging points wherever possible. E. Development plans and proposals should incorporate rest points or seating areas within the public realm aspects.**




		Response Percent	Response Total
	very, high for short term charging, so new power cables will be required to be laid in the area and such development cannot be described as sustainable or green		
2	No mention of food bins or recycling Hardly sustainable		
3	We should discourage the removal of streetlights.		
4	Electric car charging stations should also be provided		
5	light pollution from street lighting minimised		
6	I don't think public water fountains are required - who will pay for maintenance?  When the plan says developments should provide for future management of public toilets what does this mean - that developers are responsible for the maintenance and cleaning of public toilets in perpetuity? Which developer would agree to that?		
7	Will there be charging points for electric cars provided in the area Also there is a public seat at the corner of Wantage Road and Taunton Road near Sainbury's. this seat was donated by the Lee Manor Society and has no back to it. I was led to believe this was to discourage people from sleeping on it which I think is a very inhumane attitude to take. Consequently the bench is never used. In the years it has been in place I have never seen anyone sitting there. So please do not provide seating without a back to it		
8	C-3 needs to be more specific about recycling facilities		
9	Lots of the lampposts were replaced fairly recently. Why was it necessary to replace the whole things instead of just the top part that houses the actual light?		
10	Unsupervised toilets can attract anti-social behaviour. I would be cautious about installing more		
11	Attention needs to be given to council support for clearing litter bins, or proliferation of street litter will continue. The public street lighting, in many ways, does not conform to the recommended British Standards, and are having bad effects on residents, wildlife, the ecology.		
12	Points C1/C2Am in broad agreement, but there should be a minimum number of 'Fox-Proof' litter bins available within ther Forum area and their loctiohs.		
13	Use of solar panels on lights?		

**Do you agree with Policy 3: Enhancement of Public Realm Facilities? A. The installation and future management of public drinking water and water refill stations in appropriate locations should be provided for in all new development plans and renewal proposals for public realm. B. Large scale commercial developments that include public realm should provide proposals for, and secure the future management of, publicly accessible toilets C. Development proposals that lead to the protection and upgrading of all public litter bins in the Forum area will be supported. Proposals that support the following aims will be encouraged: 1. The number of publicly accessible litter bins in the Forum area should be maintained and increased where appropriate. 2. All publicly accessible litter bins in the Forum area should discourage the proliferation of litter due to weather or animal disturbance. 3. All retail sites and large public realm areas should provide access to recycling facilities. D. Development plans and proposals regarding street lighting in the Forum area should ensure that the lamps used are in keeping with the character of the area, unobtrusive and take advantage of modern energy saving technology. Proposals should: 1. Correspond and adhere to current British Standards with particular attention to avoiding intrusive glare on residential properties. 2. Incorporate the highest levels of energy efficiency technology. 3. Incorporate electric vehicle charging points wherever possible. E. Development plans and proposals should incorporate rest points or seating areas within the public realm aspects.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
14	These should be subject to appropriate design and demonstrably viable, ie. maintenance may rely on incorporation into council responsibility and the implications of this, alongside location and appropriateness of scale should be considered. In certain instances contribution to S106 or offsite provision may be preferable.		

## 6. Transport and Connections

**Map of Lee Forum Transport Facilities Do you agree with Policy 1: Protect, Promote and Enhance Public Transport Provision? A. Proposals which demonstrate how they help to achieve an improvement in the Public Transport Accessibility Level rating of the Forum area will be supported. B. New developments that are likely to cause a negative impact to the capacity of existing travel options should demonstrate through Transport Impact Assessments how this impact is to be addressed. C. The use of sustainable public transport should be encouraged.**

			Response Percent	Response Total				
1	I fully support the above policy		90.91%	90				
2	I agree with the above policy and but would like to see amendments		8.08%	8				
3	I disagree with the above policy		1.01%	1				
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.1	Std. Deviation:	0.33	Satisfaction Rate:	5.05	answered	99
	Variance:	0.11	Std. Error:	0.03			skipped	13




Please explain any points you would like addressed (13)

1	The best way to reduce local traffic and pollution levels is maintaining and improving public transport options
2	Public transport is the responsibility of the Mayor for London and so not relevant here
3	Does this include ensuring sufficient secure cycle stations particularly around schools, shops and local amenities?

**Map of Lee Forum Transport Facilities Do you agree with Policy 1: Protect, Promote and Enhance Public Transport Provision? A. Proposals which demonstrate how they help to achieve an improvement in the Public Transport Accessibility Level rating of the Forum area will be supported. B. New developments that are likely to cause a negative impact to the capacity of existing travel options should demonstrate through Transport Impact Assessments how this impact is to be addressed. C. The use of sustainable public transport should be encouraged.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
4	Whilst public transport may be encouraged generally the problem shifts, e.g. drivers bringing their cars so far then shifting to public transport means the local area becomes a car park during the day with residents being blocked in. Whilst CPZ can be necessary and provide a revenue stream for the local area from those parking and commuting into the city there needs to be an improved way of tackling those who repeatedly inconsiderate or break the law (note Lewisham traffic wardens have resisted towing vehicles that have been pointed out as being parked illegally, preferring fixed fines )		
5	As Lee falls within the boroughs of Lewisham AND Greenwich I would like to see a proposal added to enhance the transport links from the Lee forum area to the centre of Greenwich e.g. a direct bus route.		
6	Sounds good, but how will this be achieved? Most commuters take Southeastern rail which is already at full capacity - not that developers can influence rail policy (or any other public transport policy?)		
7	Can we push for Hydrogen fuelled transport which will help pollution		
8	Everything goes into Lewisham  We should be able to get to places without always having to go to Lewisham eg Greenwich from Lee Green. There is no bus.		
9	Buses from Hither Green station or Lee High Road to Blackheath and Greenwich Center should be put in place		
10	Could CIL be used to support making Hither Green station more accessible? Or a loan be given to speed up the planned but delayed improvement works?		
11	Better provision of transport to other parts of south London, rather than having to go to a London terminus then out again.		
12	The 202 bus stop on Lee Road (northbound) is used by commercial coaches and they do not switch off engines when idling. This must be prohibited.		
13	TfL has comments it would like to submit		

**Do you agree with Policy 2 Improve Measures to Tackle Pollution Levels? A. Development will be required to make a positive contribution to improving air quality and reducing noise pollution in the Forum area. Proposals should: 1. Maximise the contribution that the public realm makes to encouraging active travel via design that discourages travel by car and avoids an over-reliance on street parking. 2. Promote and encourage a reduction in the use of private vehicles by adopting measures such as reduced parking provision, controlled parking and car clubs. 3. Consider how they can contribute to improving walking and cycling routes particularly along routes identified as being strategic neighbourhood routes linking the Forum area's key destinations. 4. Help to reduce barriers to cycling by ensuring that all new developments and public realm provide safe, secure and appropriate cycle parking and storage provisions. 5. Provide Electrical Vehicle charging point provision in all new residential parking spaces and increase the capacity across the Forum area without impacting the visual amenity and inclusive design principles. 6. Promote the London Mayor's Healthy Streets Approach to design and support improvements to the ten Healthy Street Indicators in line with Transport for London guidance. B. In order to reduce the reliance on motor vehicles for journeys in and around the Forum area, proposals will be supported that help to secure the aim of all residential homes being within 500m of: 1.Safe and secure cycle storage 2. An electric charging point for vehicles**

			Response Percent	Response Total				
1	I fully support the above policy		69.31%	70				
2	I agree with the above policy and but would like to see amendments		21.78%	22				
3	I disagree with the above policy		8.91%	9				
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.4	Std. Deviation:	0.65	Satisfaction Rate:	19.8	answered	101
	Variance:	0.42	Std. Error:	0.06			skipped	11

Please explain any points you would like addressed (30)

1	All the above is critical . Including ease of creating and maintaining school streets and play streets
2	A1, this is not practical for families, and those who need a car A2. Absolutely not as this disadvantages those in terrace type housing and favours the landed rich with parking facilities on their own land and is not in alignment with labour party policy. A4 Cycling can only be supported once there is adequate provision for the regulation and insurance of dangerous cyclists by national legislation A5 will require substantial power infrastructure and so not green or sustainable A6. Does not work for the sick and disabled B2 An electric vehicle IS a motor vehicle
3	Could some of the disused garages be given over to secure cycle stands for local residents?
4	I agree with the ethos of making the streets as healthy as possible and avoiding pollution. That said I believe that issues surrounding street safety need to be addressed before there is reduced capacity for parking; it will be appreciated that private car use is often the only way for individuals to safely draft especially at night.  In addition to the above the issue of passing/through traffic should be addressed before parking provisions for local residents are tackled. It will be appreciated that the A20 is an extremely busy road frequently used by heavy industrial vehicles  Further still consideration should be given to methods of how to reduce local 'rat runs' many of which are used at high speed. This effects local residents and is a safety risk to pedestrian and cycle traffic
5	Many residents need to use their cars as may journeys would be lengthened far too much by use of public transport. My own journey round trip would have 2 hours added to it. Please don't make it more difficult for local residents by closing off roads or making them narrower, etc. Travel by car is difficult enough as it is. However, by all means bring in CPZ's as parking causes many of the

**Do you agree with Policy 2 Improve Measures to Tackle Pollution Levels? A. Development will be required to make a positive contribution to improving air quality and reducing noise pollution in the Forum area. Proposals should: 1. Maximise the contribution that the public realm makes to encouraging active travel via design that discourages travel by car and avoids an over-reliance on street parking. 2. Promote and encourage a reduction in the use of private vehicles by adopting measures such as reduced parking provision, controlled parking and car clubs. 3. Consider how they can contribute to improving walking and cycling routes particularly along routes identified as being strategic neighbourhood routes linking the Forum area's key destinations. 4. Help to reduce barriers to cycling by ensuring that all new developments and public realm provide safe, secure and appropriate cycle parking and storage provisions. 5. Provide Electrical Vehicle charging point provision in all new residential parking spaces and increase the capacity across the Forum area without impacting the visual amenity and inclusive design principles. 6. Promote the London Mayor's Healthy Streets Approach to design and support improvements to the ten Healthy Street Indicators in line with Transport for London guidance. B. In order to reduce the reliance on motor vehicles for journeys in and around the Forum area, proposals will be supported that help to secure the aim of all residential homes being within 500m of: 1.Safe and secure cycle storage 2. An electric charging point for vehicles**

		Response Percent	Response Total
	traffic problems in conjunction with the sheer width of cars these days which, in my opinion, has gone too far and unchecked.		
6	there should be no new parking zones, I don't want to pay to park outside my house		
7	I try to use public transport whenever possible but I am conscious of the fact that I will have to rely on my car more as I get older (I am nearing pensionable age). I also believe that parking restrictions have led to the demise of our high streets and local shopping areas (as mentioned earlier). I am also unhappy with the proposed extension of the ULEZ: I switched from diesel to petrol in 2013 and pay a very low vehicle tax yet I am now told that my car is not clean enough to use locally from 2021. I believe these anti-vehicle policies have gone too far. People should instead be encouraged to use alternatives where possible but not penalised for using their vehicles when necessary e.g. those who need to drive due to age or infirmity but who aren't disabled enough to qualify for a Blue Badge.		
8	I am concerned that reducing parking opportunities without making provision to improve bus links will simply result in people not using the site or illegal parking practices		
9	Agree with the proposal try and tackle pollution but not by restricting access via Car and or other private vehicle. Individuals need the flexibility and not have to pay more for the privilege.		
10	Totally disagree. If people want to drive cars let them. There is strong anti pollution in place. I choose not to own a car - it is just not worth it in London. Other people obviously disagree, or require them for work - let them.		
11	consideration should be given to NOT disabling older members of the community from being mobile even if they are not officially disabled		
12	People are going to need their cars. Removing on street parking just encourages illegal or antisocial parking. Public transport is inadequate, and it's hopelessly optimistic to target private vehicle users until public transport becomes a fast, viable and attractive alternative for everyone and all journeys.		
13	locations of cycle storage and electric charging point should be individually approved by local residents - if in front of a specific house, approval from the house's owner has to be explicit. Better to put the electric charging points in large streets like Manor Park or on Manor Park on the park side. cycle storage can be improved at the station with an external storage point (not inside the station), near to the pharmacy for example + 1 near manor house gardens on the park side. they should be limited.		
14	Cycle lanes should be segregated from car lanes to increase safety for the cyclist. This will encourage children cycling to school and others to take the risk of abandoning their cars for a bike. If we had more one way streets this would help facilitate the space required.		

**Do you agree with Policy 2 Improve Measures to Tackle Pollution Levels? A. Development will be required to make a positive contribution to improving air quality and reducing noise pollution in the Forum area. Proposals should: 1. Maximise the contribution that the public realm makes to encouraging active travel via design that discourages travel by car and avoids an over-reliance on street parking. 2. Promote and encourage a reduction in the use of private vehicles by adopting measures such as reduced parking provision, controlled parking and car clubs. 3. Consider how they can contribute to improving walking and cycling routes particularly along routes identified as being strategic neighbourhood routes linking the Forum area's key destinations. 4. Help to reduce barriers to cycling by ensuring that all new developments and public realm provide safe, secure and appropriate cycle parking and storage provisions. 5. Provide Electrical Vehicle charging point provision in all new residential parking spaces and increase the capacity across the Forum area without impacting the visual amenity and inclusive design principles. 6. Promote the London Mayor's Healthy Streets Approach to design and support improvements to the ten Healthy Street Indicators in line with Transport for London guidance. B. In order to reduce the reliance on motor vehicles for journeys in and around the Forum area, proposals will be supported that help to secure the aim of all residential homes being within 500m of: 1.Safe and secure cycle storage 2. An electric charging point for vehicles**




		Response Percent	Response Total
15	I'm afraid that most people in SE London aspire to own a car and provision should be made accordingly. I would go along with the idea that car ownership should be limited to one car per household.		
16	It is sometimes not possible to avoid using a car (for instance, taking heavy items for repair, collection of heavy items etc.) and there should be sufficient provision for short term parking near retail outlets, otherwise local businesses might suffer.		
17	Better public transport is needed in forum area before people will reduce use of their cars		
18	Places such as the tiger junction need to be made much more pedestrian friendly- the current arrangement is appalling. Also it's all very well to say you will discourage cars but if you don't provide sufficient buses etc it's pointless. We often struggle to get on the bus for school either because of overcrowding or not enough at rush hour so have no alternative but to drive sometimes.		
19	The so called street improvements have made turning in and out of roads more perilous. Car free S1ü6 agreements More parking spaces for car clubs		
20	Traffic pollution is also brakes and tyre particles, so electric is only part of the solution,...		
21	I would like to understand more about reduced parking provision and controlled parking		
22	There are a great many terraced properties in the area with narrow front gardens, not suitable for parking. This penalises the less well off who live in cheaper properties. Where will cars be parked if provision is reduced? It is a pipe dream to think peopel will give up their cars. Will you? How is it that each residence is not deterred from having more than one vehicle per household?		
23	Points A & B. Am concerned emphasison these points may end up providing additional problems tothe aged and/or disabled memb efrs ofourcommunity. Proceed with extreme care.		
24	Please take into consideration my earlier comments on the proposed walkways and the impact it will have to secure residential streets you're currently proposing they open onto (one of which is privately owned)		
25	The car already steals enough space, taking more space to litter electric charging everywhere just encourages out of date personal car ownership. Encourage rental car schemes which don't require charging points everywhere. Discourage personal car ownership in all but the infirmed		
26	Cycle storage and charging points within 500m - won't this be a lot of clutter and ugly bike racks? I disagree with reducing parking. Why not charge more for more polluting vehicles? Not everyone can afford an electric car, unfortunately.		



**Do you agree with Policy 2 Improve Measures to Tackle Pollution Levels? A. Development will be required to make a positive contribution to improving air quality and reducing noise pollution in the Forum area. Proposals should: 1. Maximise the contribution that the public realm makes to encouraging active travel via design that discourages travel by car and avoids an over-reliance on street parking. 2. Promote and encourage a reduction in the use of private vehicles by adopting measures such as reduced parking provision, controlled parking and car clubs. 3. Consider how they can contribute to improving walking and cycling routes particularly along routes identified as being strategic neighbourhood routes linking the Forum area's key destinations. 4. Help to reduce barriers to cycling by ensuring that all new developments and public realm provide safe, secure and appropriate cycle parking and storage provisions. 5. Provide Electrical Vehicle charging point provision in all new residential parking spaces and increase the capacity across the Forum area without impacting the visual amenity and inclusive design principles. 6. Promote the London Mayor's Healthy Streets Approach to design and support improvements to the ten Healthy Street Indicators in line with Transport for London guidance. B. In order to reduce the reliance on motor vehicles for journeys in and around the Forum area, proposals will be supported that help to secure the aim of all residential homes being within 500m of: 1.Safe and secure cycle storage 2. An electric charging point for vehicles**

		Response Percent	Response Total
27	I do not own a car but if this is to be implemented then far better public transport would have to be introduced. How would that be funded. Again I do not own a car but public transport is not particularly safe nor particularly pleasant - how will that be addressed. For some people travelling by car is a better option.		
28	I think there should be a differentiation between petrol/diesel vehicles and electrics/hybrids. After all, they are not the same when it comes to pollution production., I think that the survey for the resident parking permits suggests that this is not being adequately financially encouraged either. I think part B should be more emphatic: we need more charging points to encourage electric car use (as someone without a drive, the lack of charging points was the singular reason for me choosing a hybrid) and cycle storage needs to be rolled out without the current need to badger the council ad nauseum to get one, which is then filled immediately. People also need to be better informed about the possibility of GETTING bike storage, as it is one of the greatest reasons why people do not travel by bike in London.		
29	Specific recommendations to enhance access to car clubs would be useful, to ensure adequate supply of parking spaces		
30	Subject to design considerations, safety and consideration of the wider transport context (to ensure connectivity) and minimising unwanted street clutter.		

**Do you agree with Policy 3: Improve Road and Traffic Safety Measures? A. Proposals impacting on the capacity or provision of road infrastructure should demonstrate a positive contribution to addressing identified road safety and traffic issues. Proposals should: 1. Provide improvements to key junctions, road crossings and key routes. 2. Improve pedestrian crossings – where people need them, safe and with minimum waiting. 3. Provide small traffic islands to reduce the width of the roadway where it is over 9 metres wide (from kerb to kerb). 4. Improve access and streetscape around public transport sites. 5. Improve parking for shops. 6. Prioritise improvements and crossings along identified strategic walking routes. 7. Provide safe pavements, giving the maximum possible space to pedestrians.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above policy		81.00% 81
2	I agree with the above policy and but would like to see amendments		17.00% 17
3	I disagree with the above policy		2.00% 2

**Do you agree with Policy 3: Improve Road and Traffic Safety Measures? A. Proposals impacting on the capacity or provision of road infrastructure should demonstrate a positive contribution to addressing identified road safety and traffic issues. Proposals should:**

- 1. Provide improvements to key junctions, road crossings and key routes.**
- 2. Improve pedestrian crossings – where people need them, safe and with minimum waiting.**
- 3. Provide small traffic islands to reduce the width of the roadway where it is over 9 metres wide (from kerb to kerb).**
- 4. Improve access and streetscape around public transport sites.**
- 5. Improve parking for shops.**
- 6. Prioritise improvements and crossings along identified strategic walking routes.**
- 7. Provide safe pavements, giving the maximum possible space to pedestrians.**

						Response Percent	Response Total	
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.21	Std. Deviation:	0.45	Satisfaction Rate:	10.5	answered	100
	Variance:	0.21	Std. Error:	0.05			skipped	12

Please explain any points you would like addressed (27)




1	Too much traffic, speeding and accidents (to adults, children, vehicles and property)
2	A5 Charge all shops for each vehicle parking space on their land A7 and NOT cyclists
3	Improve safe cycle routes to shops, schools, doctors, train stations, bus stops and local amenities
4	Not convinced about traffic island proposals. Improved parking for shops appears to directly contradict Measures to Tackle Pollution above.
5	Many residents need to use their cars as many journeys would be lengthened far too much by use of public transport. My own journey round trip would have 2 hours added to it. Please don't make it more difficult for local residents by closing off roads or making them narrower, etc. Travel by car is difficult enough as it is. However, by all means bring in CPZ's as parking causes many of the traffic problems in conjunction with the sheer width of cars these days which, in my opinion, has gone too far and unchecked. The 'improvements' to Manor Lane has made some turns almost impossible. These did not adequately allow for the current size of cars. I have a small car but most people don't!!
6	3 A traffic islands designed to avoid pinch points and reduce motor vehicle speed to avoid putting motor vehicles and cyclists in conflict.-chicanes?
7	As before - restrictions on roads, increase traffic congestion which leads to increased pollution and cars are stationary for longer than necessary. We need to find measures to keep flow of traffic safe but constant.
8	I do not think any improvement is necessary. In my opinion the revised junction at the end of Courthill Road which was introduced for safety reasons was counter productive. There are already plenty of road crossing points. I am a pedestrian and have no problems with crossing roads.
9	I would particularly welcome an island in the 3 way junction Leahurst/Fernbrook Crescent where drivers coming south and turning right onto Fernbrook Crescent do so at full speed, crossing diagonally, because the road is so wide. It's such a dangerous crossing for children going to Brindishe Manor (and adults too) and there is no alternative crossing.
10	I would like to see the removal of all small three humps in residential road throughout the area as cars swerve in order to go over the middle hump sometimes causing a collision possibility. A hump across the whole width of the road is a much safer option. In some cases the three humps do not take into consideration that cars are parked at the sides of the road causing additional hazards. The rat runs in our area (Micheldever Road) cause traffic chaos during rush hour as cars try to negotiate the narrowed entrances at the Manor Lane end.
11	Parking for shops should be on site not on the road. Small parades are really walking destinations. We should aim to reduce cars and vehicles on the road. We need to make the area more pedestrian and cycle friendly and focused and stop through traffic in residential areas.

**Do you agree with Policy 3: Improve Road and Traffic Safety Measures? A. Proposals impacting on the capacity or provision of road infrastructure should demonstrate a positive contribution to addressing identified road safety and traffic issues. Proposals should: 1. Provide improvements to key junctions, road crossings and key routes. 2. Improve pedestrian crossings – where people need them, safe and with minimum waiting. 3. Provide small traffic islands to reduce the width of the roadway where it is over 9 metres wide (from kerb to kerb). 4. Improve access and streetscape around public transport sites. 5. Improve parking for shops. 6. Prioritise improvements and crossings along identified strategic walking routes. 7. Provide safe pavements, giving the maximum possible space to pedestrians.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
12	I think the Chris Boardman trial in Greater Manchester for "cheaper" zebra crossings at most road junctions has merit for this area as well...For example the side roads crossing Manor Lane could all benefit from these enabling much safer school children pedestrian routes.		
13	Improve parking for shops in this policy jars with reduced parking provision in policy 2...confused		
14	Manor Lane needs more safe crossing points.		
15	Block the coaches on manor lane from the industrial estate so that they do not try to go the hostel directly via this route.		
16	Only to comment that previous mechanisms to do the above had created confusion between motorist, cyclists and pedestrians alike, whilst not at all improving the amenity of pedestrians and cyclists... all along Manor Lane.		
17	Not sure about improved parking for shops unless for disabled parking or loading - especially local shops where we can easily walk or use public transport - it flies in the face of your wanting to reduce traffic pollution and encouraging greener forms of transport..		
18	Improvements should lead to keep traffic moving. The main crossroad at Lee Green is appalling for not just permitting a single flow of traffic at any one time or for having a filter light system.		
19	Completely agree with point 5, as per my above comment		
20	See previous points - improving tiger junction to make it more pedestrian friendly is a must		
21	Improvements to key junctions, road crossings and key routes make driving more difficult for residents.		
22	Please do not repeat the experience of what has happened in Manor Lane. In my 74 years of being a pedestrian and then car driver it has never been so dangerous and not properly/safely negotiable.		
23	Improving parking necessarily makes the roads worse for pedestrians and cyclists. Bad parking is part of our green future. Crack down on people parking on pavements		
24	The crossing at the Tiger's Head junction has been changed to have high kerb stones. Is this an "improvement"? If so, I don't agree with the form of it. It is ugly, sharp, and dangerous.		
25	Stop rat runs and parking around Lee station Upwood road Cambridge drive horn park lane		
26	The current system hugely disadvantages pedestrians; the crossings on Lee High Road take far too long to allow pedestrians to cross. Drivers are given priority and this should be changed The current crossings lead to people taking risks or standing next to heavily polluted road sides for far too long		
27	Lee Road should have a 20mph speed limit actively enforced by provision of speed cameras, with revenue being used for additional safety and pollution-reducing measures		

## 7. Building New Homes and Amenities

**Do you agree with Policy 1: Housing Delivery? A. Residential development will provide a range of housing sizes and tenures to meet local housing needs and create sustainable communities. This will be achieved through the: 1. Provision of minimum viable levels of social housing in line with the London Plan and council development plan. This should include appropriate provision of social rented and intermediate housing. 2. Provision of a range of different sized units, prioritising larger family housing (3+ bedrooms) and 2-bed. 3. Appropriate provision of accessible homes for the elderly and consideration given to the provision of extra care units. 4. Appropriate provision for necessary social infrastructure including education, health and community facilities, green infrastructure and biodiversity. B. All new residential development should reflect the policies of the Lee Neighbourhood Development Plan. C. Proposals for community led / self-build housing on appropriate sites will be supported.**

		Response Percent	Response Total			
1	I fully support the above policy		74.00% 74			
2	I agree with the above policy and but would like to see amendments		17.00% 17			
3	I disagree with the above policy		9.00% 9			
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.35	Std. Deviation: 0.64	Satisfaction Rate: 17.5	answered	100
	Variance:	0.41	Std. Error: 0.06		skipped	12

Please explain any points you would like addressed (25)

1	Lewisham is becoming a dormitory town, used to harvest rates to support the economy of the borough with no means of support for non-retail work.  Housing must be nearing saturation in Lewisham and so any new housing above 10 homes must be supported by a referendum for the entire borough
2	Give priority to 2 bed units as suit both young families and older couples/people living alone
3	Further consideration needs to be given to A1 and 2 above in terms of sites to be utilised and integration of local communities (see for example the issues experienced by numerous registered providers of social housing at mixed use sites)
4	First point good 2 and 3 are simply self aggrandisement
5	Not building lots of flats, keep the neighbourhood mostly houses. And the schools in the area are mostly oversubscribed.
6	I would say 'at least minimum' social housing. At the moment it reads like we're trying to restrict social housing which I have a real issue with. I would disagree with priority being given to larger residential units. The area has a thriving family culture but we should be moving to a more diverse set of residents. I would argue that we should be prioritising one bed properties to encourage more single people and first time buyers
7	We need to be careful how we manage communities and the building of houses which are not in keeping with the area as this impacts the look, feel and price of housing within the local area
8	Obviously development should comply with the London plan and Council development plan (even if I disagree with those plans). Why should 3+ and 2 bed units be prioritise? It is in the developers interest to cater to demand.
9	Are the general public made aware of land released by the Council for communityled/self-build housing
10	Provision should be made to press the council's seeming current opposition to family homes being divided into sub flats. This would enable older people to potentially live in the ground floor of their long tome family dwelling whilst allowing a second or third apartment to be created for rent or purchase for single or childless couples. This would unblock some of the challenges with older people "blocking" housing access through wanting to remain in family homes.




**Do you agree with Policy 1: Housing Delivery? A. Residential development will provide a range of housing sizes and tenures to meet local housing needs and create sustainable communities. This will be achieved through the: 1. Provision of minimum viable levels of social housing in line with the London Plan and council development plan. This should include appropriate provision of social rented and intermediate housing. 2. Provision of a range of different sized units, prioritising larger family housing (3+ bedrooms) and 2-bed. 3. Appropriate provision of accessible homes for the elderly and consideration given to the provision of extra care units. 4. Appropriate provision for necessary social infrastructure including education, health and community facilities, green infrastructure and biodiversity. B. All new residential development should reflect the policies of the Lee Neighbourhood Development Plan. C. Proposals for community led / self-build housing on appropriate sites will be supported.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
11	Define in more appropriate provision of accessible housing and necessary social infrastructure  Not happy with self-build housing - must always meet building regulations and safety standards. This leaves the Plan open to abuse.		
12	Prioritising large family housing is a mistake.		
13	we should authorise nanohouses - look at developments abroad in Japan etc, that's the future.		
14	There will still be a demand for 1 bed units... the policy suggests a range, but then prioritised family homes.		
15	I'm not happy with the strength of the focus on young families. There are plenty of older people around here whose families have moved out and who are in large houses who could be encouraged to downsize (myself included) by a priority to provide sustainable smaller accessible accommodation with green space in mixed communities. And we are an ageing population after all. I don't want to move out of Lewisham to find a place I will love to be retired.		
16	I think the last thing London needs is more and more housing. I last travelled to London in rush hour ten years ago and it was stressful then. It must be much worse these days. More business and Government offices must locate away from London.		
17	there should be no compromise with the level of social housing in any new development		
18	More self build community led housing needs to be introduced		
19	Range of bedroom numbers and tenure important		
20	No more social housing		
21	in supporting more family housing and less 1 bed dwellings, I would also like to see some provision for inevitable car parking for families.		
22	I think there should be stricter stipulations for social housing - this seems way to vague, which is why we are not getting close to addressing the housing crisis in this country...		
23	Additional provision of accessible homes for the elderly is a high priority		
24	General  The extent of the neighbourhood plan area is set out clearly and precisely at the very start and this is welcomed by officers. Officers welcome the acknowledgement of the wider role the neighbourhood area can play in the region. In this regard the support for the Lee town centre as a District centre is welcome. The role and viability of this centre could be enhanced through the introduction of residential development. Annex 1 of the draft new London Plan notes Lee Green town centre has a low potential for commercial growth but a medium potential for residential growth.  The overarching spatial principles are made clear at the beginning of each chapter of the document, and this clarity is also welcome.		

**Do you agree with Policy 1: Housing Delivery? A. Residential development will provide a range of housing sizes and tenures to meet local housing needs and create sustainable communities. This will be achieved through the: 1. Provision of minimum viable levels of social housing in line with the London Plan and council development plan. This should include appropriate provision of social rented and intermediate housing. 2. Provision of a range of different sized units, prioritising larger family housing (3+ bedrooms) and 2-bed. 3. Appropriate provision of accessible homes for the elderly and consideration given to the provision of extra care units. 4. Appropriate provision for necessary social infrastructure including education, health and community facilities, green infrastructure and biodiversity. B. All new residential development should reflect the policies of the Lee Neighbourhood Development Plan. C. Proposals for community led / self-build housing on appropriate sites will be supported.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
	<p>Neighbourhood planning provides communities with the opportunity to set out a positive vision for how they want their community to develop over the next ten, fifteen or twenty years. It is about enabling rather than restricting development and a neighbourhood plan should demonstrate how it positively contributes towards achieving good growth. The NPPF makes clear that neighbourhood plans should support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans and plan positively to support local development. While officers consider that the Neighbourhood Plan would positively contribute towards achieving some elements of sustainable development, it should help contribute more positively and proactively towards the implementation of the emerging London Plan in meeting housing needs. A positive and proactive approach is considered to be one which recognises and reflects the boroughs' annual housing targets and sets out how it will contribute towards achieving it.</p> <p>New updated national guidance on neighbourhood planning has been published recently and should be taken into account. New paragraphs 100-106 of the National Planning Guidance now set out information on housing requirement figures, making it clear that an indicative housing requirement figure can be requested by a neighbourhood planning body based on local authority's local housing need as a starting point. If Greenwich and Lewisham Councils are unable to provide a housing requirement figure, or set out an indicative one, the Neighbourhood Forum should instead use the neighbourhood planning toolkit on housing needs assessment for this purpose. Neighbourhood Plans are encouraged to meet or exceed identified housing requirements.</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>The overarching objective of the current and Draft New London Plan is to deliver the homes that Londoner's need whilst protecting land uses such as green space/MoL, employment and industrial land. Greenwich and Lewisham's housing targets of 3,204 and 2,117 per annum, respectively are set out in Table 4.1 of the Draft New London Plan. The inclusion of Site Allocations for housing development is welcome but the Lee Neighbourhood Development Plan should build on the area based on guidance in line with the Mayor's Good Growth policies GG2 and GG4 and Policy D6 of the Draft New London Plan.</p> <p>Officers welcome the draft Plan's proposal to adopt the London Plan's approach to affordable housing.</p>		
25	No specific comments		




**Do you agree with Policy 2: Windfall Sites? A. The development of sites which are not allocated for housing will be supported where the proposals satisfy the criteria set out in Policy B1 and provided that the proposed development is in accordance with other policies in the Lee Neighbourhood Development Plan. Development will be supported where: 1. Underused sites are brought back into active use as either residential or local/micro employment or mixed-use sites, where appropriate. 2. Design is of a high quality and makes efficient and sensitive use of the land with minimal impact on amenity. 3. Provision is made for affordable housing in line with Policy B1. 4. An appropriate mix of housing typologies is ensured, taking the context of the site into account.**

		Response Percent	Response Total			
1	I fully support the above policy		86.14% 87			
2	I agree with the above policy and but would like to see amendments		8.91% 9			
3	I disagree with the above policy		4.95% 5			
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.19	Std. Deviation: 0.5	Satisfaction Rate: 9.41	answered	101
	Variance:	0.25	Std. Error: 0.05			

Please explain any points you would like addressed (11)

1	Stop building housing and start encouraging non-retail employment
2	With appropriate controls to avoid over-development and disruption
3	It MUST be stipulated that existing social housing and mixed-tenure housing should not be pulled down for new developments, as Councils are increasingly doing this in order to build "luxury" housing which doesn't benefit local people. This is a VITAL issue to include in the Neighbourhood Plan.
4	New projects should have sustainability as a priority.
5	I can't agree with this until I'm familiar with the Development Plan but 'infill' developments are always bad news.
6	social housing needs before 'affordable' housing
7	Explanation of points needs to be made clearer I didn't understand what housing typologies are If it means types of housing then state that
8	No more social housing
9	It's a scandal that the New Tiger's Head former pub at Lee Green Crossroads has stood empty for so many years - I understand that people have tried to negotiate some temporary use with the owner, but have got nowhere. The local council (Greenwich) should have powers to make the owner allow community use of a building, especially a ground floor building, when there are skilled people in the local area who are offering to do something with it, for the community's benefit.
10	Renewable energy generation?
11	I would like to see redundant sites 'greened up' as an interim measure while funding found, similar to sites in urban plots in Holland.

**Do you agree with Policy 3: Design of New Development? A. All new development will be required to meet policy HD2 and to be of a high quality and environmentally conscious design. New development will be required to: 1. Undertake a Health Impact Assessment (HIA), informed by a robust evidence base, ensuring that health and wellbeing are addressed as an integrated part of the planning process, for new developments of significant size (over 10 units). 2. Incorporate design features to ensure sustainable water use, and reuse of grey water, and avoid water course pollution. 3. Incorporate design features that maximise energy efficiency. 4. Incorporate boundary treatments which contribute to an active and attractive street scene, passive surveillance to ensure safety and security and demonstrate a positive interaction with the wider public realm through appropriate scale landscaping. 5. Provide adequate and discreet waste management facilities.**




			Response Percent	Response Total				
1	I fully support the above policy		87.88%	87				
2	I agree with the above policy and but would like to see amendments		8.08%	8				
3	I disagree with the above policy		4.04%	4				
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.16	Std. Deviation:	0.47	Satisfaction Rate:	8.08	answered	99
	Variance:	0.22	Std. Error:	0.05			skipped	13

Please explain any points you would like addressed (11)

1	as discussed above
2	Much better handling of recycling bins - continually full and overflowing at leegate centre
3	Minimise number of large unit flats
4	I agree with efficiency but not at the cost of the look and feel of the community. There are a number of individuals who have worked hard to preserve their properties and new ones, using new significantly obtuse materials will have a negative impact.
5	If there is demand for energy efficiency and sustainable water use (which I am sure there is) developers will do this anyway. If the costs of doing so mean potential purchasers aren't prepared to pay, then the demand is not there at the required cost
6	Design should be in keeping with the surrounding skyline ie low rise in low rise areas Design should avoid gated developments and avoid separation of pedestrian and transport access ie avoid pedestrian only areas which can become unsafe
7	And include access to green space and community gardening
8	See comment to previous question.
9	Bring green also means less parking and car support, and better bike storage, maintenance and cleaning facilities
10	All new developments should incorporate renewable energy generation.
11	More bins that are clearly defined as recycled or landfill



**Do you agree with Policy 4: Extensions and Alterations to Existing Buildings? A. Development proposals for alterations and extensions to existing residential and commercial properties, including roof extensions, should be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, complementing the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, and detailing of the original buildings and context, including external features such as chimneys and porches. Proposals should ensure: 1. A presumption in favour of a colour and material palate which is in harmony with the materials of its context. 2. The use of good quality materials. 3. The original built fabric, particularly Victorian, Edwardian and Arts & Crafts buildings and their boundary features are repaired or restored rather than replaced, wherever feasible, where this would protect and enhance local character. 4. Extensions, infill development and alterations that respect and are sensitive to the height, form and proportions of adjoining properties and existing buildings in their vicinity and setting. 5. Sensitive design and location of bin enclosures within front gardens. Stores in front gardens should be avoided and if required they should be screened from the street. 6. Extensions, alterations and infill development are encouraged to remedy alterations to existing buildings which have weakened the coherence of the urban form through inappropriate boundary treatments, loss of front gardens, and poorly designed additions and alterations.**

						Response Percent	Response Total	
1	I fully support the above policy					82.83%	82	
2	I agree with the above policy and but would like to see amendments					13.13%	13	
3	I disagree with the above policy					4.04%	4	
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.21	Std. Deviation:	0.5	Satisfaction Rate:	10.61	answered	99
	Variance:	0.25	Std. Error:	0.05			skipped	13

Please explain any points you would like addressed (19)

1	Extensions to roofs are generally unsustainable because they are flat, these will leak and create issues in a relatively short space of time. Apex roofs and nd sloping roofs must only be provided on roof extensions
2	The bounds of general and economic reasonableness need to be borne in mind regarding the above. Furthermore any policies should apply to all i.e. council, social and private properties alike.
3	Driving people away under the guise of faux concern for Victorian builders rates
4	How can this be implemented in areas that are not conservation areas?
5	Agree but not at the expense of restricting significant improvements.
6	Take appropriate action if residents do not adhere to guidelines and make sure that lewisham council follow the guidelines too!!
7	Bins have to go somewhere! when there is not back access Loft extensions are generally sheds on roofs and ugly but not sure how the look of them can be controlled
8	windows as long as the same shape should be accepted whichever material it is made of
9	Again.... householders should be encouraged to create extensions that protect the coherence of the host properties, through the use of high quality design, including contemporary solutions that distinguish themselves as such.
10	Do we need to include something about basement excavations in case it starts up around here?
11	See previous comment on 'infill' developments.

**Do you agree with Policy 4: Extensions and Alterations to Existing Buildings? A. Development proposals for alterations and extensions to existing residential and commercial properties, including roof extensions, should be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, complementing the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, and detailing of the original buildings and context, including external features such as chimneys and porches. Proposals should ensure: 1. A presumption in favour of a colour and material palate which is in harmony with the materials of its context. 2. The use of good quality materials. 3. The original built fabric, particularly Victorian, Edwardian and Arts & Crafts buildings and their boundary features are repaired or restored rather than replaced, wherever feasible, where this would protect and enhance local character. 4. Extensions, infill development and alterations that respect and are sensitive to the height, form and proportions of adjoining properties and existing buildings in their vicinity and setting. 5. Sensitive design and location of bin enclosures within front gardens. Stores in front gardens should be avoided and if required they should be screened from the street. 6. Extensions, alterations and infill development are encouraged to remedy alterations to existing buildings which have weakened the coherence of the urban form through inappropriate boundary treatments, loss of front gardens, and poorly designed additions and alterations.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
12	Bin enclosures. Many houses on Manor Park now store their bins on the street. They attract other rubbish and are an obstacle to people using the pavement. All of these houses have large front gardens so no reason for this.		
13	Lewisham council has a newly accepted policy document on extensions and alterations. The area has been badly damaged by loft extensions that are not co-hesive, do not match their properties, create intrusive views into private gardens and back windows. It is a totally unregulated system and outcomes have been eyesores from every point of view.		
14	How about communal bins in areas where the front gardens are too small to house individual bins. Streets littered with wheely bins are a modern scourge.		
15	But this should not discourage contemporary designs that use different materials or colours that may stand out as substantially different. This is far more preferable than pastiche/copied developments.		
16	Whilst the protection of historical property is important, so is promoting the area as a progressive, forward thinking, sensible and futuristic. Maintaining sympathetic redevelopment of existing properties is important but using new, sustainable and energy efficient materials should also be allowed.		
17	Again I question how this will be implemented. Would there be retrospective remedial works enforced if for example as is already happening significant amount of front gardens being lost.		
18	I particularly agree with point 6 above		
19	Planning Officers comments in response to planning applications and comments are not posted on LBL's planning website. They should be. You have to ask for them. In my experience they have contained significant inaccuracies, rendering it impossible to monitor whether alterations, extensions and building works are carried out in accordance with planning consent.		

**Do you agree with Policy 5: Managing Flood Risk? A. The Lee Forum area is particularly susceptible to flooding. To adequately manage this risk, developments in or adjacent to areas at risk of surface water flooding must demonstrate that it will not increase flood risk and will be required to contribute to surface water flood risk mitigation in the area. This will need to be reflected through the inclusion of a positive statement within the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for the site that sets out how this will be delivered.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above policy	94.12%	96

**Do you agree with Policy 5: Managing Flood Risk? A. The Lee Forum area is particularly susceptible to flooding. To adequately manage this risk, developments in or adjacent to areas at risk of surface water flooding must demonstrate that it will not increase flood risk and will be required to contribute to surface water flood risk mitigation in the area. This will need to be reflected through the inclusion of a positive statement within the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for the site that sets out how this will be delivered.**

						Response Percent	Response Total	
2	I agree with the above policy and but would like to see amendments						4.90%	5
3	I disagree with the above policy						0.98%	1
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.07	Std. Deviation:	0.29	Satisfaction Rate:	3.43	answered	102
	Variance:	0.08	Std. Error:	0.03			skipped	10

Please explain any points you would like addressed (8)

1	Is the whole of the Lee Forum area particularly susceptible to flooding??
2	I think something needs to be added about adequate maintenance of drains, removal of 'fatbergs', build-up of sludge, etc.
3	Consider making a requirement for SUDS and other soft engineering mitigations against flooding.
4	hard non porous landscaping of front gardens to be prevented
5	I am aware that the quaggy flooded in the 1070's but has there actually been significant flooding since?
6	Some areas are particularly susceptible, but most are not. This appears as though the whole area is susceptible, which is definitely not the case.
7	We have experienced a great deal of road flooding, at places where the kerbs disappear, where roads (e.g Manor Lane) have been badly re-surfaced after road works/changes and poorly cleared drains.
8	Please see previous comments on permitted or agreed development in front and back gardens. To date this has been granted in high risk flood areas without carrying out impact assessments. Front gardens are being converted to car parks. Large back gardens are being built on - extensions, large impermeable patios, and garden rooms with further paving. There is no oversight or overall management of this. It is happening on a large scale in high flood risk areas. The last big flash surface water flood in the Manor Lane area (approx 25 years ago) fully flooded all the gardens, front and back, in adjoining roads in the space of half an hour. At that time front and back gardens had not been built on or paved over. This is a recent development. It is likely that given the current reduced opportunity for water absorption houses would be flooded too.

## 8. Site Allocations

**Do you think any of the sites should not be included in the list?**

						Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Open-Ended Question						100.00%	32
1		7 - I would be concerned about redevelopment of Sainsburys site into a new and much larger property adding to congestion in the immediate area.						
2		This list must be earmarked for non-retail employment development						
3		It is not possible to read this map clearly.						

## Do you think any of the sites should not be included in the list?

		Response Percent	Response Total
4			none identified
5			Please consult the Courtlands Residents Association about the Lockup Garages if you have not done so already. Many residents on the Courtlands Estate rent out their garages for an income, if they don't use them personally. Plus the ownership of a garage increases the value of the property when selling or renting it out.
6			No Courtlands Estate Lockup Garages should be included in this list for development
7			No
8			No.
9			No
10			no
11			no
12			Sainsburys. I think it is good to have such a large supermarket nearby
13			All sites ok
14			don't know
15			Yes. The Lockup Garages located within the Courtlands Estate.
16			I would prefer existing community space not touched. Also any garages off Lyme Farm Road
17			The Courtlands Estate Garages must be removed, this is mainly freehold land and many of our residents bought their homes and garages then subsequently the freehold interest. There is considerable anger that these areas have been included from those who live here, it is wrong to blanket say the garages are not used as this is also factually incorrect. By all means work with us to improve the estate but our garages are not for redevelopment as this would also completely spoil the estate with over population and even less places for existing residents to Park as well as the Freehold matters mentioned above.
18			Courtlands avenue
19			Sainsburys
20			Garages on courtlands estate should not be included
21			Sainsbury's should be kept as it is.
22			7 - Sainsburys - low chance of land becoming available
23			All of the garages area on Courtlands What you propose is nonsense Most of us own the freehold on our garage Who ever proposed this should have had the decency to consult us before proposing such a ridiculous suggesting
24			All
25			No
26			From the point of view of parking used garages can be a very useful tool to create off street parking

**Do you think any of the sites should not be included in the list?**

		Response Percent	Response Total
27	Map Reference 1 Map Reference 7		
28	No		
29	The lock-up garages on the Courtlands Estate are private and who is to say they are unused? They are mostly used even if just for storage. Any development will impact the residences.		
30	No		
31	No		
32	Courtlands Estate has a reasonably good mix of housing and green spaces. Green spaces should be protected. Lockup garage areas are not suitable for development and easing of any planning restrictions in respect of development should not be allowed.		
		answered	32
		skipped	80

**Do you think any sites are missing from the list? If so please provide details of the site and your suggested use for it below.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	22
1	The network rail triangle and rail maintenance yard		
2	Leegate Centre - if planning approval lapses - this plan should address the centre.		
3	It is not possible to read this map clearly.		
4	no		
5	No.		
6	No		
7	no		
8	no		
9	Not that I am aware of		
10	Half developed Old Penfold garage off Old Road. Something really needs to be done with this.		
11	Don't know		
12	what about the St. Modwens site		
13	Car wash on burnt ash road - could be used for independent shops / cafes / Community use		
14	And the old tiger head should be turned into a community space		
15	No		
16	Not at the moment		

**Do you think any sites are missing from the list? If so please provide details of the site and your suggested use for it below.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
17	Not that I can identify		
18	The lock up garages on lampmead road are never used		
19	New Tigers head		
20	No		
21	No		
22	The New Tiger's Head pub site should be converted into a usable commerical business that does not lead to an increase in anti-social behaviour or traffic. A suggestion would be to convert it into a cinema on condition that no extra car parking is provided in the area.		
		answered	22
		skipped	90

**Do you think any sites are correctly included in the list but should have a different suggested use?**

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	14
1	All should be earmarked for non-retail employment		
2	It is not possible to read this map clearly.		
3	Seems to be a disproportionately large number of these sites under consideration for residential rather than mixed use or community space.		
4	I think item 7 should stay as retail so that it can remain as a supermarket as there are no other equivalent supermarkets in the area. Neither Lidl nor the Co-op are equivalent to Sainsburys and the Waitrose at Grove Park is too far away. Item 4. Where is Boone Street. Do you mean Holme Lacey Road? Why does it (Citroen) have to change to Residential, why not Mixed Use?		
5	No		
6	no		
7	no		
8	The Courtland Estate residents should be encouraged to use the Garage areas for car parking.		
9	Sainsburys - could be developed and improved but should remain as a supermarket.		
10	No		
11	No		
12	No		
13	No		
14	In respect of Strategic Environmental Assessment, this is generally applicable in the event of the identification of site allocations within a neighbourhood plan. We do however note that in this instance the intention is to provide policies which will generally have a positive impact on the		

**Do you think any sites are correctly included in the list but should have a different suggested use?**

		Response Percent	Response Total
	<p>historic environment and does not therefore raise issues of concern for Historic England. It may however be necessary to consider these in terms of impact on the Local Development Plan and conformity with the emerging London Plan.</p> <p>Many of the included sites are small in scale. You may wish to consider addressing aims through more generic small sites policies rather than site allocations.</p>		
		answered	14
		skipped	98

**9. Non-Planning Policy Projects**

**Please tell us your thoughts on the above suggested projects and whether you think other projects should be included to improve the Lee Forum area.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	38
1	Demolish the lee green A20 crossroads area and start again its a mess with very poor shopping no cohesion and is only missing a betting shop to complete the disaster		
2	Some great independent businesses have set up in the Lee gate centre so any initiative that helps them stay post redevelopment would be welcomed. Need to ensure there is sufficient secure parking for those working in local businesses so they don't spill out onto residential roads.		
3	The above all sound like good ideas which I would support.		
4	Alongside encouraging independant local business, restrictions on the introduction of high street retail chain stores		
5	I agree with the above wholeheartedly		
6	I agree with the above.		
7	Lee Shopping Centre needs particular attention with regard to occupation and appearance - perhaps regular food markets would help 'uplift', planting and lighting would assist		
8	These all sound potentially good. It will be interesting to see what level of stakeholder 'buy-in' there is.		
9	What type of street art? Some street art is dreadful. Where you state 'development of Lee Green District Town Centre' please do not delay the Leegate Development, it has taken far too long as it is!		
10	Soft play facility would be excellent - there is no near option and it would be good to have something for winter use. I would suggest the tigers head as a possible location except for its proximity to the road junction. Somewhere in current leegate centre could work. Sandpit for summer.		
11	Acceptable		
12	it sounds good		
13	Please just get on with the redevelopment of Leegate and Lee Green.....it's been in the planning stage for far too long!		
14	Agree with all of the projects in principal but also the option to give local residents the option to choose from 3-4 options.		

Please tell us your thoughts on the above suggested projects and whether you think other projects should be included to improve the Lee Forum area.

		Response Percent	Response Total
15	Encouraging local traers to improve their shop fronts - who decides what is an improvement? One person's improvement is another person's eyesore.  Street art could be ok - as long as there is a mechanism for art pieces to be reomved should they not prove popular - some 'street art' is horrendous, but others are nice - in my opinion, but everyone's opinion is different.		
16	I think a BID would have positive impacts as it creates both a say from local business but also collective buy in and support where needed.		
17	The Lee Green District Town centre site needs lots of trees to combat air pollution at the junction. Rather than retail other options like a cinema and arts/entertainment venue could be considered		
18	The priority has to be the redevelopment of the Leegate Centre. The successful redevelopment there would surely act as a catalyst for the enhancements needed to restore the whole of the intersecion site. shops etc.		
19	Surprisingly, there's no collaboration with the number of local Architects in the area		
20	Have a look at Friends and Users of Staplehurst Shops as a small grant funded organisation packing a punch on supported local shops and improving the environment for a model - small grant funding for community groups can obtain the results you are looking for		
21	All of the above would improve the area - although it's not that bad as it is.		
22	Fully support		
23	VacAnt small shops that don't keep ip to standards		
24	Leegate centre needs priority planning agreement to be knocked down and new development of commercial and domestic properties built It is a complete eyesore and wasted shopping area		
25	Community spaces for young people and older residents to meet and socialise		
26	Yes, especially with the Leegate, although this is outside the plan it is a key area		
27	All good stuff		
28	No problem with any of these but how big is a District Town Centre? Retail is currently on a downward spiral, with home deliveries and the on-line shopping increasing. thought has to be given to what kind of retail will thrive in the short term future, with adaptability.		
29	Am in broad ageement with the above.		
30	Very keen to see street art, and the use of vacant retail sites for 'pop ups'		
31	Fully agree with each point		
32	Shared workspaces?		
33	Fully support any improvements to Lee Green town centre!		
34	All good ideas. New young businesses have moved in to take advantage of lower rents and these need to be encouraged to stay with similar low rents in place once development is complete.		
35	A specific time of year for a "Festival" type event. Very much hope that Manor Park Library is fully supported.		
36	I think this is a good Idea. I think that there should be greater flexibility on usage change for sites, and there needs to be incentives offered for people to start businesses in so many of the vacant lots, for example of Lee High Road.		



Please tell us your thoughts on the above suggested projects and whether you think other projects should be included to improve the Lee Forum area.

		Response Percent	Response Total
37	Agree		
38	Another consideration you may wish to consider is the impact of development within the setting of heritage assets and significant views. We also publish substantive advice in respect of the setting of heritage assets which is available to download here. <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/</a>		
		answered	38
		skipped	74

Please tell us your thoughts on the above suggested projects and whether you think other projects should be included to improve the Lee Forum area.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	30
1	Fly tipping is a big problem , strategies to improve this would be welcome		
2	No detail so unable to comment		
3	Sounds good!		
4	Again, all good ideas particularly a strategy to prevent fly tipping		
5	agree		
6	I agree fully wit the above		
7	I agree with the above.		
8	Agree definitely with the buffering and improvement of access to the river Quaggy.		
9	These all sound good, but I'm particularly interested in the Quaggy linear park, will provide community amenity and, hopefully, flood alleviation benefits.		
10	Please look at getting a more local refuse tip rather than the one in Deptford which is far too far away.		
11	Acceptable		
12	ilook forward to seeing it happen		
13	Agree - more needs to be done to look after and make good green spaces, as well as encourage local communities and the Council to look after the area with more street cleaning and weeding.		
14	I have concerns about the idea of a linear park buffering the river quaggy - doesn't the Quaggy flow right on the boundary of some private land?		
15	Fly tipping has become rife and lets the neighbourhood down. More must be done to tackle it. Also support more planting of trees and other greenery to help mitigate air pollution.		
16	I am part of Street Trees for Living Group and know that residents will fund trees but that Lewisham Council does not have the capacity to plant them - so realistically the Councils need to have the infrastructure in place (public health funding?) to support tree planting and greening and get on top of air pollution.		
17	In favour of the above proposals.		

Please tell us your thoughts on the above suggested projects and whether you think other projects should be included to improve the Lee Forum area.

		Response Percent	Response Total
18	Agree with all ideas particularly developing walks along quaggy		
19	Yes		
20	Fly tipping strategy is really important - this has such a negative impact on the community.		
21	Totally agree, but concerned about how much the council will be able to be involved, with less money and fewer staff, with great turnover. We need council staff with experience, local knowledge and local contact.		
22	Am inbroad agreement with the above.		
23	Agree. Would like to see youth projects included		
24	I think that they are all good ideas.		
25	Good start at corner of Leegate at junction, so more of that please.		
26	The above sounds great. Fly tipping is definitely a big problem in the area. I have seen white vans dumping at the Leegate recycling bins. Either relocate the bins to an area where they cannot park to do this or I do recall they were located in Sainsbury's car park at one time. Put them back there, at least they would be seen very visibly if they attempted to offload and presumably there are security cameras located there		
27	Fly tipping is a big one, and it seems to me that the council needs to be more useful here. They do not currently offer collections of large items, at a fee or for free - and the tip is far too narrow in what it will take. This makes people far more likely to just stick it in the street as it is too much hassle. I think people also end up thinking - well if I pay someone to do it, who knows if THEY won't fly tip too? I therefore don't think there needs to be a a lot of wasted time developing a strategy - I think the council needs to step (as it does in other boroughs) and provide a service.		
28	Need to increase provsion of bins on Lee Road - perhaps have one located at the junction of Sims Walk and Lee Road. This will reduce the amount of rubbish being thrown onto the street as people walk up from the take-away outlets on the south end of Lee Road		
29	Agree		
30	NA		
		answered	30
		skipped	82

Please tell us your thoughts on the above suggested projects and whether you think other projects should be included to improve the Lee Forum area.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	29
1	New Tigers Head a priority as such am eyesore and wasted building! Great location for a community hub		
2	if you want to improve lee town centre, make a deal with Waitrose to provide shopping facilities, this will encourage and support further associated aspirational development. remove the tattoo shops, weatherspoons, takeaway curry, the very many hair dressers, and low market fast food outlets and charity shops. This place is a mess that does not encourage anybody to dare to walk there late at night, what a contrast to Blackheath		
3	Householders within conservation areas are protected and even greater pressure is put on surrounding areas to compromise their quality of surroundings to accommodate intensification of		

Please tell us your thoughts on the above suggested projects and whether you think other projects should be included to improve the Lee Forum area.

		Response Percent	Response Total
	housing. Therefore we don't support local funds / efforts into these projects. The focus should be on protecting the whole area from ugly and unwanted downgrading of local housing stock.		
4	I support these ideas. I think it is particularly important to bring the New Tiger's Head back into use.		
5	I agree with the above projects comprehensively		
6	I agree with the above.		
7	I think all these are good, but am particularly in conservation status for Manor Park.		
8	I agree with the list and certainly the New Tigers Head needs to be high on the priority list to get back into use, even if it ends up as a hotel.		
9	Acceptable		
10	The conservation areas are quite large so could there be a specific list of parameters , rather than full conservation status. Conservation projects are more costly in nature for residents which makes changes less likely and people to delay making the necessary improvements to their property.		
11	What is a 'community hub'? Do we know there is sufficient demand to justify the cost? If those using it had to fund it themselves would they?  I am certainly against tax payer funds being used for this.		
12	I would welcome CPOs on empty and neglected buildings. Also support cinema and arts organisations for more diverse offer. .		
13	Reconsider the space in front of Hither Green Station as an open green space rather than car dropping off point  Support extending conservation areas to retain the look and integrity of the architecture		
14	To include Lee High Road as a conservation area runs the risk of allowing the area to fall further into disrepair. It becomes less attractive, with more a restrictive planning framework, to business owners. Shop fronts are more likely to remain as they are, rather than being restored to their late Victorian grandeur. It's a fine aspiration, but the actual impact could create the opposite impact. Realistically... is there anything that really justifies its designation as a CA?		
15	Replace the orchards that used to exist around Hither Green Station with new street or Park fruit trees for the community to use. As well as youth provision (which is critically important) we also need provision for the lonely, disabled and elderly. And intergenerational work and projects focussed on inclusion and diversity.		
16	In favour of the above proposals. I would also add that the Courtlands Estate is worthy of inclusion as a fine example of 1950/60s' residential estate planning.		
17	Would like to see courtlands designated as a conservation or equivalent site		
18	Good		
19	I would welcome these projects		
20	A cinema in the new tigers head would transform the area with a massively positive impact for all ages.		
21	OK with all.		
22	m happy with the above.		

Please tell us your thoughts on the above suggested projects and whether you think other projects should be included to improve the Lee Forum area.

		Response Percent	Response Total
23	I'm all in favour of these areas being designated as new Conservation Areas.		
24	Extend the conservation area to include Millers meadow, meadowcourt road and bowring sports ground (currently MOL/flood plains, but an area of great natural beauty, nature, communism sports & working flood plain)		
25	Off road cycling		
26	Again all good ideas.		
27	I support		
28	Agree		
29	<p>Our web pages on neighbourhood planning provide further details in respect of heritage in Neighbourhood Planning, including assets of community value, and site allocations.  <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/improve-your-neighbourhood/policy-writing/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/improve-your-neighbourhood/policy-writing/</a></p> <p>Our Heritage Action Zone programme is one of a number of initiatives and I would suggest referring to area focussed grant schemes, as the form of this scheme may change for future years as we are currently focusing on High Street Heritage Action Zones but are not in a position to clarify future rounds of this scheme.</p> <p>We do not wish to comment of the appropriateness of CA extensions at this juncture but would suggest reviewing these with the local authority and in line with our national guidance on assessment and designation. Our Advice Note 1 on CA appraisal and related web pages are available at.  <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/what-is-designation/local/conservation-areas/">https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/what-is-designation/local/conservation-areas/</a></p>		
		answered	29
		skipped	83

Please tell us your thoughts on the above suggested projects and whether you think other projects should be included to improve the Lee Forum area.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	33
1	It would be great to see New Tigers head as a cultural space but would be happy with almost anything as long as its facade and as many interior original features were kept intact		
2	Demolish the new tigers head, keep the façade, its had its day, demolish legate, its a mess		
3	Having a local small scale cinema at the New Tigers Head would be a welcome addition.		
4	See comment above on New Tiger's Head		
5	agree		
6	I agree with the above		
7	I agree with the above. Also, the "popup" Yoga Studio in the Leegate Centre is a great enhancement of the area and priority should be given to a replacement building for this facility if/when the Leegate Centre is demolished. There are many gyms in the Forum area but very few		

**Please tell us your thoughts on the above suggested projects and whether you think other projects should be included to improve the Lee Forum area.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
	Yoga or Dance studios (I know of only one other such space, in the shops on the West side of Hither Green station). It would also be great to have a swimming pool somewhere: David Lloyd is too expensive and not very accessible.		
8	Redevelopment of the new Tiger's Head is long overdue, and a cinema would be a great use provided that this is on a small scale in keeping with the original features of the building.		
9	Whatever develop improvements take place regarding Leegate Centre there still needs to be adequate parking facilities made available with perhaps bike racks for local students - considering Leegate is so close to Blackheath which is immensely popular and we seem to look and feel like the 'poor neighbours'		
10	I think re-purposing the New Tiger's Head should be a priority.		
11	Please do not delay Leegate further.		
12	Acceptable		
13	Agree that The New Tigers Head needs redeveloping (if it cannot be reopened as a pub/restaurant). A cinema/theatre space would be a good idea.  REDEVELOP LEEGATE ASAP!!!!		
14	I agree the area could benefit from a local and affordable cinema that would also attract some residents from Blackheath and the surrounding areas. The PictureHouse at Greenwich or the everyman, or a community version which employee local people predominantly. People are more likely to look after something if they are involved in it.  We also need more youth activity centres to encourage children off the streets and into a safe place.		
15	If there is local demand for a cinema and it is commercially viable, why has one not been built?		
16	The Tiger's head really lets the junction down and an alternative use must be found. I even support turning it into flats if need be as long as it's in use but a cinema or culture/community hub would be ideal.		
17	Support all the above and also consider more open access sports facilities like all weather basket ball, netball etc pitches  have suggested running routes avoiding pollution areas as well as cycle routes		
18	A cinema in New Tiger's Head would be fantastic! There should be a community hall for Teens designed like an Apple store with a coffee/salad shop.		
19	All welcome		
20	YES to it all! Crowd funding for a cinema in the New Tigers Head - consider the Ethex platform to achieve this.		
21	In favour of the above proposals.		
22	Agree with ideas		
23	I am not convinced about specific youth provision, community provision that caters for youth is likely to be more sustainable, if not as ideal. Youth projects tend to be resource hungry - fine if you have them.		
24	Issues around secondary schools need to be addressed. I am a secondary teacher at a school in Westminster and a mother and would like to feel more positive about working in and sending my child to a secondary school in the area.		
25	This involves a great deal of committed work to be successful.		

Please tell us your thoughts on the above suggested projects and whether you think other projects should be included to improve the Lee Forum area.

		Response Percent	Response Total
26	Am happy with the above		
27	Yes, definitely agree about youth provision		
28	I'm fully in favour of the New Tiger's Head being turned into a community space with multiple uses, and understand that there are skilled people who live in the area, ready and willing to make this happen, if the owner of the property will only agree to it. ACV designation is also a great idea.		
29	Fully agree Affordable sports / activity facilities		
30	All good ideas.		
31	Could Tigers Head become a music centre for youth to form bands to practice etc. Rooms with dedicated drum kits for renting? Old Tigers Head is already a venue?		
32	I support		
33	Agree		
		answered	33
		skipped	79


**Possible Building New Homes and Amenities Project Work with local authorities to improve quality via regulation of new and existing Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) in the Lee Forum area. Please tell us your thoughts on the above suggested project and whether you think other projects should be included to improve the Lee Forum area.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	19
1	No more new homes, sustainable employment must now take priority		
2	I agree with the above projects		
3	I agree with the above suggested project.		
4	Regulation of HMOs should be a priority, and should work for the tenants.		
5	I agree.		
6	Acceptable		
7	As long as any new regulations do not lead to loss of housing.		
8	There is already regulation on HMO's and recently Lewisham Council had a consultation on their own proposals to regulate the private rented sector. I have concerns over the Council proposals.		
9	How?		
10	Support for self build.  Name and shame rogue landlords. Look for provision of Council Housing (not just affordable) within our area.		
11	This is a bit vague to me. Some properties at the outset are not suited as an HMO.		

**Possible Building New Homes and Amenities Project Work with local authorities to improve quality via regulation of new and existing Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) in the Lee Forum area. Please tell us your thoughts on the above suggested project and whether you think other projects should be included to improve the Lee Forum area.**

		Response Percent	Response Total
12	HMOs change the nature of the local population, people do not stay. They change the nature of the buildings. Communities are not created and do not build up.		
13	I agree entirely with this.		
14	There are concerns that HMOs can result in flytipping and a rise in crime. Recently a house in the Forum area was redeveloped as a five-unit HMO, with very little consultation with local residents, who have had difficulty obtaining any information from the local council (Lewisham). While the interior of the building has been fully redecorated, the outside has had no work done on it, which means that water pours down from the broken gutter right in front of the entrance door when it rains.		
15	Closer monitoring of hmos		
16	I support licensing of HMOs but not licensing of all landlords. There is so much going on at the moment - getting rid of tenants fees, ever increasing safety regulations, and the possible abolition of S21 notices, I think landlords will be deterred from letting out their properties.		
17	Working together to improve the quality of life for all residents is always a good idea.		
18	My understanding is there is lots of regulation on HMOs - so if there are problems perhaps they are not being adequately monitored within current provision?		
19	Agree		
		answered	19
		skipped	93

**What do you think about the proposals detailed above?**

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above proposed projects		75.56% 68
2	I support the above proposed projects but would like to see amendments		18.89% 17
3	I disagree with the above proposed projects		5.56% 5
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean:	1.3	Std. Deviation: 0.57
	Variance:	0.32	Std. Error: 0.06
		Satisfaction Rate:	15
		answered	90
		skipped	22

Please explain any points you would like addressed (24)

1	It is essential that the ULEZ be extended to the M25. Otherwise the existing ULEZ plan will actually increase pollution around the current borders - particularly the South Circular - which will increase adverse health outcomes in our neighborhood. Also need to add electric vehicle charging stations and convert local buses to electric as soon as possible.
2	Every single one of the above is critical

## What do you think about the proposals detailed above?

		Response Percent	Response Total
3	<p>no cycling support until there is national legislation to control dangerous cyclist and forcing them to have identification and insurance. How about a direct transport link from Bromley through Lee and Blackheath to the O2 that can be accessed prior to and after all concerts, now its a easier to go into central London to go / return to/from the O2</p> <p>Extending the the LEZ to the M25 does not affect Lee, so I cannot agree to this, Sneaky forms of control, rather invalidated the purpose of this survey</p>		
4	An unelected group with public accountability trying to set public policy.		
5	Increasing / blanket coverage of controlled parking zones. The area is a known commuter parking zone which disrupts local quality of life and ability to move about.		
6	I find the bus stops around the Lee Green crossroads and in Burnt Ash Road to be in perfect positions right now for commuting, and don't wish to see changes. It WOULD be good to move bus stops nearer to Lee Station for the 261 and 202 buses. I know some elderly people who don't use Lee Station because there isn't a bus stop near enough to the station.		
7	URGENT NEED FOR ADDITIONAL TUNNEL OR BRIDGE TO ALLEVIATE MAJOR CONGESTION LOCALLY		
8	The issue of access to and within Hither Green station should be a matter of priority.		
9	<p>Please do not block off Upwood Road, Horn Park Lane, Cambridge Drive or Abergeldie Roads (except as 'No Entries' in peak hours only) as that will mean traffic coming from the A20 will all then have to go along the South Circular and then have to turn right at the traffic lights on Burnt Ash Hill which is a problematic turn already. This will cause huge delays and make the traffic situation far worse for residents that need to drive. The snarl-ups in Upwood Road can be sorted out by stopping cars parking on 1 side of the road. Then the cars will be able to pass each other again as used to be the case when cars were narrower than they are now.</p> <p>If necessary a 'No Entry' sign between 7am and 9:30 at South Circular end of Horn Park Lane and Abergeldie Roads will stop the rat runners in the morning peak as this is by far the worst time. If necessary the 'No Entry' could be the other way at these locations between 1630 and 1830 although the traffic isn't quite so bad then.</p>		
10	Road safety on Lee High Road and around the Tiger's Head crossroad concerns me if Lee Green town centre is to be developed. Completely support the developments but hope you can think of a way to improve pedestrian access across these busy roads.		
11	<p>I am against an increase in controlled parking zones and street calming - there are already too many of these areas. I certainly wouldn't welcome either in my road. And I am against the extension of the ULEZ to the South Circular boundary, let alone the M25!!!</p> <p>I would like to see better transport links to central Greenwich, not just North Greenwich</p>		
12	<p>Controlled parking works but need to be more affordable. we already pay road tax and are charged for parking on stop, for no additional gain. Each home should be given 1 permit with extras paid for.</p> <p>Bus services need to be more frequent and evenly spread. Buses all going in the same direction all come at the same time.</p> <p>More options to cross the road (Lee High Road) need to be made as the traffic is very fast an crossing can take some time. It would also help to slow the traffic down, without putting in speed humps which I feel are unnecessary, as I do, width restrictions.</p> <p>All train station facilities need improvement, lighting, accessibility.</p>		
13	Don't like the idea of bus lanes. I believe for the average road user they will make things worse.		
14	a bus route from Lee Green to Greenwich would be great		
15	<p>CPZ's have to be 2 hour zones, except without good reason.</p> <p>Whilst laudable, extending the ULEZ is going to be a major issue for many people who do not have the financial capability to change their vehicles.</p>		






### What do you think about the proposals detailed above?

		Response Percent	Response Total
16	Broadly in favour with these proposals.		
17	Making more parking controlled streets just pushes parking on to the next available streets as has happened with parking restrictions on Weigall rd So now park on Lyme farm rd narrowing road down to one lane		
18	Some areas such as micheldever road are currently being as rat runs led by apps such as waze - more traffic calming measures Should be introduced		
19	Hither Green station is in serious need of re-design. Our elderly relatives can no longer use this station, the steep approach and the stairs make it a nightmare for anyone with a disability.		
20	There will be knock on effects from other areas, unless it is cohesive across London, and wider! the same applies to air pollution.		
21	Am in broad agreement with the above subject to my previous concerns on related matters		
22	I do not support extra CPZs just for the sake of it. They should only be used where there is a need, and the residents want them.		
23	- Extending the ULEZ to the M25 would be very good - Please lobby to get Bakerloo line extended to Blackheath station - Please lobby for additional river crossings with dedicated lanes for cycles/buses		
24	Need to bear in mind unintended consequences and knock on effects of any changes to traffic flows, and ensure opportunity for consultation reaches all who might be affected. Online only consultations exclude some sections of our community. Need to consult those who use existing public transport routes and schedules regularly before making changes to routes or schedules.		

### 10. Community Infrastructure Levy Spending Priorities

#### What do you think about the proposals detailed above?

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above proposed projects		92.93% 92
2	I support the above proposed projects but would like to see amendments		5.05% 5
3	I disagree with the above proposed projects		2.02% 2
<b>Analysis</b>		answered	99
	Mean: 1.09 Std. Deviation: 0.35 Satisfaction Rate: 4.55	skipped	13
	Variance: 0.12 Std. Error: 0.04		

Please explain any points you would like addressed (10)

1	Needs to explain the how they would control the explosion of rats emanating from the Quaggy
2	So exciting! This would really open up access to our various parks.
3	If private funding can be secured then maybe. Personally I love Manor Park, Manor Park Gardens (and outside the forum area Greenwich Park and Mountsfield Park). I prefer these parks to a linear park and think there is enough green space in the forum area already.

### What do you think about the proposals detailed above?

		Response Percent	Response Total
4	Use the same landscape designer as for Sutcliffe Park which is wonderful, and would ensure coherence!		
5	As previously mentioned The Ramblers Association (Ramblers) would endorse this proposal.		
6	I think this would be a great addition to the local area		
7	Really important to achieve.		
8	Please do not run this path through to Millers meadow. Millers meadow is a Privately owned no through road of 8 houses. It is currently a safe secure neighbourhood for our children to enjoy. Opening up this road with a pedestrian walkway will take this away. The pathway could open up on the drive onto eltham road opposite lee green bus stop. (A couple of hundred ft further up)		
9	I don't see how this is going to work where people's gardens go down to the river - for example in Brightfield Road. I know the route is shown as going down the road, rather than the river, and this should be adhered to.		
10	I think this might be very costly and not sure where funding would come from? Certainly an extension to local chain walk would be excellent as currently no idea where it is in this are.		

### What do you think about the proposals detailed above?

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above proposed projects		91.67% 88
2	I support the above proposed projects but would like to see amendments		5.21% 5
3	I disagree with the above proposed projects		3.13% 3
<b>Analysis</b>		Mean: 1.11	Std. Deviation: 0.4
		Satisfaction Rate: 5.73	answered: 96
		Variance: 0.16	Std. Error: 0.04
			skipped: 16




Please explain any points you would like addressed (7)

1	Guided walks? Seriously?
2	I don't like the idea of using old containers.
3	A cafe is ok as long as it is self supporting
4	Do old containers really look that sympathetic to a park? Or green?
5	You must be aware that the Weigall Sports Ground is threatened with a proposed service road for the proposed Academy school. This sports ground seems woefully underused and I would support improved access. I don't think 'old containers' are a good idea. Development of football pitches would be good as the area lost so many when Sutcliffe Park was reconfigured for flood defence.
6	At present a number of good playing fields are ruined by the fact that there is an unnecessary amount of floodlights in or near the areas. Views of residents and community groups is very important.

### What do you think about the proposals detailed above?

		Response Percent	Response Total
7	There should not be any car parking facilities; this simply encourages car driving which we should be discouraging in this area		


### What do you think about the proposals detailed above?

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above proposed projects		93.00% 93
2	I support the above proposed projects but would like to see amendments		5.00% 5
3	I disagree with the above proposed projects		2.00% 2
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean: 1.09 Std. Deviation: 0.35 Satisfaction Rate: 4.5 Variance: 0.12 Std. Error: 0.03	answered	100
		skipped	12

Please explain any points you would like addressed (9)

1	Trees not to be planted where roots would disadvantage the blind and disabled
2	Choose tree type with care - locally to us tree growth at the lower trunk in the summer creates a muggar's paradise along the pavements at night. Other than that the more trees the better.
3	A good idea
4	As long as there is sufficient room on the pavement for pedestrians (and also vehicles were they are allowed to partially park on pavements). I am subsidence issues will be taken into account
5	Trees need to be appropriate to the existing housing stock. We've had trees removed owing to potential subsidence issues. You have to be mindful that homeowners may be adversely affected by the impact on trees on the water table... both their planting and removal.
6	Increase capacity at Tree Officer level and look for funding now we have a climate emergency that gives priority to Lewisham's air quality. Look at success of groups such as Street Trees for Living who have a markedly better success at tree survival than many projects because of enabling resident participation in watering.
7	Living walls could also be installed where possible
8	There should be a tree height max to avoid blocking sun to gardens/properties
9	Need to keep to right tree in the right place, too often trees are just installed with no thought to future scale or management

### What do you think about the proposals detailed above?

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above proposed projects		97.92% 94

### What do you think about the proposals detailed above?

		Response Percent	Response Total
2	I support the above proposed projects but would like to see amendments	0.00%	0
3	I disagree with the above proposed projects	2.08%	2
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean: 1.04	Std. Deviation: 0.29	Satisfaction Rate: 2.08
	Variance: 0.08	Std. Error: 0.03	
		answered	96
		skipped	16

Please explain any points you would like addressed (6)

1	.
2	The 'view' of the river Quaggy - clean up the rubbish dumped in it and deal with the colonies of rats before you consider letting anybody see the place
3	Do whatever is possible to stop the developers from turning the Leegate Centre into an impenetrable high sided triangle of horribleness for existing local residents
4	Not my borough, not close to me so not relevant for me.
5	I support this even though I think it's a bit daft!
6	I would like to see more details on the pocket park before committing.

### What do you think about the proposals detailed above?

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above proposed projects	92.71%	89
2	I support the above proposed projects but would like to see amendments	5.21%	5
3	I disagree with the above proposed projects	2.08%	2
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean: 1.09	Std. Deviation: 0.36	Satisfaction Rate: 4.69
	Variance: 0.13	Std. Error: 0.04	
		answered	96
		skipped	16




Please explain any points you would like addressed (7)

1	I would like to see greater emphasis in meeting the needs of the very young, very old and those with a full range of disability in Lee District Town Centre, namely purpose built , fully accessible toilet/baby change facilities, varied height seating and access to free drinking water
2	Demolish Leegate and start again, by compulsory purchase if necessary
3	I'm supportive as long as proposals for provision don't further delay the redevelopment of Leegate.
4	Who decides what is 'adequate'? What sort of community facilities are required? Is there demand? Great if private funding can be found.

### What do you think about the proposals detailed above?

		Response Percent	Response Total
5	Local Area Grants need re-instating to support this work.		
6	Incredible that Leegate redevelopment has not been tackled before now. Unfortunately with switch to online shopping retail units would struggle however the fact that nothing seems to have been progressed in all this time seems incredible. Hard to see how some of the plans outlined in this consultation will be taken forward given the failure to achieve anything at Leegate.		
7	It is imperative that local groups - and the NHS - are brought into these discussions. As a local volunteer I am painfully aware of how important drop in services are to so many users, and how their funding is and recognition is minimal. As mentioned earlier, there is much debate by those of us using and visiting the Lee Centre on Aislibie Road as to what the SLAM hospital has planned for the place, as it is falling into terrible disrepair, There is so much lip service about 'quality provision' and I appreciate that times are hard with this government and its policies..... but community centres save the NHS so much time and money, and those doing their bit to provide services need better support!		

### What do you think about the proposals detailed above?

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	I fully support the above proposed projects		98.00% 98
2	I support the above proposed projects but would like to see amendments		1.00% 1
3	I disagree with the above proposed projects		1.00% 1
<b>Analysis</b>	Mean: 1.03 Std. Deviation: 0.22 Satisfaction Rate: 1.5	answered	100
	Variance: 0.05 Std. Error: 0.02	skipped	12

Please explain any points you would like addressed (8)

1	All libraries should be supported, how about putting books, music and video on line and make them available in the surrounding park users by free wi-fi
2	Better - less interference in people's lives here and more community action.  More of this please
3	Manor House should be a central community point and used for valued services and resources that bring the local residents together
4	I don 't want public resources to be used for this. There is already Lewisham library.
5	V22 have kept the library going, but I really do object to the principle of letting a private company run this at a profit on the back of volunteers. Should be passed to a not-for profit organisation ASAP.
6	Manor House gardens and library and cafe so vitally important. Please can we have a new duck house?
7	I must declare that I hold Manor House Library in very high regard. I was unemployed for some time and the use of resources at the Library was invaluable in helping me to job hunt. In does need funding though to improve facilities and better access. There is a vicious circle in that it lacks certain amenities and therefore take up is not what it should be.
8	This is a vital resource which should be protected

11. Thank you for completing this survey

12. Credits