

Comments 18/AP/1604

OVERVIEW

- **No development until current transport issues are formally resolved.**
- **Phase 1 to provide realistic additional transport capacity for the new residents and workers.**
- **K1 to be totally designed**
- **A1 to be modified**
- **A2 to be modified**
- **Outline application to contain much more detail in order that there is limited scope to amend the delivery promises when full planning permission is sought. The quantum of family dwellings – particularly in the affordable sector - must have a guaranteed minimum and should be spread evenly across the area.**
- **Fit for purpose links to / from all surrounding areas**
- **A formal commitment that a renown centre of excellence will move to the area.**
- **It has been said that ‘development is easy, but regeneration requires partnership’. The quality of life and needs of existing residents and workers must be part of the process.**

ZONE A

A1 - 33 storey residential tower & office buildings

- A1 impacts the view and prominence of the Dock Masters Office and Clock Tower which is a Grade II listed. The Dock Offices were built in 1892 and as such are the only remaining heritage building linked to the previous use of the area as docks. There is a duty to conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets and their setting and create views that contribute positively to the significance of the building
- A1 does not have sufficient unique architectural merit to justify its 129 m height. The residential tower is buttressed by a five-storey podium housing commercial units. A1 is in fact three towers, each of a different height, facade and colour. One assumes that the aim is to avoid them merging visually. However, the result is that A1 dominates the award winning landmark CW library and DMO and as such creates a very muddled gateway to the area.
- The level changes in Surrey Quays Road are significant. Hence A1 's relationship to the existing neighbouring tall buildings Columbia and Regina Point (62m) and Ontario Point (78m) needs to reflect this.
- Serious concerns about A1 servicing via a new crossover from Surrey Quays Road (4.2.3) TfL also state that *the operation of Surrey Quays Road in particular is critical, as it is the access route to Canada Water bus station, which is served by six daytime bus routes, two night bus and two 24 hour routes. .*
- A1 shadow appears to breaks BRE Guidance on light requirements for residents in Orchard House and Columbia Point
- Atleast 8 affordable family housing units on A1 must be a formal condition. It is not acceptable that the majority of Phase 1 affordable units are on Zone K, a considerable distance from all amenities.
- The Sellar Tower was described as a landmark building. The addition of A1 and others will completely change the character of the CW basin and surrounding area.

A2 - Leisure Centre and Office Block

- New leisure facilities are underground for the most part and lack the light of Seven Islands.
- Disabled access is poor. Blue Badge parking (4 bays) will be provided on Deal Porters Way at 90m from the entrance. Content of Para 4.2.4 unrealistic. Content of Para 4.2.5 suggesting Tooley Street is a 10 minute coach drive away is very questionable.
- Design of the building is incompatible with what is currently a residential area.
- The plans for 'Prince of Orange Walk' do not appear to address the significant land level change and provide disabled access. This pedestrian route is currently very well used and it is not clear how this will be incorporated in Phase 1. Nor do there appear to be any plans at this stage for the landscaping treatment between the Masterplan site and Hothfield Place. Maybe Dock Office Walk should form part of Phase 1 ?

Comments 18/AP/1604

- There does not appear to be any formal commitments made to retaining and maintaining the Surrey Quays Shopping Centre wildlife area.
- Proximity to existing residents will adversely affect their quality of life, especially because the loading bay and service areas for this building are sited closest to existing residents
 - Privacy – extensive planting has to be maintained in order to prevent overlooking by office workers into residents back gardens
 - Projections are for 66 deliveries a day which all have to reverse to access the bay. This will generate an unacceptable level of noise from the vehicle reversing alarms.
- The new courtyard at the rear of the Dock Offices is well designed. It should form part of Phase 1.

ZONE B - Concerns about shadowing

ZONE C

The new entrance to Surrey Quays Station is welcome as currently only CW has disabled access. Developments in Deptford will have a significant impact on use of the overground, the jubilee line and the buses. It is unclear as to the possible impact of the making Lower Road two way and Cycle Super Highway 4. Is Lower Road wide enough to be able to accommodate such changes?

Concerns about the shadowing onto Lower Road

ZONE E - Concerns about shadowing

ZONE G - New Tesco etc – Concerns about the shadowing impact on Greenland Dock and the traffic and parking arrangements.

ZONE K – A residential block on Robert's Close next to Russia Dock Woodland

- Not in accordance with CWAAP18 which states site suitable for 28 units and must protect sense of openness with Russia Dock Woodland.
- The proposals are not sympathetic to Russia Dock Woodland and the neighbouring developments – old and new. The proposals have a negative impact on the entrance to RDW Nature Reserve.
- The 35% Affordable housing provision (39% including discount market rent/sale units) is highly dependent on grant assistance: How likely is it that the scheme would be awarded the full grant amount assumed in BL's viability appraisal?
- Why do the intermediate housing income caps accord with those set by the LPA rather than the GLA? How is this meeting local need?
- Are you able to clarify what provision is proposed in outline for specialist housing (use class C2) for older persons including extra care? Why not seek a full planning permission for specialist housing now? The outline application seeks a maximum of 35,700 sq m (Gross External Area) of assisted living (Use Class C2); what is the minimum GEA and how would any such minimum amount be secured under Planning?
- Only 4x blue badge car park spaces are proposed for 84 dwellings. 10% or 9 would be wheelchair accessible units: Would the proposed car parking spaces be available to anyone with a blue badge? Why does the proposal fall so short of providing the required wheelchair accessible car park spaces on site? There is an increasing national trend towards issuing blue badges to people with none physical disabilities. How will these people be accommodated in K1 ?
- Why is the design and appearance of the energy centre so underwhelming / utilitarian when compared against the overall building design? Why not a more ambitious design given its location and visibility? What are the acoustic requirements of the louvre system and where are the nearest likely residential receptors?
- In regard to Russia Dock Woodland, what measures are proposed to prevent undue harm from light spill and / or light pollution? Has a comprehensive artificial lighting assessment been provided ?
- Roberts Close is a cul de sac with no turning circle. It is not appropriate to propose using the rear gates of Alfred Salter Primary School as a turning, drop off, waiting area. Assuming a minimum 84 movements a day will generate H & S issues and the constant noise from

Comments 18/AP/1604

reversing vehicle alarms will negatively impact on the teaching spaces. There must be turning/ drop off / waiting provision within the footprint of K1.

- K1 is a considerable distance from shops, transport and public amenities. Hence it needs car parking spaces similar to London Squares and Quebec Quarter.
- Quietway 14 passes K1, which will add to the already very busy pedestrian route.
- It is not acceptable to propose routing the K1 construction traffic via Canada Street and Quebec Way. There is a width restriction outside Alfred Salter School and the school entrance must be clear at all times. Also large vehicles cannot navigate the turn from Canada Street into Quebec Way.

ZONE L - Need to clarify the origins of the Cafe East / Quebec Curve building

The proposals need to be more detail and definition in order to ensure compatibility with Quebec Quarter and London Squares & Brunswick Quay.

ZONE M - Former Police Station

- Massing of new building is far in excess of existing buildings and does not reflect the local footprint or the topology of period residential properties. Character of Lower Road at this juncture will remain small scale and residential .
- Concerns regarding access via Dock Office Walk and Prince of Orange Walk. There is a significant land level change and there must be a general gradient to provide access for all.

Transport

- There appears to be a total lack of guaranteed remedies for the current dire congestion in the Phase 1 proposals. All improvements appear purely speculative . This is neither sustainable nor acceptable. Buses will continue not run to schedule, emergency vehicles will struggle to reach incidents, people will be late for work etc etc. Transport improvements must be made before Phase 1 commences.
- The modelling is inadequate (e.g. the TfL studies are all based on 2011 data). When will BL produce a multi-modal study ? The cumulative impact of all the development (Grosvenor Development at the Biscuit Factory, Convoys Wharf, Timber Yard in Deptford) as well as CW Master Plan appears to have not been considered.
- There appears to be no provision to integrate a river crossing or river pier stops in the proposals.
- BL statement that it is hoping that residents will find 'alternative routes' is unhelpful. Regeneration should deliver initiatives that address the issues faced by the current community and focus less on what may be available to newcomers.
- The lack of parking penalises disabled, old people and those with young children. The consequence will be a huge influx of internet delivery vehicles, taxis etc etc.

General

- There appears to be no new infrastructure in Phase 1. The leisure centre, cinema, etc. already exist. The CWMP will rebuild in a different location. How will this cater for the increase in population ? .
- Ad hoc expansion of existing purpose built schools is highly undesirable. Movement around school buildings and access to facilities is a very exact science. Expansions invariably upset the balance.
- Will the water pressure locally will be affected by the number of high rise towers ?
- Serious concerns regarding the long term viability of the retail space.
- The scheme must aspire to ensure a world renown centre of excellence moves to CW to give the area status and a sense of place. Without such an organisation it is difficult to envisage how CW will compete with other areas of London. If CW does not become a distinctive place and a destination it will be reliant on local residents and workers to sustain the shops and restaurants.
- Access to the CW Masterplan site must reach out to the wider area. Pedestrian, cycle and bus links from all directions are vital. Currently links to Albion Street and beyond appear rather circuitous.
- It is assumed the street names in documents working titles. There is a need for a PUT IT ON THE MAP initiative to ensure names correctly reflect heritage / points of interest.