

Comments to London Borough of Lewisham on Reserved Matters Application DC/18/107620 Convoys Wharf, Block 22 (Phase 1)

Submitted in response to the consultation ending 12th August, 2018 by **Voice 4 Deptford**: Address - c/o Pepys Community Forum, 1 Creek Road, Deptford, London SE8 3BT

A. Public Consultation

The Planning Statement 5.2 contains a false statement and an arrogant statement.

See Planning Statement, Public Consultation Page 18:

*5.2 The submission of this planning application follows extensive consultation undertaken over a period of years. This process has seen the scheme develop through close consultation with planning and design officers from Lewisham Council, key stakeholders, local groups (including Deptford Folk and **Voice for Deptford**), local residents, businesses and Councillors, including Ward Members.*

False statement: There has not been extensive consultation on Plot 22 which includes **Voice 4 Deptford** specifically and we were unaware of the plans for Plot 22 until they appeared on the Planning Portal.

Furthermore:

5.5 In light of the intended use of Plot 22 for a temporary marketing suite, it was felt there isn't a great degree of scope for consultation with the local community. However, to ensure local residents and stakeholders are kept apprised of the proposals the following actions have been undertaken prior to submission of the application

- Local press notice
- A leaflet to surrounding residents within our consultation zone
- An update to the website
- A letter to stakeholders offering them an opportunity to meet/ ask questions.

5.6 These stages presented formal opportunities for local residents and stakeholders to feed into and respond to the development.

Arrogant statement: It is not the role of the developer to unilaterally decide whether there is, or is not, '*...a great deal of scope*' for consultation. Planning law states that local people should be consulted.

In addition, to the knowledge of **Voice 4 Deptford**, local residents living around the development site have not had sight of leaflets, press notices, website updates and letters.

Conclusion: The proposals for Plot 22 have not been put out for public consultation. They should not be considered until a full and meaningful public consultation has taken place and the plans revised taking into account all the valid views expressed.

B. Voice 4 Deptford has a number of concerns arising from the Reserved Matters Application (RMA).

They include:

i. Planning History

The Planning Statement is generic for the whole site (and previously the Elephant Park) with general references to Plot 22. It does not give the precise planning history and would be the place to explain how the Outline Permission for *'the use of Plot 22 (the Jetty) for construction logistics and/or as a park and to provide access for the riverbus pier'* evolved into a 2 to 3 storey building.

Development Specifications (Revised) states under 'Development Plot 22':

3.27 The key components of Development Plots P22 are, in accordance with Appendix 3, as follows:

- 800sqm of River related uses; and*
- 800sqm of restaurant and cafes (Class A3) and drinking establishments (Class A4) floor space*

- a. Where do we look to see the document which specifies when this has been formally agreed?
- b. What constitutes the 800sqm of River related uses?

Conclusion: A public consultation would help to clarify the intentions of CPL

ii. The Building Design

- a. The specifications above leave open the form that the *800sqm of restaurant and cafes (Class A3) and drinking establishments (Class A4) floor space* will take. Permission is being sought to build a 3 storey building. Although just below the permitted 800 sqm as described in the application, the design is such that it could lead to having a total area of 1,075 sqm, given scope to add 290 sqm by enclosing the ground floor at some future time.
- b. The building fails to take advantage of the surrounding architectural design to come up with a contemporary design worthy of its position in a historic context including the form of the buildings on Deptford Strand and the Master Shipwright's House, with a strong architectural waterfront style.
- c. The building occupies an important point in the experience of approaching not only Convoys Wharf, but also Royal Greenwich. The experience would be diminished by the present proposed design.
- d. The building does not incorporate sustainable and green design techniques or means to keep it cool in increasingly high summer temperatures.
- e. The glass presents a problem as a materiel on the river front due to pollution and building dust. It will be almost impossible to keep it clean and will soon look dilapidated.

Conclusion: Outline permission gives wide scope for a more creative solution, including more than one building. This application should be rejected and a design put forward which is relevant to its context and surroundings.

iii. Proposed Use of the Building

a) The proposal is to use the building as a marketing suite. During the time of use as a marketing suite the area will be private and access by appointment only. One of the promises of the developer is to provide access to the river to the people of Deptford and the public at large. It now seems we will have to wait at least another 15 years for this to happen. This is not acceptable. As the proposal is to carry out development in Phase 1, then public access to the jetty should be enabled before the end of Phase 1.

b) The proposal to have the marketing suite access private and by appointment only begs the question of what the marketing strategy is, who is this development for, and how much are the homes being marketed for? If marketing has begun, this must already be public knowledge somewhere, so it is time this information was shared among the local community.

c) Position of the Marketing suite - It would be more practical to have a marketing suite on Deptford High Street and free the jetty for public use with the promised park.

Conclusion: A marketing strategy should be made publicly available showing the price of units, especially at this time when there is an intention on the part of the developers to begin the development with Plot 8. CPL should find another position for the marketing suite and abide by the Outline Permission to provide a public park on the jetty.

iv) Lack of worked through cultural strategy

A proper worked through cultural strategy arising from a process as described in Annexe 3 Cultural Strategy Commitments the Section 106 agreement would make possible a far better and more place appropriate design for the building and public space.

Conclusion:The application should be rejected and a cultural strategy worthy of the site presented and used to inform design of the jetty. The developers should involve local artists, architects, local people and especially young people in working out the strategy.

C. Summary of V4D's Comments on Phase 1, Plot 22:

In view of the lack of consultation on Phase 1, Plot 22, and the serious nature of our immediate observations about the Plot's planning shortcomings this application to should be refused.

End of document