

2022 | SUBMISSION VERSION



All basemaps are reproduced from Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. All other data is open source from online locations, references as footnotes throughout the documents.

For more information contact:

Lee Neighbourhood Forum

E INFO@LEEFORUM.ORG.UK

W [HTTP://LEEFORUM.ORG.UK/](http://LEEFORUM.ORG.UK/)

© Lee Neighbourhood Forum

Date Published 2021 – submission version

The Lee Neighbourhood Plan (Pre-submission version) has been prepared with the help of Mapping Futures. It is, however, a collective effort, involving much input and text from the residents themselves.

All basemaps are reproduced from Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office

Contents

1	Introduction.....	4
1.1	Background Context	4
1.2	Compliance with Consultation Regulations.....	5
1.3	Revision History	5
1.4	Document Structure	6
2	Stakeholders	7
3	Engagement and Consultation Approach	8
3.1	Communication Channels	8
3.2	Engagement Activities	9
3.3	Equality, Inclusion and Human Rights Statement.....	9
4	Engagement and Key Issues Consultation Events.....	11
5	Regulation 14 Consultation	22
5.1	Consultation Timeframes.....	22
5.2	Who was consulted	22
5.3	Consultation Methodology.....	23
5.4	Key Issues Workshops / Meetings	24
5.5	Section 14 Statutory Consultees Outcome and Changes Made to the Plan	25
5.6	Section 14 Local Consultation Summary	29
5.7	Section 14 Local Consultation Outcome and Changes Made to the Plan	28

6 Health Check.....	40
6.1 Presentation of Revised Wording and Evidence of Approval.....	41
7 Appendices	42
7.1 Selection of Communication Media for Engagement Events.....	42
7.2 Table Cross Referencing Pre S14 Consultation Draft NP and Post S14 Submission NP.....	44

List of Tables

Table 1: Revision History.....	5
Table 2: List of Consultees	7
Table 3: Key Issues Engagement Events, Purpose and Key Outcomes.....	11
Table 4: Section 14 Statutory Consultee Responses and Changes Made as a Consequence.....	24
Table 5: Section 14 Local Responses and Changes Made as a Consequence	28
Table 6: Section 14 Further Local Responses and Changes Made as a Consequence.....	38
Table 7: Health Check and Changes Made as a Consequence.....	40

1. Introduction

1.1 Background Context

Lee Forum's founders hope to increase community involvement and influence in local development.

An application to establish a forum was made to Lewisham and Greenwich councils in September 2015. Lee Forum was designated by both councils in January 2016.

The plan process has been led by the Lee Neighbourhood Forum. It established seven work groups to act as a key means of compiling the evidence base, engaging with the local community and testing the suitability and acceptability of its emerging policies and proposals.

It is the intention of the Forum is to submit the Neighbourhood Plan in general conformity with both Lewisham and Greenwich's Local Plans.

2.3 The process up to submission includes the following stages:

- Extensive community engagement;
- Gathering of evidence base;
- Production of the draft plan and the Pre-Submission Plan;
- Final Submission Neighbourhood Plan.

This document takes into account the representations received on the Pre-Submission Plan and has been amended as necessary before submission to Lewisham and Greenwich Councils.

Extensive support and advice has been provided by Lewisham and Greenwich Councils throughout the process. Meetings and briefing sessions with officers have taken place at all stages.

The Plan is accompanied by a Basic Conditions Statement and this Consultation Statement.

If approved by the Councils, the Neighbourhood Plan will then be subject to an independent examination. Any recommendations made by the Examiner will be considered by the Forum and Councils. Both Councils will be responsible for amending the Plan before going to local referendum. If supported by a majority vote, the Neighbourhood Plan will be ‘made’ by both Lewisham and Greenwich Councils and will become planning policy for the Lee Neighbourhood Plan Area.

1.2 Compliance with Consultation Regulations

In accordance with the NPR (2012) this document constitutes the Consultation Statement to comply with the requirements of Regulation 15. As well as capturing a record of all key engagement / consultation events, it also provides the response to the Pre-Submission Statutory Consultation required under Regulation 14 of the NPR (2012).

This statement has been completed largely by Lee Forum’s committee who have been responsible for organising each event, with support from Mapping Futures Ltd.

1.3 Revision History

Table 1 documents the revision history for each issued update.

TABLE 1: REVISION HISTORY

Date of Issue	Revision No	Summary of Change
25/01/2018	0.1	First Draft – incorporating all the evidence gathered at various engagement events to date
31/11/2020	0.2	Second Draft - – incorporating all the evidence gathered through Statutory Consultation required under Regulation 14 of the NPR (2012)
13/1/2021	0.3	Third Draft – Section 15 Submission Final

1.4 Document Structure

The structure of this Consultation Statement is set out to meet Part 5, Section 15(2) of the NPR (as amended, 2012):

- **Stakeholders:** Details the key organisations consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan throughout its development.
- **Engagement and Consultation Approach:** Explains how residents and stakeholders were consulted.

- **Key Engagement Events:** Details the key events that took place to gather local views, aspirations and design ideas as part of developing the plan.

Evidence for these events is provided including:

- The event name and broad methodology.
 - Evidence such as notes, summaries of outcomes, photos collated on the day, and summaries of key outcomes
 - The main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted, and where relevant, how these were addressed in the proposed NDP.
- **Regulation 14 Consultation:** Details the key events that took place to gather local views on the full pre-submission plan.
 - **Health Check:** Summary of the health check outcome.

2. Stakeholders

TABLE 2: LIST OF CONSULTEES

Name	
Statutory Consultees	Local Community Groups/ Organisations (not an exhaustive list)
Natural England	London Living Streets
Historic England	Affinity Sutton Clarion
Environment Agency	Local Churches including Kings Church and Church of the Good Shepherd
Sport England	Quaggy Waterways Action Group
The Crown Estate	Hither Green Community Association
Thames Water	Users and Friends of Manor House Library
Network Rail	Courtland Residents' Association
The Coal Authority	Weigall Road Residents
SGN	Lee Green WI
Hyperoptic	Peabody Estate
National Grid	Newstead Estate
Arqiva	Friends and Users of Staplehurst Shops
Cityfibre	Grove Park Neighbourhood Forum
TfL	Friends of Manor Park
Neighbouring Boroughs	Blackheath Society
UK Power Networks	Lee Green Lives
Met Police	Lee Manor Society
NHS	
Government Organisations	Other Local Stakeholders
GLA	Those who live, work or study in the area
Lewisham Council	Local Businesses including Leegate Traders Group
Royal Borough of Greenwich	Local Landowners

3. ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION APPROACH

Engagement and consultation has been carried out in accordance with the aims and objectives of the Neighbourhood Forum Constitution¹.

3.1 Communication Channels

- The main approach to disseminating information has been via the neighbourhood forum's social media sites:
 - Website: www.leeforum.org.uk
 - Twitter: @leeforum
 - Facebook: leeforum
 - Email: info@leeforum.org.uk
- Additionally, the forum has a mailing list of over 500 residents and businesses who receive news of events, information, inviting them to participate and contribute their feedback and other local groups have shared the forum's events via their own communication channels.
- Other local groups and Lewisham and Greenwich councils have been kind enough to share our communications via their social media and email networks.
- Lee Forum presented and took questions at local meetings and events
- Lewisham Ledger published an article on Lee Forum in 2019.
- Before major events an area- wide leaflet drop was done

3.2 Engagement Activities

Various methods have been employed to carry out the engagement and consultation events, including:

- Community workshops and consultations
- Surveys (both online and physical displays)

¹ <http://leeforum.org.uk/about/our-constitution/>

- Community briefings, including at ward assembly meetings
- Engagement activities and events
- Engagement at community events

3.2 Equality, Inclusion and Human Rights Statement

The Human Rights Act contains a number of articles which are potentially relevant to neighbourhood planning such as:

- the right to respect for private and family life
- freedom of expression
- prohibition of discrimination

Lee Neighbourhood Forum confirm that all sections of the community have been given the opportunity to get involved in preparing the plan and express their views on it. Non statutory and statutory consultations have been carried out in such a way that all sections of the local community have been given the opportunity to express their views. The Forum committee were constantly mindful of the need to engage all sections of the local community and applied different consultation techniques accordingly.

Lee Forum's constitution states that the committee should actively encourage all the Members to participate in the activities of the Forum for the promotion and improvement of the area. This has been attempted by:

- a. Early engagement events specifically targeted as many people as possible through personal approaches to: Lee Green Lives, Lee Manor Society, Manor House Library Users Group, Hither Green Community Association, Friends of Manor Park, Friends of Manor House Gardens, FUSS, Peabody Estate Residents, Newstead Estate Residents, Weigall Road Residents, Corbett Estate Forum, Cator Estate Residents, Courtlands Estate Residents Group, Lee Green Local Plan working group, Affinity Sutton, Lee Green, Blackheath, Sutcliffe and Middle Park councillors, Jimmy Mizen Foundation, Church of the Good Shepherd, St Margarets Church, Emmanuel Pentacostal Church, Kings Church, Lee Green United Reformed Church, Lee Christadelphians, New Testament Church, Apostolic Church, Women's Institute, Lewisham and Greenwich council's planning policy personnel. Some of these local Groups also email circulated their contact lists: Lee Green Assembly, Kings Church, Blackheath Society, Lee Manor Society, Friends and Users of Manor House Library, A Better Lee Green.

- b. The forum's constitution specifies people it would actively attempt to have represented on it's committee as follows:
- i. at least one person aged under 30
 - ii. members from local businesses
 - iii. at least one person from each of the tenure groups: owner-occupier, tenant of the local authority or registered social landlord and private tenant.
 - iv. members who are women
 - v. members who are men
 - vi. ethnic minority members
 - vii disabled members
 - viii at least two people from each of the wards which is included in whole or part within the forum'
- c. The forum's committee has made every effort to include a range of people who reflect the community it serves, including those often less engaged in neighbourhood planning for example younger people, those in a range of housing tenures and neurodiverse people through engagement activities and liaison with other community groups and local stakeholders.
- d. Consultation was undertaken in such a way to try to ensure different sections of the local community were given the opportunity to express their views, including seldom heard voices. These initiatives are documented in this Consultation Statement. Examples of how we did this include:
- i. Visiting places and taking our consultations to where people are already for example to local churches, community centres, housing estates, supermarkets, residents groups, train stations, assemblies, and local traders.
 - ii. Using different consultation techniques such as online and paper surveys, door knocking and visiting local businesses.
 - iii. Holding meetings in different places across the forum area and ensuring first that were physically accessible for all.
 - iv. Becoming involved in what matters to people before asking them to be involved in local planning, eg helping with tenancy agreements, unsafe rental properties, improving derelict buildings, improving bus services, air pollution monitoring, tree planting, parking and flytipping problems.
 - v. Taking the results of our consultations to a long-standing local councillor to cross check them against what he hears people say on the doorsteps when canvassing.

It is therefore believed that the Lee Neighbourhood Plan has had appropriate regard to the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the European Convention on Human Rights and complies with the Human Rights Act 1998.

4. Engagement and Key Issues Consultation Events

Table 3: Key Issues Engagement Events and Outcomes

Event	Purpose	Outcome
<p>9 May 2016 Lee Forum AGM at Halcyon Bookshop</p> 	<p>Purpose: To inform and engage the community in neighbourhood planning; asked people to add sticky notes on a map about what they like/don't like/ want changed/want protected in the area 33 attendees</p>	 <p>Findings were incorporated into Working Groups findings (see below)</p>

<p>22 June 2016 Manor House Gardens Festival Table</p> 	<p>Over 1,000 people attended the festival. Many people came to visit the table.</p> <p>Purpose: To inform and engage the community in neighbourhood planning; gather their contact details in advance of the key issues online survey and ask people to add sticky notes on a map about what they like/don't like/ want changed/want protected in the area</p>	 <p>Findings were incorporated into Working Groups findings (see below)</p>
<p>3 June 2017 Key Issues Survey Launched</p>	<p>Paper copies of the survey were placed in the Manor House Library and in the Lee Green Community Centre.</p> <p>The survey asked 10 open questions about what people like/don't like/what protected/want changed about the area.</p> <p>The survey was advertised via an area-wide leaflet drop to all homes and businesses, along with details as to how to sign up to the forum and email/twitter/facebook details.</p>	<p><u>Survey:</u></p> <p>https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/arps3ffluz1xrjdsaaaio/Lee-Forum-Survey-report-28.5.17.xlsx?dl=0&rlkey=so1933947iywlapeljv9cc7vq</p>
<p>26 June 2017 Manor House Gardens Festival Table</p>	<p>Over 1,000 people attended the festival. Many people came to visit the table</p> <p>Information about the forum and survey, paper copies of the survey and flyers with details of the online survey available.</p> <p>585 responses to the key issues survey were received.</p>	<p>Responses can be seen here:</p> <p>https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/hqwq4wfb0zcc8srkqr1mw/Key-Issues-Survey.pptx?dl=0&rlkey=ipfruygprmu8fqgiopc728ua5</p> <p>https://www.dropbox.com/s/z9og0h3182wptfa/20.3.17%20survey%20written%20summary.pdf?dl=0</p>

		<p>https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/720uofej1kpj9ceqyveh/Lee-Forum-Survey-report-14.3.17-anonimised-2.xlsx?dl=0&rlkey=694506tu2y2myl4nmqxx7r09w</p>
<p>23 February 2017: A joint consultation was carried out by Lewisham Council's Lee Green Assembly Local Plan Group and Lee Forum at a Lee Green Assembly</p>	<p>80-100 people were present and took part. Meeting asked the same questions as those asked in the key issues survey to inform both the Lee Green Assembly Local Plan and the Lee Neighbourhood Plan. The Assembly, and Lee Forum's attendance at it had been leafleted to every home in Lee Green ward as well as advertised by email and social media by Lee Forum.</p>	<p>Minutes from the meeting: http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/g4092/Printed%20minutes%2023rd-Feb-2017%2019.30%20Lee%20Green%20Assembly.pdf?T=1 Responses from the meeting: https://www.dropbox.com/s/m6mrlwiuegif0by/Joint%20Lee%20Green%20Assembly%20and%20Lee%20Forum%20Consultation%2023.2.2017.pdf?dl=0</p>

January – March 2017: Nine local walks.




Organised across the forum area and advertised widely, local people met, walked and talked, noticing everything about their local area. Between 7 and 26 people came on each walk, documenting what they thought about what they saw. One walk was guided by planning consultant, Kay Pallaris, one by Quaggy Waterways Action Group and the others by Lee Forum committee members. Walks were organised in areas highlighted on this map and one was a wade through the river Quaggy:



We looked to see whether there were any sites that could potentially be used to provide housing and facilities that people said they want in the consultation. At the same time we carried out a call for sites via email and social media asking people to put forward sites that might be used, worked with local councils, looking at their existing site allocations, and commissioned a site allocations report from AECOM

Findings from the walks can be read here: https://www.dropbox.com/s/yyz5rkgr14h18fu/2017-05-12_Lee%20Walks%20-%20Mapping%20Assets%20%26%20Opportunities_DRAFT%20v0.1.pdf?dl=0



<p>20 March 2017 Community Meeting:</p> 	<p>Over 120 people attended. People were asked to vote on their top three pressing issues in the area; to note down what makes Lee special, and to mark on maps key issues. The meeting was advertised by leaflet to every home and business in the forum area. It was also advertised by Lee Forum and Hither Green Community Association via email and social media.</p>	<p>Key Issues Votes can be viewed here: https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/58pm1z0jdwk u2tegt034s/Map-Notes_Lee-Workshop_2017-03-20.docx?dl=0&rlkey=8io96o65hziigga07t127rxbv Notes from maps can be seen here: https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/h6egvas8jii455cdn4iol/Record-Card-Notes_Lee-Workshop_2017-03-20.docx?dl=0&rlkey=qyjemhpyu9m7vz5hdhgvb k8oc</p>
<p>June 2017 - January 2018: Working Groups wrote Neighbourhood Plan Vision, Objectives Themes</p> 	<p>Thirty two local volunteers came forward to join working groups. These working groups worked on identifying key issues identified by consultation and evidence gathered to date. On 20th June they met with Tony Burton and Kay Pallaris (planning consultants) to agree the working group tasks, then each group worked independently in small groups, supported by Kay Pallaris to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Define the objective for their theme * Determine what feedback and views have been expressed on it so far from the survey, consultations, sites, walkabout and maps * Determine what other information/evidence we have * Determine what we want planning policy(ies) to achieve on the themes objectives * Explain the justification for their decisions * Look to see if any other neighbourhood plan addressed this issue and, if so, what can we learn from it 	<p>The following themes were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retail and Local Economy Heritage and Design Green and Blue Spaces Amenities, Infrastructure and Housing Transport and Connectivity <p>A detailed write up of the working group's findings can be read here: https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/wnaxi865s105a030719am/Draft-Issues-and-Options-all-Working-Groups-7.11.17.docx?dl=0&rlkey=m7xc8u9tdhlqbq7oiq 14h0z9m</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Look to see if our proposals either add value to or conflict with Lewisham/Greenwich/London/National planning policies * Identify what we want from planning policy(ies) to help deliver and possible necessary additional evidence needed * Identify any further community engagement with groups/areas not well represented in the feedback so far * Drafting of an outline plan and initial planning policies 	<p>These draft vision and objectives arose as a summary of this detailed analysis::</p> <p>https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/ucyz5tpnjfsoqms8cc1y4/Draft-Vision-and-Objectives-25.6.17.docx?dl=0&rlkey=5hbvgz61t0m9r1bpxtc7rzpoc</p> <p>These objectives and detailed analysis of both the qualitative and quantitative evidence were then used to inform the strengths, weaknesses and opportunities, spatial vision, policies and priority projects included in the neighbourhood plan</p>
<p>September 2017: Met with Jim Mallory, Lewisham Lee Green ward Councilor, to share the survey and working group results and explore whether they correlated with what he hears from constituents on the doorstep.</p> <p>Requested the same from Greenwich Councilors but received no response.</p>	<p>Checked working groups results correlated with what Jim has heard.</p>	<p>Key Findings</p> <p>Apart from the supply of affordable creche places which had been expressed to Jim but not appeared on the forum survey, Jim agreed the Forum’s findings were the same as his own. Forum considered how <u>affordable</u> childcare could be considered in the Neighbourhood Plan. Added to BHA4 and 4.3.7</p>
<p>September 2017 – June 2018: Barlett School of Planning, UCL Summer School Co-Design of Lee Green District Town Centre with Lee Local Community through Lee Forum</p>	<p>Advertised via Lee Forum email and local social media</p> <p>Local Community and UCL planners met to walk the area, work together, discuss and agree priorities for planners to work on based on what the community had prioritised to date through consultation.</p>	<p>Community learnt about ideas and best practice from around the world regarding sustainable development of the area and used this in designing the neighbourhood plan.</p>



Agreed that planners would concentrate on the Lee Green crossroads and surrounding area, with particular regard to:

- a) Housing and Dwelling
- b) Urban Fabric and Landmarks
- c) Public and Open Spaces
- d) Leftovers and spatialities of threshold
- e) Cultures and Economies
- f) Infrastructures and Spaces for Mobility

UCL planners returned to the community to present and discuss their initial findings and recommendations for the area February 2018

UCL planners visited Lee Green for a third time in May 2018 to present their finalised ideas and recommendations for Lee Green District Town Centre.

UCL students findings, which helped inform the plans aspirations for Lee Green Town Centre particularly, can be read here:

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ze6s7qbprm950ex/AAakoJ9U5Mp9XFPVGywskeka?dl=0>



July 2018 – ongoing traders engagement

Lee Forum took a clipboard to a sample of traders in each of the retail areas and asked what their priorities were. Lee Forum also communicated many times with traders in the Leegate Centre and attended a trader’s meeting.

The highest ranking priorities in Lee Green district town centre, Burnt Ash Hill and Lee High Road were parking provision for customers and improved public realm and shop fronts. In Staplehurst Road and Manor Park the priorities were more mixed although they did include pedestrian safety and parking.

		<p>Leegate traders face particular challenges because of the threat of redevelopment looming over them for many years. Their priorities are dealing with the effects of the centre's dereliction and pending redevelopment on their businesses and that when redevelopment finally takes place, that it allows those traders who wish to remain trading onsite.</p>
<p>September 2018 AGM and Design Workshop</p>  	<p>Advertised via Lee Forum email and local social media</p> <p>As well as the normal business of an AGM, AECOM joined us to run a design workshop for Lee Green District Town Centre.</p> <p>AECOM consulted attendees, gathering information on how attendees would like to see the area around Lee Green crossroads developed and designed.</p> <p>44 people were present.</p>	<p>AECOM produced a Lee Green Town Centre design report based on the feedback that was received at the meeting to inform the final neighbourhood plan</p> <p>https://www.dropbox.com/s/6bwaazzf0a2wwcu/190401%20LEE%20GREEN%20DESIGN%20REPORT%20FINAL%20AECOM%20Design%20Masterplanning.pdf?dl=0</p> <p>Whilst this was used in the design codes of the plan, along with UCL Barlett's summer school work, it was decided to delay detailed master planning of the area due to lack of resources in the Lee Forum at this time. The section 14 Consultation draft plan recommended that councils take on this work. However at consultation councils responded to the draft plan saying that councils cannot be told what to do in a plan and the community said there was</p>

		<p>not enough emphasis on design in the draft plan. The AECOM reports findings have therefore been taken into account in developing a new policy and priority project around design in Lee Green Town Centre in the post section 14 plan, along with an aspiration that master planning is done by the community in the future</p>
<p>Apart from the formal consultations above there were many other less structured engagements including:</p> 	<p>27.4.15 Presentation by Tony Burton from Locality and forum proposers to Local Groups and Councilors in Leegate Community Centre to explain what the forum would be</p> <p>12.5.15 Meeting between forum proposers and Lee Green Local Plan members, Lee Green Councilors and Lee Manor Society to decide how groups would work together</p> <p>1.6.15 Presentation by Tony Burton and forum proposers to local community at King’s Church to gain initial ideas of whether people would like a neighbourhood forum and plan</p> <p>16.6.15 Meeting between Forum proposers and Greenwich Councilors in Woolwich Town Hall to establish how to work together</p> <p>17.6.15 Meeting between Forum Proposers and Lewisham and Greenwich planning departments to determine support methods</p>	<p>Ongoing idea sharing, listening and communication</p>  <p>http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/g4796/Agenda%20frontsheet%2027th-Feb-</p>



1.6.15 meeting Hither Green Community Association, postings to the association's website and various emails to establish working together

18.6.15 and 12.3. 19 presentations to Manor Park Users Group as well as more communications regarding specific issues to Manor Park, highlighting the groups priorities

Blackheath, Middle Park and Sutcliffe and Lee Green Councillors meetings, emails and communications throughout

20.6.15 table at Blackheath Assembly 13.7.19 presentation to Blackheath Assembly to engage and learn the group's priorities

23.6.15 and 3.6.19 Presentation to Lee Green Assembly to engage and learn priorities

24.6.15 and 2019 AGM Presentation to Courtland Estate Residents Group to engage and learn the group's priorities

Blackheath Society, various conversations and emails regarding forum work to engage and learn the group's priorities

12.5.15 and 7.8.15 meetings with Lee Manor Society and various communications after then to engage and learn the group's priorities

June 2015 onwards posting to Page Estate facebook account Postings on Streetlife starting June 2015 to engage wider community

[2018%2019.30%20Lee%20Green%20Assembly.pdf?T=0](#)



	<p>December 2015 and 2018 FUSS Christmas Fair leaflet handing out and available to talk to engage and learn priorities and Aug 2019 met with chair to discuss thoughts on draft plan</p> <p>20.3.18 Lee Green Assembly presentation. Trinity School to engage and learn priorities</p> <p>21.2.19 Lee Green Assembly Presentation, Trinity School, presented an update of the plan to the attendees, advising them of the upcoming consultation on the draft neighbourhood plan and took questions</p> <p>28.2.19 Blackheath Assembly in St Margaret’s Church, presented an update of the plan, advising them of the upcoming consultation on the draft neighbourhood plan and took questions</p> <p>February 2019 met with Greenwich Cllr Ian Hawking to explain the proposed Quaggy trail which falls in his ward to to ask his views.</p> <p>March 2019 ran River Quaggy Walk engagement with QWAG and Lewisham and Greenwich Councilors to explain and show the Quaggy Trail aspiration</p> <p>July 2019 Meeting with London Wildlife Trust, London Living Streets, London Ramblers and Berkeley Homes to discuss the proposed River Quaggy Trail in the draft neighbourhood plan</p>	<p>Key outcome: two Councilors from each of the forum’s three wards came and increased understanding and expressed support for the proposed River Quaggy walk</p> <p>Key Outcome: Increased understanding for these stakeholders of what is being proposed. They all expressed support for the project and Lee Forum received the benefit of their advice and expertise in the related matters.</p>
--	---	---

	2015-date: There were many forum-wide and individual Email, Facebook, Twitter and Website communications. Examples can be found in annex 1	
--	--	--

5. Regulation 14 Consultation

5.1 Consultation Timeframes

Consultation ran July to September 2019, with public events and a paper and online survey which ran 2nd July- 31st August 2019.

5.2 Who was Consulted?

Statutory consultees via email

Every home and business in the Lee Forum area via a leaflet and social media

5.3 Consultation Methodology

The full survey can be read [here](#)

All policies, projects and recommended further actions in the draft neighbourhood plan were consulted on

Advertised through a leaflet drop to all homes and businesses in the Lee Forum area as well as by Lee Forum emails and local social media; a table at Manor House Gardens Festival 2019 and presentations at Lee Green and Blackheath Local Assemblies. Two well attended drop in events were held where forum members could come to ask questions and discuss what was proposed in the draft neighbourhood plan.

Paper versions of the plan were available to complete at the Manor House Library and Lee Green Community Centre. Some visitors to the Lee Green Community Centre were helped in completing the survey.

5.4 Workshops / Meetings

16 July 2019 Drop in Consultation event at Leegate Community Centre



25 July 2019 Drop in Consultation event at Manor House Library



Some extra meetings and correspondences occurred following some submissions to the survey in order to clarify what people were saying eg

A meeting was held with residents of Weigall and Meadowcourt Roads who wanted to discuss the River Quaggy trail and two site allocations, hosted by a resident of Weigall Road and member of local group, Weigall Watch.

Lee Forum met with FUSS chair to discuss FUSS input to the draft plan's policies that impacted Staplehurst Road Shops.

Manor Park Friends and Lee Forum met to discuss impact of the draft plan's policies on Manor Park.

Conversations with Leegate traders about their situation in the Leegate centre

4 hours of meetings with planning officers from both councils to discuss in detail and make sure we understood how best to coordinate both their responses. Here are notes of those meetings on [3rd](#) and [19th](#) December 2019.

5.5 Summary of Changes Made due to Statutory Consultees Letters

Full list of those consulted and original responses received from statutory consultees can be read [here](#)

Table 4 Statutory Consultee S14 Consultation Responses

Consultee	Response summary	Changes Made to the Plan
Thames Water	<p>‘Within Policy B1 on housing delivery it is considered that physical infrastructure should also be referred to in bullet point A. 4 along with social infrastructure’</p> <p>“It is suggested that the following text is added to section 7.2: “In some circumstances Thames Water may seek the inclusion of phasing conditions in order to avoid adverse amenity impacts for existing or future users such as internal and external sewer flooding, pollution of land and water courses and / or issues with water supply in the form of no or low water pressure. To minimise the likelihood of requiring such conditions developers are advised to contact Thames Water as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme. Further information for developers and land promoters on pre-planning enquiries can be found at: https://www.thameswater.co.uk/preplanning”</p>	<p>Inserted the word ‘physical’</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to add this to a neighbourhood plan – Thames Water should make these this point in their own policies and make them to developers when commenting on applications when they are consulted on developments</p>
Transport for London	The Forum should ensure that their plan aligns with the Healthy Neighbourhood scheme.	Done

	<p>References to the London Plan should be updated to ensure that they are referring to the latest version of the draft London Plan.</p> <p>It would be useful if the Plan was updated to include a reference which recognise that an accessible bus network is reliant on maintaining good bus journey times, and that any changes to road layouts, such as through the creation of traffic islands and improving key junctions, should not adversely impact bus operations, and should maintain or improve journey times. All highway changes should also at least maintain if not improve existing bus stops and stands within the area.</p> <p>Every effort must be made to protect existing green infrastructure – where a loss can be justified as unavoidable, new green infrastructure should be provided in order to deliver a net gain in biodiversity (as measured by CAVAT value).</p> <p>It appears that no spatial vision has been included within the Plan. It is strongly recommended that the Plan is updated to clearly show the spatial vision for the Area.</p> <p>It is considered that objective four, which seeks to ‘Reduce the pressure of on-street parking spaces for residents and visitors to the neighbourhood’ would benefit from further clarification as it is unclear what mitigation measures will be put in place to achieve this.</p> <p>Policy TC1(A) includes a reference to Public Transport Accessibility Level. This term is incorrect and should instead be Public Transport Access Level (PTAL).</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Bus times referred to in recommended actions</p> <p>See Policy GB3C</p> <p>See 3.1 of the LNP</p> <p>Details added to policy TC2</p> <p>The word PTAL removed and replaced with what is meant by the policy</p>
--	--	--

	<p>TfL would recommend that this point is expanded to include proposals that improve access to public transport more generally, for example through the creation of new routes to improve permeability.</p> <p>A (2) seeks to encourage a reduction in the use of private vehicles, which is supported and in line with the draft London Plan. This does however conflict with TC3(5) which seeks to improve parking for shops, which can be seen to be encouraging the continued use of a private car. To support A(2), it is recommended that TC3(5) is removed, or further clarification of the intention behind Part 5 of this policy provided.</p> <p>Opportunities for bus priority needs to be prioritised in the Plan.</p> <p>TfL would welcome the identification of ‘key junctions, road crossings and key routes’ and the pedestrian crossings which are referred to within this policy.</p> <p>Clarification should be provided on what is meant by the term ‘strategic walking route’.</p> <p>The Forum should include in their table reference to working with TfL as well as the boroughs give that TfL is the highway authority for the TLRN within the area.</p> <p>Throughout TfL asks us to reference TfLs Active Travel policies.</p>	<p>As a result of this feedback we ran a separate survey regarding buses and results of this survey added and this policy now explains in detail</p> <p>Consultation with traders showed that traders want more car parking so this is retained. TfLs response suggests that LNP is proposing an increase in traffic but this is not the case – it is suggesting a reduction – see policies TC2 and TC3</p> <p>See TC1</p> <p>Added to TC3(1)</p> <p>See TC3(5)</p> <p>This is included in the recommended actions section</p> <p>We have added more active travel detail to TC3</p>
Environment Agency	We are very pleased with the plan and the objectives that it sets out to achieve.	No changes suggested.

	We support the nature improvements along the River Quaggy and proposals to naturalise the rest of the stretch within the neighbourhood	We include this as it was wonderful to receive this response from the EA
National Grid	No suggested changes	No changes required
National Rail	Network Rail are in the process of securing funding for an 'Access for all' Scheme at Hither Green Station for Control Period 6 (2019-2024). This would be to improve access to the station. No suggested changes	No changes required
SGN	No suggested changes	No changes required
Historic England	<p>Please see Historic England's webpages on public realm in the historic environment.</p> <p>https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/streets-for-all/heag149-sfa-national/</p> <p>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>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>	<p>Added to recommended actions</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Added to HD1A5</p> <p>Housing provision is partially addressed in the site allocations section of the plan. It is believed that a</p>

	The neighbourhood plan should consider carrying out a housing needs assessment and meeting or exceeding the councils needs to provide housing locally	housing needs assessment would be repeating the detailed work already done by the councils.
Sport England	No suggested change	No suggested changes
English Heritage	Suggest Heritage Action Zone programme focussed grant scheme. Currently focusing on High Street Heritage Action Zones	Link to scheme added to recommended further actions

5.6 Local Consultation Summary

There were 112 online responses and 3 paper responses. Most were from residents, some from local business.

Returns were generally highly supportive in each category for each policy, with only about 2% being against. There were lots of comments, with some suggestions for amendments.

Full survey results can be read [here](#).

5.7 Summary of Changes made to the Plan Due to Community Responses to Section 14 Consultation

Table 5: Local responses to Section 14 consultation

Policy ID	% fully support	% support with suggested adjustments	% don't support	Key Points Raised	Changes Made to Plan
R1-R4				There was a general theme running through the comments that : (a) the Leegate Centre of Lee is a disgrace	Policy RLE5 added. The consultation evidence for this had already been gathered (see AECOM Lee Green design report, UCL Barlett work and Key Issues consultations in annex 4 of the plan). However it had been put on hold

				<p>(b) the crossroads junction lay-out is hopeless/dangerous for all. (c) Regeneration is a strong wish, while maintaining character.</p> <p>Also</p> <p>The community were supportive of the master planning proposal but council feedback was that councils cannot be asked to do this</p>	<p>and not been turned into a policy because we had planned for it to be wrapped up in policy RL2 in the draft plan which asked councils to carry out design codes and master planning for the area. Because many respondees asked for more planning around Lee Green's redevelopment; because councils replied to the consultation saying they should not be told what to do in a neighbourhood plan, and because St Modwen sold Leegate to Galliard Homes, meaning St Modwen's 2018 planning application on the site would no longer happen, policy RLE5 and a site allocation for Leegate were added to the plan, reflecting consultation responses Policy RLE5 wording was developed with the help of local architects and sent to Lee Manor Society and Blackheath Society for consultation</p>
R1	84	14	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Be careful encouraging night time economy where it becomes a nuisance - Consider change of use where this would bring disused buildings into use - St Modwen, owner of the Leegate Centre, request that Draft Policy R1 is amended to enable changes of use within primary and secondary shopping frontages in accordance with Local Development Plan Policies 	<p>This has been renamed to be 'in line with the Portas Report' which covers how night time economy and more should be run sensitively and sensibly We consider this better covered by RLE1 – meanwhile uses for disused sites</p> <p>Councils have not asked us to change this policy in line with Local Development Plan Policies so we assume it is sufficiently inline already</p>
R2	84	12	4	<p>Although support the principle be careful to not put too onerous demands on shopkeepers</p>	<p>Wording of shopfront design amended to make this point</p>

R3	89	9	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support but be careful to not penalise vehicle drivers too much - Historic England asked that we follow this guidance https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/streets-for-all/heag149-sfa-national/ 	<p>The plan is caught between TfL saying it is too car friendly and some community responses saying it is too onerous for car drivers. We think the balance is right</p> <p>Added to Heritage and Design recommended actions</p>
R4	83	13	4	- None	
HD1	86	14	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Also consider creating a new heritage with design that is bold and striking - Modern (glass-type/zinc) additional enhancements through a heritage statement could be considered - Some explicit license 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>There was feedback about the heritage and design section of the plan being more about heritage than design. We therefore used the comments at section 14 consultation and also went back over past consultation, including the AECOM Lee Green Design report, Key Issues consultation and UCL Bartlett work (see annex 4 in the neighbourhood plan) to add HD1 B and C and further to give more design guidance and aligned wording in the plans Design Codes</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 	
HD2	88	11	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 - Developments should reflect the human scale so people feel connected to their surrounding - 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 	<p>See comments above, for HD1</p> <p>Wording around energy added to the new design policies added above</p> <p>Illustrative images added at 5.2 of the neighbourhood plan</p>

GB1	86	12	2	- There shouldn't be any ability to build on green spaces or to block views of them	It is no possible to put this in the plan but the plan does discourage this
GB2	87	11	2	- St Modwen request that Draft Policy GB2 is amended in accordance with DM Policy 25, to provide support for proposals for high quality, hard landscaping, alongside soft landscaping	Councils have not asked us to change this policy in line with DM Policy 25 so we assume it is sufficiently inline already
GB3	91	6	3	- Whilst support principle, make sure to consult local residents on design and access points	The need for consultation has been made explicit in the River Quaggy Priority Project
GB4	89	10	2	- St Modwen request that Draft Policy GB4 is amended to remove reference to the tree ratio replanting requirement. - St Modwen request that Draft Policy GB4 is amended to remove reference to 'square surrounds' as its too prescriptive.	Removed and replaced with Capital Asset Valuation of Amenity Trees (CAVAT) formula Word 'square' removed
Design Codes				- Support but be careful to not be too restrictive on residents - Add images and descriptions of specific examples	We think a good balance has been struck in this regard Done

CI 1	89	9	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - St Modwen recommend that Draft Policy CL1 removes reference to the need to provide community facilities only on the ground floor - 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. 	<p>No change made as this was strongly supports by the community</p> <p>Added</p>
CI 2	92	7	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MUST rather than MAY address gaps in provision to support the community. 	Wording changed
CI 3	89	10	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of solar panels on lights? 	Covered already with the wording 'take advantage of modern energy saving technology'
T1	90	8	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Many requests for a bus route to Greenwich 	A new bus survey was conducted (see annex 4) and findings incorporated into T1 and recommended actions
T2	69	22	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People need to have a say over cycle storage is and how to use it. -Could use garages for cycle storage? - Some responses very supportive of restrictions on cars – others not wanting as many restrictions - Policy TC2 should be amended to accord with the London Plan (2016) parking requirements for a maximum 	<p>'involving local residents in the positioning of these' added. Think this is allowed by the plan already</p> <p>Good idea. Covered by TC3 9i and BHA5 amended to explicitly mention garages because there are unused garages that should be considered for best use in the area</p> <p>Hope the plan has struck the right balance. Considering TfL comments</p>

				of 20% active and 20% passive provision of electric vehicle parking for residential developments.	This is in the London Plan already so no need to repeat
T3	81	17	2	<p>- I think the Chris Boardman trial in Greater Manchester for "cheaper" zebra crossings at most road junctions has merit for this area</p> <p>- 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.</p>	<p>Included in policy TC31</p> <p>Included the words 'pedestrian friendly' Also accessibility stressed in public realm priority project since there ARE issues with wheelchairs being able to cross the Lee Green cross roads</p>
BHA1	74	17	9	<p>- I would say 'at least minimum' social housing. At the moment it reads like we're trying to restrict social housing</p> <p>- We should authorise nanohouses</p> <p>- look at developments abroad in Japan etc, that's the future. Consider their possibility in disused garages as well</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Added to policy, but then removed as council officers did not support so added to recommended actions 4.3.7</p> <p>BHA5 amended however because there are unused garages that should be considered for best use in the area</p>
BHA1	84	14	2	- States there should be a range of homes then prioritises family homes – need one beds and nanohomes	Wording now in B1A4 – extended to 1 bedroom homes but on discussion council officers not keen to include nanohomes

BHA2	86	9	5	<p>- Renewable energy generation?</p> <p>- Would like to see redundant sites 'greened up' as an interim measure similar to sites in urban plots in Holland theguardian.com/world/2020/mar/27/utrecht-rooftops-greened-plants-mosses-vertical-forest</p>	<p>Added a reference to 'Be Lean, Be Clean, Be Green', energy hierarchy as set out in the current London Plan applicable to all development</p> <p>Added to recommended actions</p>
BHA3	89	8	3	None	
BHA4	83	13	4	None	
BHA5	94	5	1	- Consider making a requirement for SUDS and other soft engineering mitigations against flooding.	Already included
Should any site allocation not be included				<p>Courtland road garages not supported by Courtlands Road residents</p> <p>Sainsburys – people like Sainsburys so if developed would like to keep it</p> <p>Europcar on Lee High Road/Manor Park corner – this was raised as a proposed site allocation via email request to Lee Forum by a local resident</p>	<p>Removed – after further conversations with the residents on their communal email chat group</p> <p>Wording added to site allocation</p> <p>It is considered that this site fits the criteria of site allocation and so has been included and attempts made to consult its owner</p>
Should any of the sites				Residential – make more mixed use	Many are mixed use already

be differently allocated					
What are your thoughts on the further actions proposed?				<p>Generally supported. Especially strong support for the revival of the New Tigers Head, appropriate regeneration of Leegate and addressing flytipping</p> <p>Suggestion that Millers Meadow/Meadowcourt and Courlands Estate areas be conservation areas</p> <p>Some concerns that conservation areas can be restrictive on planning.</p> <p>CPZs split opinion</p>	<p>Strength of support for Leegate and New Tiger's Head highlighted in priority projects and site allocation</p> <p>Conversations had with Greenwich council officers about the possibilities of doing this. However told that the age if the sites does not qualify them, and that we should concentrate on strong design codes instead – done</p> <p>Boroughs with consult on any future conservation areas so there will be the chance to local people to choose if they want them then</p> <p>Plan says local consultation would be needed</p>
What do you think of the River Quaggy Walk priority projects	93	5	1	Consult with those affected by living close on access etc to the walk	Priority Project also says this should be done
What do you think	92	5	3	Old containers are not supported – seen as messy looking	Site removed as not supported through consultation with Weigall Road residents – see below

of the Weigall road sports ground priority projects					
What do you think of the trees and greening priority projects	93	5	2	Right tree for right place	Wording amended
What do you think of Osborn Terrace pocket park priority project	97	0	2	None	
What do you think of Community Centres priority project	93	5	2	Must be accessible by everyone	Wording amended
What do you think	98	1	1	Needs funding	Noted

of Manor House Library priority project					Added to community centres project in revised plan as they are similar but no changes to wording
---	--	--	--	--	--

Following the consultation we contacted people in some local areas to get further clarification:

Table 6: Further local responses to S14 consultation

Meeting with Weigall and Meadowcourt Road residents	<p>Not supportive of Raven’s Way, Courtland’s Estate garages and Willow Tree sports club being site allocations</p> <p>Supportive of walk if residents involved meaningfully in talks about access, surfacing and so on</p>	<p>Site allocations removed</p> <p>Specific wording added to priority project</p>
Meeting with Lewisham Council and Royal Borough of Greenwich planning officers	<p>Both council submitted long response with comments section by section. LF then met with planning officers from LBL and RBG on 3rd and 19th December 2019 to discuss and agree changes needed</p> <p>LBG response can be read here. RBG response can be read here.</p> <p>Officers asked that councils not be committed to masterplanning Lee Green district town centre in policies, for the key</p>	<p>Lee Forum are grateful to planning officers for meeting for several hours with us to agree changes.</p> <p>The responses were discussed line by line, especially where it was not clear how the two responses interacted with each other, until clarity was agreed between all parties</p> <p>Masterplanning being the responsibility of councils was removed from policies and put into priority projects and a new NP policy created, a special vision was added, and lots of photos and examples were added.</p>

	<p>priorities to be made more prominent and for examples to be included</p> <p>Officers suggested more appropriate language, without changing the meaning of policies in places</p>	<p>Several changes were agreed to the wording of policies that made them more 'planning speak'.</p>
Leegate Traders	<p>Asked that more certainty given over their position in the Leegate Centre given the 10 years of redevelopment uncertainty they have had to live with</p>	<p>RLE1 5 policy added as a result</p>
Campaign for the Protection of Rural England, Sport England, Sporting.org	<p>Since the last drafting of the neighbourhood plan, the application for IAG school on the Bowring Sports Ground has been rejected and adjacent fields have come under threat of development.</p> <p>Many conversations have been had with interested groups such as CPRE, Sport England, Sporting.org and local groups and its felt that the protection that needs to be added to fields should be strengthened. More can be read here</p>	<p>GB6 and priority project on Protection of Weigall Road extended to all Playing Fields.</p> <p>Added wording to recommended actions and priority project that existed in the consulted on plan and were well received at consultation around protection and increased access to and use of playing fields due to increased</p>
Ravensbourne Catchment Working Group (EA, T21, QWAG)	<p>The need for the plan to guide development near river banks more was highlighted</p>	<p>GB3B 5 and 6 added as a result</p>

Contacts with landowners and their responses can be read [here](#) (Quaggy Trail and Sports Park owners) and [here](#) (Site Allocation owners)

5.8 Health Check

Health Check – July 2020: Undertaken by Andrew Seaman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI. The full health check can be read [here](#)

Summary of Key Findings and resulting actions:

Table 7: Further local responses to S14 consultation

It is not clear from the Consultation Statement specifically what has altered, for example new policies/content since the Regulation 14 consultation was completed and it is recommended that this is updated	Tables above added
The qualifying body should satisfy itself that all landowners directly affected by the LNP have been consulted/notified of its content	Wrote to Site Allocation and Quaggy Trail and sports field owners
A statement of common ground with Boroughs would be a useful addition to the evidence base	So far boroughs have not suggested this is necessary
SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessment) and HRA (Habitat Regulations Assessment) Screening should be undertaken before submission under Regulation 15 and consultation under Regulation 16	LBL to complete these
The LNP is relatively lengthy and there is some scope to reduce its overall length by refocusing on the land use policies of the plan and potentially placing some aspects of the current draft document into appendices	Some parts of sections 2 and 3 moved to appendices
The LNP does not contain a clearly stated vision for its area.	Vision added at Section 3.1
It would be informative and helpful for the plan to set out how the spatial principles and policies have been identified	This has now been better explained in this consultation statement, referenced from the plan, since adding it to the NP would have made an already long plan longer

There is a need for additional clarity on the approach to site allocations with expanded references to the evidence base	The wording of the site allocations section has been expanded with further explanation and moved within the plan to a section where it's origin makes further sense
Consideration could be given to the inclusion of a slightly expanded Implementation/Monitoring Section	This section has been expanded
There is a need for clearer identification of the specific consultation responses in evidence	Links to all consultation responses have been included in this document
The minutes and/or confirmation correspondence of the designation by each London Borough should be added	Links via council websites added to annex 4, evidence, neighbourhood plan
The Consultation Statement will require updating prior to submission for Examination and should include a more detailed explanation as to how community engagement has influenced the objectives, principles, policies and projects within the plan	Added to Section 4 above
Details of the various engagement and the specific responses received in relation to the Regulation 14 consultation should be made available	Added to Section 5 above
Explain more clearly how the LNP will contribute to the achievement of sustainable development	Section 4.3 now combines relevant policies under the umbrella of sustainability
Many more detailed and smaller recommendations were made	How these detailed recommendations were dealt with can be read here

6.1 Presentation of Renewed Wording and Evidence

The revised Neighbourhood Plan and Consultation, following section 14 consultation and the Health Check, were circulated to Lee Forum Committee members on 8th December 2020 for further comment and refinement, then agreed at [16th December 2020](#) committee meeting

7 Appendices

7.1 Annex 1: Selection of Media Used to Advertise Engagement Events

Working Groups

[View Report](#)

[Campaign Preview](#) [HTML Source](#) [Plain-Text Email](#) [Details](#)

[View this email in your browser](#)

Your chance to get involved!

Lee Forum is moving onto it's next phase.

We are looking for volunteers to work in a team, analysing evidence to consider what planning policies should aim to achieve in the draft

- * Family & community
- * Green (and blue) places and connections [including air pollution]
- * Diverse and independent shops and businesses
- * Transport (Getting around) connections
- * Heritage and character [including design]

Nothing but enthusiasm and some available time needed.

With thanks for your continued feedback and involvement,

With best wishes

Lee Forum Committee



Copyright © 2018 Lee Forum. All rights reserved.
You are receiving this email because you opted in at a public event or our web

Our mailing address is:
Lee Forum
Lee
London, Greater London SE128SS
United Kingdom

[Campaign Preview](#) [HTML Source](#) [Plain-Text Email](#) [Details](#)

[View this email in your browser](#)

Walks lined up for the coming two Saturdays as follows:

6th March: West of Burnt Ash Hill and South of Railway Tracks (blue outline below)
Meet outside Lord Northbrook Pub on Burnt Ash Hill at 2pm

11th March: Lee Manor Conservation Area (purple/yellow outline below)
Meet outside Lord Northbrook Pub at 2.30pm. With thanks to Lee Manor Society who will be jointly running this walk.

As always, everyone welcome. Please note the different start times. Notes taken on these walks will be used in drafting the Neighbourhood Plan.

Below are photos from last Saturdays walk north of Eltham Road, can you spot where they are?

Best wishes

Lee Forum



Copyright © 2018 Lee Forum. All rights reserved.
You are receiving this email because you opted in at a public event or our website

Survey Reminder

[View Report](#)

[Campaign Preview](#) [HTML Source](#) [Plain-Text Email](#) [Details](#)

Invitation

We are delighted to let you know that, following its 'Creating Healthier Urbanisms' work in Lee last year, University College Londons Bartlett Development Planning Unit has decided to focus its work in Lee again this year.

Students on the School's MSc in Building and Urban Design in Development course will make Lee their case study this spring, considering aspects such as housing, urban fabric and landmarks, public and open spaces, culture and economies, infrastructures and mobility. The students' findings will be presented to the community in March, and will be open to everyone.

To kick off their work, the students will spend the afternoon of Monday 15 January in Lee, walking part of the Lee Forum area and hoping to speak with local people about their experiences of living/working/ studying here and to understand their aspirations for the area. If you'd like to join them, either to walk and talk from 2-3.30pm (meeting outside the Old Tiger's Head pub at 2pm) or to sit and talk in the Old Tiger's Head from 3.30-5pm (or both!), please email info@leeforum.org.uk to let us know that you intend to come.

[View this email in your browser](#)



Above, students from UCL's 'Creating Healthier Urbanisms' summer school, also based in Lee, September 2017.



[Campaign Preview](#) [HTML Source](#) [Plain-Text Email](#) [Details](#)

[View this email in your browser](#)

If you haven't already and would like to, please complete the survey [here](#) by 12th March, to give us time to collate responses for presentation at the 20th March meeting.

The 20th March meeting in Soul Cafe, unit 9 Leegate, 7.30pm start is open to everyone. The survey, further consultation and the meeting will determine Lee Forum's priorities.

The survey will remain open and replies received after 12th March will still be considered

With thanks and best wishes

Lee Forum



Copyright © 2018 Lee Forum. All rights reserved.
You are receiving this email because you opted in at a public event or our website

Our mailing address is:
Lee Forum
Lee
London, Greater London SE128SS
United Kingdom

[Add us to your address book](#)

Want to change how you receive these emails?
You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#)

MailChimp

7.2: Annex 2: Cross Referencing Pre S14 Consultation Draft NP and Post S14 Submission NP

Post Consultation Plan	Pre Consultation Plan	Reason for Changes
Figure 1	Figure 2	Moved to more appropriate place in the plan
S1.6 Local, Regional and National Policies updated for latest versions	S1.7 Local, Regional and National Policies versions now outdated	Changes in planning policies
7.4 Review section	1.6 Monitoring and Review section	These sections are the same – moved to more appropriate place in the plan
S3.3 Policy Themes	S1.10 Policy Themes	These sections are the same – moved to more appropriate place in the plan
Section 2 Area Appraisal	Section 2 Area Profile	Considered more accurate name
S1.3 Where is Lee Forum	S2.1 Location	Same wording – moved to more appropriate place in the plan
Annex 2	2.2 History	Moved to more appropriate place in the plan
S2 Strengths Weaknesses and Opportunities	Section 4 Strengths Weaknesses and Opportunities	Moved to more appropriate place in the plan
Annex 3	3.1 Lee Forum’s Regional Role	Moved to more appropriate place in the plan

Annex 3	3.2 How the Lee Forum Area Relates to Local Plans	Moved to more appropriate place in the plan
3.1 A Vision for Lee	Didn't exist	Added because the Health Check made reference to the Spatial Strategy not being clear enough
<p>Order of policies changed to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green and Blue Spaces • Transport and Connectivity • Building Homes and Amenities • Local Retail, Leisure and Economy • Heritage and Design <p>Site Allocations included in Building Homes and Amenities</p>	<p>Order of policies was</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail and Local Economy • Heritage and Design • Green and Blue Spaces • Community Infrastructure • Transport and Connectivity • Building Homes and Amenities <p>Separate Site Allocations section 6</p>	<p>Moved shorter ones near the front for ease of reading</p> <p>Policies in Building new Homes and Amenities and Community Infrastructure were combined and moved to one section, which also incorporated Site Allocations as it was felt these three sections repeated information and were integral to each other</p>
RLE Polices	R Policies	Retail policies renamed as Retail, Leisure and Employment as more accurate
R1.4	R1.4	Reference to night time economy replaced with more general reference to Portas Review. This is because of concern expressed over night time economy noise. Replaced with more general reference to diversity of offer by referring to the Portas Review.

RLE1A5	Didn't exist	This policy was added after it was raised at the Leegate Traders meeting (date) which Lee Forum attended as part of Section 14 consultation
RLE5 and Leegate Site Allocation	R2A 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.	<p>At section 14 consultation Lee Forum met with council planning officers who said that councils cannot be told to do masterplanning.</p> <p>It had not been possible to add a site allocation for Leegate despite very high local interest in its redevelopment previously. This is because it has either had agreed planning permission (2016) or an application had been received by the council (2018). However post section 14 consultation, St Modwen sold Leegate to Galliard Homes, making their 2018 application invalid, and Lewisham released its own draft Local Plan which included a site allocation for Leegate. The plan can therefore add more aspirations for the Leegate centre at this time.</p> <p>In drafting the Leegate site allocation evidence was taken from analysis and community aspiration comments received regarding the site during AECOM's design and masterplanning work. Additionally we used many community aspiration comments for the site which were sent to Lewisham during its Local Plan consultation in April 2021, most of which can be read here. We also</p>

		used the community aspirations for the site as expressed in a letter sent to Galliard Homes in July 2021 by the Lee Green Consortium, a group representing many local amenity and other groups as well as local councillors which can be read here (scroll to the bottom and click on the 'view 58 comments' button).
4.4.7, 5.5.7 etc Justification and Evidence	5.2.5, 5.3.5, 5.4.5, 5.6.5 etc Existing Planning Policies	Previously there was a section near the start of each planning policy section but the Health Check suggested we should give more justification for the policies so we added existing policies to new, expanded Justification and Evidence sections to the end of each planning policy section
4.5.1 This text has been added to what was there previously. ‘There is the opportunity to preserve and improve the built environment with sustainable solutions, which will allow the Lee Forum area to maintain, as well as add to this heritage with buildings and alterations and extensions of the highest quality, whilst allowing people to continue to live and work in the area’	4.5.1 Policy Intent	At section 14 consultation we were asked to add more design detail to the heritage and design section based on extensive design consultation already gathered
4.5.3 Heritage and Design Objectives. Added these:	5.2.3 Heritage and Design Objectives	At section 14 consultation we were asked to add more design detail to the heritage and design

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the sustainability of buildings, allowing the continued use of buildings for current and appropriate new purposes, using modern technologies and fabric, including Passivhaus standard,s to reduce the Lee Forum area’s carbon footprint. • Improve the experience of all people at a human scale, including pedestrians, cyclists and the mobility impaired, of all backgrounds • Encourage innovative, sympathetic, high quality contemporary design to continue to evolve the history of the Lee Forum area, making the most of current technologies and materials. 		<p>section based on extensive design consultation already gathered</p>
<p>HD2 policy divided into policies HD2 and HD3 and more policies added covering design</p>	<p>HD2 policy covered heritage detail but was missing design detail</p>	<p>At section 14 consultation we were asked to add more design detail to the heritage and design section based on extensive design consultation already gathered</p>
<p>Section 5 Design Guidance added. Small changes to text to highlight design opportunities</p>	<p>Section 5 Design Guidance. Weighted towards heritage</p>	<p>At section 14 consultation we were asked to add more design detail to the heritage and design section based on extensive design consultation already gathered</p>

GB3B points 5 and 6 added	GB3B only up to point 4	Additional points to reflect aims of the Ravensbourne Catchment Working Group (EA, QWAG, T21)
GB4 amended wording but meaning retained	GB4 required actions of councils	Council feedback was that we cannot require actions of councils. Therefore we amended the points and wording to reflect this, without losing meaning
Section 4.3 Sustainable Homes and Amenities	Section 5.3 Community Infrastructure, 5.6 Building New Homes and Amenities, Section 6 Site Allocations	<p>Added detail about sustainability as Health Check requested more information and clarity on sustainability. Since the sustainability detail related to homes, amenities and site allocations we combined all three sections to make this clear.</p> <p>We also made site allocations wording clearer as to our intentions, since the Health Check said it was not clear</p> <p>Flood Risk policy moved to Green and Blue Spaces, unchanged</p>
SA10, SA11 and SA13 removed	SA10 , SA11 and SA13	Removed as Weigall Road and Courtlands residents said preferred they were removed
5.2 Examples which illustrate the Lee Forum's Area Design Guidance	Didn't exist	Examples as Councils advised to add more specific information
More photos added throughout		Because Councils advised to add more local – specific information

7.3 Monitoring expanded	7.3 Monitoring	This section has been expanded due to recommendation in the Health Check
<p>Priority Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hither Green Nature Trail added • New Tigers Head added • Lee Green Detailed Strategy/Master Planning added • Weigall Sports Ground project expanded to incorporate other playing fields • Trees policy expanded to all planting – Urban Greening • Manor House Library policy incorporated into Community Centres 	<p>Priority Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River Quaggy Trail • Tree Planting • Osborn Terrace Pocket Park • Public Realm Improvements • Preserve and Promote Manor Park • Community Facilities and Centres • Weigall Sports Ground 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hither Green Nature Trail added as it was omitted in error from the first draft • New Tigers Head added as there was a lot of community feedback about the Tigers Head and a community project towards it already exists • Lee Green Detailed Strategy/Master Planning added since the Leegate planning permission has now lapsed; councils asked us to remove their obligation to carry out master planning, and using AECOM design and UCL Bartlett work on Lee Green town centre which was omitted from first draft • Weigall Sports Ground incorporated as its become clear that other sports grounds area under threat (Bowring had a planning application and those north of the river are being fenced off and becoming derelict) • Felt Manor House and Community Centres issues are related

LEE NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

EMAIL: INFO@LEEFORUM.ORG.UK

WEB: WWW.LEEFORUM.ORG.UK

TWITTER: [@LEEFORUM](https://twitter.com/LEEFORUM)