

BEXLEY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
BEXLEYHEATH CIVIC OFFICES PLANNING BRIEF

**CONSULTATION STATEMENT**

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that a local planning authority shall not adopt a SPD until they have:

- considered any representations made during the consultation period; and
- prepared a statement setting out a summary of the main issues raised in these representations and how these main issues have been addressed in the SPD that they intend to adopt.

The Bexleyheath Civic Offices Planning Brief SPD and its associated Sustainability Appraisal Final Report (the SPD documents) were the subject of public consultation between 31 January and 25 April 2007.

The documents were consulted on widely, using the consultation database that was compiled during preparation of the Statement of Community Involvement and the preliminary consultation on the Planning Brief in 2006.

Copies of the documents were sent to appropriate statutory bodies; to groups with an interest in the potential redevelopment of the Civic Offices site, such as residents' associations and faith-based organisations; and to local Councillors. Notification letters were distributed to residents within 300 metres of the site and to local businesses (around 3,000 addresses).

In view of the Borough-wide importance of the Civic Offices, the consultation covered organisations across Bexley, including amenity groups, community forums and town centre partnerships. Press releases were issued at the beginning and towards the end of the consultation period. An article appeared in the March edition of the Bexley Magazine. Information panels were displayed in Council main offices.

Stakeholder meetings were held with landowners and prospective developers. Presentations were made to the Partnership for Bexley; the Bexleyheath Business Partnership; and both the Bexley First and the LDF Cabinet Advisory Groups.

During the consultation period, copies of the SPD documents were available at Borough libraries, the Contact Centre within Bexleyheath Civic Offices, and the principal offices of the Planning Service, Wyncham House, Sidcup. Posters were also displayed at these locations. The documents were available on the Council's website, together with on-line questionnaires.

The Council received twenty-four written responses. A summary of the respondents, their representations and the Council's comments on and subsequent amendments of the SPD forms **Appendix A** to this Statement.

The Planning Brief and its associated sustainability appraisal final report have been amended to incorporate the actions proposed by Bexley Council in addressing the main issues raised from the representations made during the consultation period.

Chris Donovan, Assistant Director of Environment and Regeneration Services (Strategic Planning and Regeneration)  
July 2007

BEXLEY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
BEXLEYHEATH CIVIC OFFICES PLANNING BRIEF

**Consultation Statement Made Under Regulation 18(4)(b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004**

**Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations and How they Have Been Addressed**

<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (i) Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations</b>		<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (ii) How the Main Issues Have Been Addressed</b>
<p>Greater London Authority (officer level response also responding for London Development Agency)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many of the general aspirations laudable and references to London Plan welcomed.</li> <li>• Welcomes support for a mixed use scheme.</li> <li>• 35% affordable housing target does not meet London Plan requirements.</li>   <li>• The split of 70/30 in favour of social rented housing is supported.</li> <li>• Welcomes references to play provisions, Lifetime Homes Standard and 10% wheelchair housing and design aspirations and to revised target of 20% renewable energy generation on site.</li> <li>• Recommends Council consider including references to provision of a variety of type, size and cost of office premises to meet needs of all sectors, including small and medium enterprises.</li> <li>• Council is encouraged to include a requirement for the provision of some affordable business space aimed at small and medium enterprises and black and ethnic minority owned businesses. Incorporation with or adjacent to civic offices would facilitate its management.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Council's UDP requires 35% affordable housing on sites of 15 or more dwellings. Planning Brief is consistent with this. The London Plan target of 50% affordable housing applies to the borough as a whole and not to individual sites.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>There is little low cost business space in Bexleyheath. However, other parts of the Borough have space of this type, e.g., London House, Crayford, Old Brewery, Bexley Village. There are also proposals for community enterprise space being reviewed with voluntary sector organisations in Thamesmead and Foots Cray. Higher quality business space is available at the Thames Innovation Centre. There may be a niche in Bexleyheath for some units linked to translating community-based organisations into more commercial operations to encourage the development of the third sector. This could be located as part of the facilities for BVSC. However, this is not a level of detail appropriate to the Planning Brief.</p>

BEXLEY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
BEXLEYHEATH CIVIC OFFICES PLANNING BRIEF

<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (i) Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations</b>		<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (ii) How the Main Issues Have Been Addressed</b>
Government Office for London	<p><u>Formal Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brief fails to promote redevelopment of Civic offices as opportunity for an exemplar development in sustainable design which serves as a model for other developments in the borough.</li> <li>• Should aim for significantly longer life-expectancy without the need to retrofit, particularly with respect to energy and travel.</li> <li>• Emphasis is on travel by private vehicle and is deficient in provision for other travel modes. Fails to meet PPG13 and PPG1 policies in this respect</li> <li>• Paragraph 2.1 bullet 6 – There will need to be a trade off between pedestrian accessibility and impact on local traffic. Access by modes other than private vehicles should be prioritised.</li> <li>• Reference to Mayor’s Limousine (para 2.7 and A.8) inappropriate and out of step with sustainability objectives.</li> <li>• Paragraph 4.23-4.29 – Section needs to be redrafted to reduce emphasis on private vehicles and meet PPG13 objectives.</li> <li>• Appendix A should include a requirement for shower facilities and secure cycle storage.</li> <li>• Planning brief inappropriately focuses on refuse collections rather than waste management. Separation of waste streams should not be restricted to residential.</li> </ul>	<p>Amendments are proposed to emphasise importance of sustainable design and construction and the achievement of more ambitious renewable energy targets.</p> <p>Noted. Amendments incorporated into Brief in respect of encouraging more sustainable travel modes</p> <p>Noted. See amendments to Brief in respect of renewable energy and provision for public transport.</p> <p>See above.</p> <p>Noted. But potential developers have sought specific guidance on the Council requirements including parking needs. See re-drafted section of Brief.</p> <p>See re-drafted section of Brief.</p> <p>See changes to paragraph 4.17 to broaden scope of recycling to include businesses.</p>

BEXLEY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
BEXLEYHEATH CIVIC OFFICES PLANNING BRIEF

<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (i)</b> <b>Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations</b>		<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (ii)</b> <b>How the Main Issues Have Been Addressed</b>
Government Office for London (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Civic buildings are a focus and icon for the community. The building should be “future-proofed” to ensure it does not quickly become obsolete or dated. Brief should look to likely future requirement in relation to energy and carbon emissions as basis of design, rather than current requirements.</li> <li>• Ideal opportunity to seek a zero-carbon development as a target. 20% target should be established as a minimum.</li> <li>• Government keen to ensure affordable housing is secured as part of residential schemes. GOL supports 70:30 ratio of social rented/intermediate housing referred to in brief, but is concerned about suggestion that a different ratio could be applied in the near future. Recommends deletion of this reference to changing the ratio from the Brief.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding suggestion that a financial contribution would be sought towards the Council’s Resources Plus Scheme’s costs of local recruitment and training. This is because it would not meet the tests for Planning Obligations in Circular 05/2005</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. See main report and changes proposed to paragraphs 4.18 to 4.19 of Brief.</p> <p>Agreed. See proposed changes to Brief.</p> <p>This is a requirement of schemes that generate new employment, not existing. It will not be necessary to use a planning obligation to secure this contribution to new employment, if it could be part of the development agreement.</p> <p>It is understood that this is an issue GOL has raised with other local authorities. However stakeholders/potential developers consulted have not objected to contributing to the local labour scheme and it is proposed to retain this reference as a basis for negotiation. It could be addressed as part of a development agreement.</p>
Government Office for London (continued)	<p><u>Informal Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.9 – Clarify whether site is adjacent to a conservation area.</li> <li>• Para 3.1, 4.9, 4.26, 4.30 – Clarify whether Class A4 Drinking establishments acceptable.</li> <li>• Para 3.11 – Refer to specific wheelchair standards expected.</li> </ul>	<p>This is clarified in final version of Brief.</p> <p>Agree. A4 is specifically excluded from the acceptable uses in final version of Brief. Bexley is aware of Greenwich standards often used, but it is preferable to use a national benchmark. Reference to a specific standard can quickly out-dated.</p>

BEXLEY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
BEXLEYHEATH CIVIC OFFICES PLANNING BRIEF

<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (i) Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations</b>		<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (ii) How the Main Issues Have Been Addressed</b>
Government Office for London (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 3.12 – Last sentence clarify what effect on surrounding roads is anticipated eg environment, overshadowing, wind, amenity, traffic.</li> <li>• Para 3.13, 4.8, 4.14 – Explain expectations in relation to public realm improvements.</li> <li>• Para 4.6 – Acceptability of building heights might also be subject to ensuring amenity for residents, other occupiers, other town centre users eg overshadowing and wind tunnel effects.</li> <li>• Para 4.22 – Paragraph unnecessary. Omit.</li> <li>• Para 5.9 – Clarify what conditions/legal agreements are for.</li> <li>• Appendix A – Clarify in title this is for Civic Offices.</li>   <li>• A2 should clarify that people with disabilities should be able to enter the building using same access as able-bodied. Should also include visually impaired.</li> <li>• Consider whether Civic offices should accommodate large groups of people <u>outside</u> meeting rooms (eg groups waiting for Council meetings).</li> <li>• Para 4.10, 4.19, 5.6, 5.9 - annotated errors.</li> </ul>	<p>Clarified in revised Planning Brief.</p> <p>Clarified in revised Planning Brief.</p> <p>Agree. Paragraph has been amended in revised Planning Brief.</p> <p>Agree. Paragraph amended in revised Planning Brief to clarify that conditions relate to construction methods. Agree. Corrected.</p> <p>Agree. Amended</p>
London and Quadrant Housing Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fully supportive of the proposals and as an affordable housing provider welcomes the opportunity to be a partner in this scheme at the appropriate time.</li> </ul>	Noted.
Bexley Borough Pensioners Forum (Questionnaire response)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports range and mix of uses proposed.</li> <li>• Supports the approach to combining high quality design and major uses proposed.</li> <li>• Supports proposed massing, height, density and design and agrees the Council should promote it as an example of best practice in sustainable development.</li> <li>• Supports movement framework, but queries the</li> </ul>	

BEXLEY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
BEXLEYHEATH CIVIC OFFICES PLANNING BRIEF

<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (i) Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations</b>		<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (ii) How the Main Issues Have Been Addressed</b>
Bexley Borough Pensioners Forum (Questionnaire response) (cont.)	closure of the north end of Highland Road. No reason given for this. Driving from the west one would have to circle the building twice to get in and out, causing possible congestion.	Closure of the north end of Highland Road will reduce conflicts and allow the enhancement of this vital pedestrian link along the southern side of Broadway. The introduction of a permanent vehicle access to the site from Highland Road will improve accessibility in conjunction with the existing roundabout at the junction of Albion Road.
Resident (Questionnaire Response)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support range and mix of uses proposed. Should not include restaurants because there are enough already. Housing not appropriate in town centre, especially family housing.</li> <li>• Design approach is fine so long as it does not include housing.</li> <li>• Maximum of 6 storeys (not 8/10). More would be overpowering and have health &amp; safety drawbacks.</li> <li>• Supports public art – statues and landscaping if not too expensive.</li> <li>• Avoid dead frontage.</li> <li>• Should use as an example of best practice in sustainable development.</li> <li>• Traffic already jams at peak times so roads must be carefully considered. Highland Road gives pedestrian access to Albion Road surgery so must be retained.</li> <li>• Essential that Civic Offices stays central and near to bus station. Important for the elderly and disabled and people with children. Ground level interview rooms are also important for these reasons.</li> </ul>	<p>Inclusion of a restaurant in the scheme would benefit other site users, but it would be for the judgement of the developer whether the scheme should include one.</p> <p>To achieve a fully mixed use scheme, and enable the civic accommodation to be replaced at minimal cost to the Council Tax payer, a more intense development of the site will be required than currently exists on the site and on adjacent sites. This is consistent with its central location in the town centre, but the eventual scheme would be subject to environmental appraisal. The Planning Brief makes clear that the final decision on height of buildings will be subject to the quality of the design achieved.</p>
Resident, Pinnacle Hill , Bexleyheath (On-line questionnaire response)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fully supportive of planning brief</li> </ul>	Noted.

BEXLEY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
BEXLEYHEATH CIVIC OFFICES PLANNING BRIEF

<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (i) Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations</b>		<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (ii) How the Main Issues Have Been Addressed</b>
Resident, Warren Road, Bexleyheath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests incorporation of an Arts Centre where exhibitions and concerts can be organised as Borough is seriously lacking in such facilities.</li> <li>• More sculpture would be appreciated by residents – suggests a competition for new sculptures.</li> <li>• Encourages a beautifully designed building, perhaps as an outcome of an architectural competition.</li> </ul>	<p>Several responses have drawn attention to the opportunities for enhancing public art in the town centre and it is proposed to strengthen the references to it in the brief.</p> <p>No specific provision proposed for arts centre/exhibitions/concerts but it is envisaged Civic accommodation/meeting spaces/council chamber will be capable of multi-use.</p>
Bexley Voluntary Service Council (BVSC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BVSC is one of a number of voluntary organisations that will be housed in the new development and will need to retain its separate identity. Planning Brief should be amended to reflect this requirement.</li> </ul>	Agreed. See revised 2.3.
Resident, Tower Road, Bexleyheath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good idea: “As Councils go, you are without a doubt one of the best.”</li> </ul>	Noted.
Resident, Latham Road, Bexleyheath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports proposal to bring outlying offices onto one site. Notes comment that “this will help limit future Council Tax increases” and welcomes this. However ‘savings’ likely to be purely hypothetical and should have no part in publicising the plan.</li> </ul>	Noted.
Resident, Latham Road, Bexleyheath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to plans. High-rise building will be built on highest point in Bexleyheath town centre and be intrusively prominent to residents in wide area.</li> <li>• Development of 12 storey building objectionable. Should be maximum of 4 storeys.</li> <li>• Main entrance should be onto Albion Road to improve appearance for residents. Frontages are more presentable than washing on balconies, untidy back gardens, garages and traffic. Strongly recommends building is “turned around” so development frontage is Albion Road.</li> </ul>	<p>See comments above and in main report and amendments to Brief.</p> <p>Not appropriate to reverse the frontage of the development so that fronts onto Albion Road ( and backs onto Broadway), but it is noted that a good quality elevation to Albion Road will be important. Proposed to refer to this requirement in the finalised brief</p>

BEXLEY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
BEXLEYHEATH CIVIC OFFICES PLANNING BRIEF

<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (i) Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations</b>		<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (ii) How the Main Issues Have Been Addressed</b>
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly support aspirations for a high quality, environmentally friendly and sustainable design</li> <li>• Encourages Council to promote a green roof as an option in the Planning Brief in terms of sustainable design.</li> <li>• Agrees need for a site contamination investigation, initially a full desk study and site walkover to help identify any potentially contaminative land uses that could have potential to impact on underlying geology and groundwater environment</li> <li>• Use of sustainable urban drainage systems will be determined on the findings of any contaminated land investigations</li> </ul>	<p>No specific reference to including a green roof is proposed, but this could emerge from the revised sections on the Design Vision and Sustainability Issues. Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Resident, Lion Road, Bexleyheath (questionnaire response)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports range and mix of uses general design and sustainability aims</li> <li>• However, does not support massing and height design aims. Considers the potential scale of the building would seem out of context with the massing and bulk of existing buildings recently developed eg Broadway 2 and cinema.</li> </ul>	<p>See comments above and in main report.</p>
Resident, Red House Lane, Bexleyheath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports general approach and content of brief. Suggests additional facilities should be considered:-</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conference centre – Council chamber should be large enough to double as a conference hall for 400-500 people with modern facilities for presentations</li> <li>2. A multi faith prayer room – a must in a multi-cultural, multi-faith society</li> </ol>	<p>It is envisaged that the new Council chamber should be designed in such a way that it is capable of accommodating the needs of other occasional users, including appropriate conference facilities, although its capacity will need further investigation.</p>
Resident, Red House Lane, Bexleyheath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports general approach and content of brief. Similar comments to previous Red House Lane resident</li> </ul>	

BEXLEY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
BEXLEYHEATH CIVIC OFFICES PLANNING BRIEF

<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (i)</b> <b>Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations</b>		<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (ii)</b> <b>How the Main Issues Have Been Addressed</b>
<p>Nathaniel Litchfield &amp; Partners for St James Investments Ltd</p>	<p><u>Points in Support of Brief</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports aim of bringing forward site for redevelopment as one of last remaining opportunities for major town centre regeneration.</li> <li>• Brief must facilitate reconnection of site to town centre core and development of sufficient magnitude and presence to increase attraction of town centre.</li> <li>• Supports introduction of new uses. Should also maximise benefits of redevelopment of east side of shopping area and act as catalyst for further development.</li> <li>• Supports inclusion of parts of highway into scheme. Should also include Albion Road access.</li> <li>• Any development partner must have capability to redevelop in a manner that causes no disruption to Council services and minimise impact on local traffic.</li> <li>• Supports relocation of civic accommodation on an alternative site in Bexleyheath as part of redevelopment.</li> <li>• Supports need for visible and easily accessible civic use.</li> <li>• Welcomes flexibility accorded to developers to determine the appropriate mix of land uses. Essential that new uses at ground floor level are town centre uses provided at a scale to enhance centre's retail attraction.</li> <li>• Overall quantum of retail in Civic site should be large enough to provide quantitative and qualitative attraction to increase footfall.</li> <li>• Supports careful consideration of pedestrian flows between existing shops and car park areas in the Mall and Sainsbury.</li> <li>• Supports Para 3.5 principle that residential density must be considered on basis of site characteristics, quality of design rather than arbitrary maximum densities which would restrain appropriate design</li> </ul>	<p>Some amendments to wording in proposal to pick up on these points.</p> <p>This has been corrected in final version of Brief. The Council's business continuity requirements are referred to in section 2 of revised Brief.</p> <p>Agreed. Amended Brief reflects this point.</p> <p>See main report comments on this and revised text.</p>

BEXLEY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
BEXLEYHEATH CIVIC OFFICES PLANNING BRIEF

<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (i)</b> <b>Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations</b>		<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (ii)</b> <b>How the Main Issues Have Been Addressed</b>
<p>Nathaniel Litchfield &amp; Partners for St James Investments Ltd (cont.)</p>	<p><u>Matters Requiring Clarification</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brief should be extended to include access off Albion Road with clarity being provided that unencumbered vehicular and pedestrian access via existing access is available for site's redevelopment.</li> <li>• Para 2.2 &amp; 2.3 – Brief does not accommodate issue of how Civic Office staff will be accommodated during construction work. Brief should make provision for continuation of Council services throughout build period.</li> <li>• Para 2.4 – Unclear what this means – Is it clear advantages in terms of planning considerations to Council or clear advantages in terms of Council as landowner? Should be 'planning' advantages. Also advantages should include wider regeneration and enhancement of Bexleyheath.</li> <li>• Para 2.6 – Brief should clarify specific requirements for Civic accommodation including staff numbers, type of operations to be served from Civic site, car parking requirements and phasing implications of relocation from other offices.</li> <li>• Para 2.8 and 2.9 – Should make clear list is not exclusive and that other documents will form a material consideration. Full list of relevant documents should be appended should it be requirement that all relevant policies be considered.</li> <li>• Para 3.6 – Mix of affordable units must be informed by its context and should have regard for holistic provision to be brought forward through site's redevelopment.</li> <li>• Parking provision – Brief must establish role of existing multi-storey car park on site (if any) in</li> </ul>	<p>Agree. Clarified in finalised Brief.</p> <p>Amendment proposed to cover this point.</p> <p>Clarified in proposed amendments to Brief.</p> <p>Some of this detail has not yet been finalised and will emerge from proposed Business Plan. The Council's specific requirements will be finalised in the marketing particulars, as opposed to the Planning Brief.</p> <p>New Appendix proposed listing other relevant documents.</p> <p>Accepted in principle, but the Council will need to have regard for its own adopted guidance on affordable housing requirements.</p> <p>Agreed that any spare capacity in existing public car parks can be take into consideration in the Travel Plan.</p> <p>Car parking on site must be available for all town centre users.</p>

BEXLEY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
BEXLEYHEATH CIVIC OFFICES PLANNING BRIEF

<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (i) Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations</b>		<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (ii) How the Main Issues Have Been Addressed</b>
Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners for St James Investments Ltd (cont.)	<p>providing for development or for new uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix – No stated requirement for staff car parking for Civic offices. Brief should set Council’s aspirations for staff car parking facilities.</li> </ul>	
	<p><u>Corrections</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paragraph 3.1 – Class A4 (drinking establishments) and Class A5 (takeaways) or certain leisure/cultural based uses such as night clubs, theatres and casinos not mentioned. But paragraph 4.9 mentions bars on site. There should be flexibility to include these land uses in any scheme.</li> <li>Para 4.10 – Repetition of ‘interesting’ and ‘secure’.</li> </ul>	<p>This is corrected in the final version.</p> <p>This is corrected in the final version.</p>
	<p><u>Issues Either Not Dealt With or Limited Detail</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make explicit in brief that redevelopment should be brought forward through a comprehensive detailed application submission, developed through community engagement.</li> <li>Hours of use – needs to be covered. Brief should encourage 24 hour uses subject to amenity considerations.</li> <li>Community engagement should be part of Design Brief process.</li> <li>Scope of S106 requirements should be clearer.</li> <li>Role of other stakeholders such as CABE, GLA and TfL and other statutory bodies clarified.</li> <li>Need for strategic introduction setting broader context of site in east London/Thames Gateway and Borough.</li> <li>Brief should require a viable development of site, including temporary relocation costs, S106 measures and other costs.</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed. It is proposed in the final brief that the chosen developer will be required to develop a Design Vision through public engagement. This has implications for the amenities of existing and proposed residents and a more cautious approach is required. Agreed. See comments above.</p> <p>These would need to be engaged by the chosen developer as part of the preparation of the Design Vision. Agreed. Amendment proposed to introductory section Agreed. Covered in amendments.</p> <p>This will be covered in marketing particulars.</p>

BEXLEY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
BEXLEYHEATH CIVIC OFFICES PLANNING BRIEF

<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (i) Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations</b>		<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (ii) How the Main Issues Have Been Addressed</b>
Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners for St James Investments Ltd (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brief is silent on Council's aspirations for expected timescale of any redevelopment proposals – clear statement required to assist prospective partners bring forward timely proposals.</li> </ul>	
Bexley LA21 Natural Environment Focus Group (questionnaire response)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning brief should consider concentrating other Council offices on same site, to reduce need for travel between offices.</li> <li>• Redevelopment should act as good example to other developers and aim for highest possible standards of sustainability and renewable energy.</li> <li>• Sustainability appraisal report could be more rigorous eg incorporated energy, energy conservation and generation etc.</li> <li>• Present approach is entirely car-orientated. There should be more emphasis on improving public transport access and reducing need for travel.</li> <li>• Planning brief should set agenda for the future, not only demonstrating Bexley's high standards, but giving chosen developer an opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of the issues and their ability to address them.</li> </ul>	<p>This is the intention as sent out in section 2 of the Brief.</p> <p>Agreed. Draft Brief sought to do this, but it has been strengthened in revised Brief. To be addressed in revised Sustainability Appraisal Report.</p> <p>GOL made similar comments, which have been addressed in amendments to the Brief.</p> <p>Agree.</p>
Resident, Warren Road, Bexleyheath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should be mainly non-residential or very low amount of housing.</li> <li>• Should not exceed height of surrounding buildings. Not high density or high rise housing.</li> <li>• Concern about pressure of housing on local services eg health services, overcrowding in shopping centre and traffic conditions.</li> </ul>	<p>See comments in main report.</p> <p>See comments in main report.</p>

BEXLEY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
BEXLEYHEATH CIVIC OFFICES PLANNING BRIEF

<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (i) Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations</b>		<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (ii) How the Main Issues Have Been Addressed</b>
Bexley London Borough Federation of Residents' Associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that trying to put “quart into pint pot” – doubts whether sufficient space for necessary parking requirements.</li> <li>• Surrounding roads are inadequate for greatly increased volume of traffic.</li> <li>• Retailing could have detrimental effect on viability of rest of shopping centre.</li> <li>• Does not consider a tower block is appropriate. Design and scale of building should relate to size and scale of neighbouring buildings through a more imaginative design.</li> </ul>	<p>This would be a matter for consideration as part of a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Brief specifically requires the proposal to enhance the existing town centre offer.</p> <p>See main report comments on design, height and scale of buildings.</p>
Thames Water Property Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding water supply capability – water supply network unlikely to be able to support demand anticipated from the development.</li> <li>• Will be necessary to investigate requirements. Up to 3 year's lead in time required for upgrading network.</li> <li>• Brief should make reference to provision of both adequate water and sewerage infrastructure to service development. Additions to Brief proposed to cover requirements for foul drainage and water services.</li> </ul>	<p>Proposed additions from Thames Water have been incorporated into revised Planning Brief.</p>
Resident, Perry Street, Crayford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally supportive of Brief.</li> <li>• Opportunity should be taken to incorporate large meeting space for community events with loss of Crayford Town Hall</li> <li>• Supports need for good quality design to make building aesthetically desirable. Woolwich building good example of a land mark building.</li> <li>• New Civic development should be built to last, and should be as sustainable as possible by maximising energy efficiency and other resource use.</li> </ul>	<p>It is intended that the meeting spaces, including the council chamber, will be capable of multi-use.</p> <p>Agree. See previous comments.</p> <p>This can be considered in conjunction with emerging Design Vision.</p>

BEXLEY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
BEXLEYHEATH CIVIC OFFICES PLANNING BRIEF

<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (i) Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations</b>		<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (ii) How the Main Issues Have Been Addressed</b>
Resident, Perry Street, Crayford (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate a roof garden or green roof as public space.</li> <li>• Building must have a strong public face/identity as a public building and should be additional rather than dominating.</li> <li>• Retain existing trees around Civic offices site.</li> <li>• Create a more civic space and landscaping in front of site to provide a more pleasant relationship with the building to highway.</li> </ul>	<p>Agree. This is sought in Brief.</p> <p>Details to be agreed as scheme develops.</p>
The Mall Corporation Ltd	<p>Supportive of much of content of Planning Brief but makes following additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes vision set out in Planning Brief to promote a high quality redevelopment. Supports a sustainable high density mixed use development, underpinned by ground floor retail use and integration with the Bexleyheath commercial area.</li> <li>• Proposes inclusion of Sainsburys car park and the Magistrates Court Buildings site within the proposed development brief.</li> <li>• Paragraph 2.1. In addition, Planning Brief should emphasise importance of integrating the civic site with the commercial/retail centre of Bexleyheath and stress importance of a co-ordinated approach to the development of the town centre as a whole.</li> <li>• Paragraph 3.1. Very important that Bexleyheath remains as the focus of civic and community uses in Borough. In order to enhance the town centre identity and create a lively centre based on mixed uses.</li> <li>• Believes there are opportunities to extend the existing retail offer in the town centre with new anchor stores</li> </ul>	<p>To include these areas in the Planning Brief site at this stage would unnecessarily complicate the development. It is open to prospective development partners to come forward with proposals incorporating these sites at the marketing stage.</p> <p>This is covered in the Planning Brief (for example bullet point 7 in 2.1).</p> <p>Agree, no changes required as Brief reflects this requirement.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

BEXLEY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
BEXLEYHEATH CIVIC OFFICES PLANNING BRIEF

<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (i) Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations</b>		<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (ii) How the Main Issues Have Been Addressed</b>
<p>The Mall Corporation Ltd (cont'd)</p>	<p>and medium size units that will complement existing units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports residential on upper floors, as it lengthens the period of time that fosters a lively and safer town centre street environment from early morning to late evening. This is not achieved on a commercial only scheme.</li> <li>• Supports need for skilled, experienced design team and a clear Design Vision. Success of the scheme will be dependant on success of the design to fulfil the community's objectives.</li> <li>• The Brief should not be prescriptive or taint building heights. The building heights should be appropriate and considered on contextual merit and design quality.</li> <li>• Street scene also needs to full integrate with existing town centre environment. Important that opportunity is not missed and a comprehensive redevelopment for the whole town centre is accomplished.</li> <li>• Feels that an integrated retail frontage and parking and servicing strategy incorporating existing town centre and the civic is a core requirement to success of scheme.</li> <li>• Designing out crime – The public areas should also fully integrate with existing town centre and create a safer town centre.</li> <li>• Supports incorporation of renewable energy technology into design.</li> <li>• Access from the existing shop mobility in The Mall needs to be integrated into the expanded town centre scheme.</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed. No changes required.</p> <p>See main report and amendments to Brief.</p> <p>Noted. But to include other site within the scope of this Planning Brief would unnecessarily complicate the redevelopment. It is open for developers to come forward with proposals for a more comprehensive development.</p> <p>Agree. Designing out crime is covered at paragraphs 4.15 and 4.16 of Brief. No changes are required.</p> <p>This would be welcomed but is beyond the scope of the Planning Brief to require this.</p>

BEXLEY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
BEXLEYHEATH CIVIC OFFICES PLANNING BRIEF

<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (i) Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations</b>		<b>Regulation 18(4)(b) (ii) How the Main Issues Have Been Addressed</b>
Salvation Army, Bexleyheath	Seeking new premises to cater for growing ministry and community service programme.	Proposed range of uses for Civic site includes assembly and leisure, though not places of worship. Would be difficult to incorporate a place of worship in the type of development likely to emerge. Writer offered meeting to consider other options in Bexleyheath.