

Statement of Consultation			
Respondent	Comments Submitted (summary)	Proposed Response	Proposed Change
Bexley College / Barratt Osborne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 7.5 – SPD should omit references to potential alternative uses</li> <li>• Fig 4-20 - update drawings with latest college plans</li> <li>• Para 7.6 and 7.7 – include reference to skills and education and SPD should omit references to potential alternative uses</li> <li>• Para 7.7 – add text relating to Station Square to remove reference to preferred option and alternative uses</li> <li>• Para 7.9 – references to building heights – college is likely to be a three storey building</li> <li>• Paras 8.2-8.4 – text changes relating to college relocation being the preferred option, the reference to an outline brief, the benefits of the proposal and the nature of the second entrance.</li> <li>• New para proposed regarding viability of the scheme and the link with the proposed Tower Road development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is considered important to maintain flexibility in the SPD and reference to alternative uses accomplish this without prejudicing the plans for Bexley College</li> <li>• The SPD sets out a potential layout for the site - it is designed not to be overly prescriptive and would allow for variation when detailed plans are put forward formally , however some additional wording could clarify this</li> <li>• Reference to skills and education benefits are not considered a necessary addition - it is already explicit that the Council supports the relocation of the college in the area and views it as an important element of the proposals . Alternative use issue as above.</li> <li>• Proposals for Station Square are a preferred approach to the treatment of this area however the current wording does not reflect the latest position and should be altered. Proposed wording from the college is not considered appropriate since the area indicated encompasses a wider area than the proposed college car park. College building heights noted and text should be altered to reflect latest position</li> <li>• Proposed changes to 8.2 – 8.3 considered appropriate with exception of additional wording on benefits of scheme – see above.</li> <li>• Proposed new paragraph on viability is too detailed for the SPD and considered inappropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional wording regarding illustrative natured blocks at Para 5.1</li> <li>• Alter text at para 7.7 (3) to indicate potential creation of open space as part of parking area.</li> <li>• Alter text at 7.9 to reflect latest height proposals for college</li> <li>• Alter text at para 8.2 and 8.3 to reflect latest position re College proposals and clarify Stonewood Road access.</li> </ul>

British Waterways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
The Coal Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
UK Power Networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UKPN own land adjacent to Walnut Tree Depot which accommodates an electricity substation which needs to be retained; the site could potentially be partially redeveloped; developers would need to fund any works</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments acknowledged; there is a clear need to retain and provide for essential infrastructure as part of any development proposals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledge within at para 13.9 that plans will need to include protection or reprovision of essential infrastructure including the existing electricity substation</li> </ul>
Thames Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include references to water and sewerage infrastructure,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments acknowledged; water and sewerage infrastructure is clearly an important issue which will need to be addressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include reference at new para 13.3 to water and sewerage infrastructure.</li> </ul>
Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 4.4 – include further ecological references</li> <li>Para 4.5 – reference to safeguarding of trees</li> <li>Para 7.7 – NE would welcome the opportunity to discuss detailed design of Riverside Gardens with the Council in due course</li> <li>Para 8.6 – NE would welcome the opportunity to discuss the regeneration of Orbit Towers with the Council in due course</li> <li>Climate change is not considered to be sufficiently addressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ecological enhancements are already implicit within para 4.5 although enhanced access could be added</li> <li>The existing wording in relation to trees is considered appropriate and already includes a commitment to safeguarding existing trees where possible</li> <li>The Council would also welcome further discussions with Natural England on relevant detailed matters</li> <li>The SPD includes extensive information on sustainability which relates to climate change within section 12, whilst the SA also comments on Sustainability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add reference to accessibility at Para 4.4</li> </ul>
GLA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town centre designations need to be aligned with the London Plan designations. Therefore Erith should be referred to as a District Centre (remove the word 'Major').</li> <li>GLA support The Vision including the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree that reference should be added to London Plan designation to clarify position</li> <li>Agree wayfinding measures are important and reference should be added</li> <li>Agree with additional reference to accessibility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add reference to London Plan town centre designation in para 1.1</li> <li>Add reference to wayfinding at para 12.2</li> </ul>

	<p>commitment to improve accessibility and the full integration and upgraded flood defences.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ TfL supports the improved walking links to Erith station. It is recommended that the improved links are supported by way finding measures (Legible London)</li> <li>▪ 4.4 omission: deliver the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion for all to be in conformity with the London Plan.</li> <li>▪ 4.5 omissions: plant new trees wherever possible, reference to living roofs and walls, reference to retrofitting existing building stock</li> <li>▪ 6.1 Fig 9 error: label for 'Station Square' has been transposed with 'mews'</li> <li>▪ 6.5 the design of shared surfaces must be carefully considered so as not to compromise ability of disabled people to use the space</li> <li>▪ 7.2 document can demonstrate exemplar standards for residential design, open space and family sized affordable housing given high level density proposed</li> <li>▪ 7.5 GLA support the provision of small retail or B1 units. Walnut Tree may also be appropriate for student housing and could assess this option.</li> <li>▪ 7.7 omission: flood protection should be included as a guiding principle for Riverside Gardens. Welcome reference to Mayor's playspace standards.</li> <li>▪ 8.1 omission: <b>"The area will be designed to meet the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion for all.</b> Ramping to overcome the level differences will be subtly integrated into the design of the paving service"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree reference to new trees, living roofs and walls and retrofitting of buildings should be references</li> <li>• Agree labels at fig 6.1 have been transposed</li> <li>• Agree shared surfaces should have regard to disabled</li> <li>• Agree that exemplar standards will be required in the development</li> <li>• Bexley's Strategic Housing Market Assessment did consider student accommodation and identified no significant need for the borough. However, the SPD does not specifically prohibit student accommodation proposals should they be proposed.</li> <li>• Agreed flood protection should be guiding principle for the Riverside Gardens</li> <li>• Agree reference to accessibility should be added to Riverside gardens section</li> <li>• Agree amended wording regarding space standards to para 9.2 so as to reflect latest position</li> <li>• Agree addition of further detail on lifetime home standards and wheelchair accessibility at para 9.2</li> <li>• Agree amendments with regard to housing types to clarify position. Also reference to Bexley Housing Design Guide SPD would be appropriate</li> <li>• The Queens Road junction proposals are proposed to smooth traffic flow at a congested junction and would comply with the overall TfL policy. Detailed discussions on the design will be required with TfL at detailed design stage.</li> <li>• Agree reference to servicing requirements will need to be added</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add reference to accessibility at para 4.4</li> <li>• Add references to new trees, living roofs and walls and retrofitting of buildings at para 4.5</li> <li>• Amend labels at figure 6.1</li> <li>• Add reference to consideration of disabled users when using shared surfaces at para 6.5</li> <li>• Add reference to exemplar standards at para 7.3</li> <li>• Add reference to flood protection at para 7.7</li> <li>• Add proposed amendment to para 8.1</li> <li>• Add proposed amendments to para 9.2 regarding space standards</li> <li>• Add proposed amendments to para 9.2 regarding lifetime homes and wheelchair access</li> <li>• Add references to space standards and Bexley Residential Design Guide SPD at para 9.4 and Appendix 1</li> <li>• Add reference to servicing requirements at new para 11.7</li> <li>• Add references to parking standards approach in Core Strategy and cycle parking requirements at para 11.6</li> <li>• Add reference to London Plan carbon reduction policies at para 12.2</li> </ul>
--	---	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 9.2 suggested wording “<b>Dwellings should have consideration for the space standards set out in the emerging LP and have regard for the evolving Housing SPG standards.</b> Affordable units...”</li> <li>▪ 9.2 omission: All dwellings should be built to lifetime home standards and 10% should be wheelchair accessible, or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users.</li> <li>▪ 9.4/Appendix A Should consider whether the sample housing types and apartments meet Mayor’s space standards and housing design guidance</li> <li>▪ 11.3 TfL wish to highlight its emerging policies on ‘smoothing traffic flow’ and traffic signals with regards to the Queens Road roundabout junction.</li> <li>▪ 11 Potential for a no. of commercial premises to be developed and provision should be made for servicing requirements.</li> <li>▪ 11.6 parking will need to accord with maximum London Plan parking standards. Electric vehicle charging points to be provided and cycle parking in accordance with standards in LP.</li> <li>▪ 12 feasibility study into district heating network is welcomed in particular viability of using surplus heat from Belvedere waste plant.</li> <li>▪ 12 omission: SPG should include specific carbon reduction targets in line with LP</li> <li>▪ 12.4-5 should be specific references to Bexley’s SFRA and specific suggestions including in Thames Estuary 2100 report. Council should confirm PPS25 sequential</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking will need to have regard to London Plan standards as well as national guidance and local circumstances. This approach is confirmed in Bexleys Core Strategy and needs to be clarified in the text. Agree reference to cycle standards is required.</li> <li>• Agree that reference to London Plan carbon reduction targets need to be added for completeness</li> <li>• Agree reference to Bexley SFRA and TE2100 document should be included for clarity. Clarification of sequential approach also required. Environment Agency has raised no objection to figure 19</li> <li>• SPD makes clear that surface water will be discharges into attenuation areas which would provide the required storm water storage above the standard water level.</li> <li>• Agree additional wording is required to make clear that the proposed channels and gullies should have sufficient capacity.</li> <li>• Suggested changes to affordable housing section has been superseded by Bexley Core Strategy policy CS10. SPD should be amended to reflect new policy. Reference to emerging national or regional policy is now no longer relevant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend paras 12.4 and 12.5 to reflect comments re SFRA, TE2100 study and sequential test.</li> <li>• Amend para 12.7 to refer to sufficient capacity of channels and gullies</li> <li>• Amend paras 13.10 and 13.11 to reflect Core Strategy policy CS10 and update other references.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

	<p>approach. On Fig 19 it is difficult to identify new line of flood defence and statement confirming this has been agreed with EA would be appropriate. 'Where possible' on 2<sup>nd</sup> line of para 12.5 should be removed to ensure principle of avoidance is a clear priority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 12.7 Council should confirm that surface water will be discharged into Thames and not sewer network. Dimensions/capacity of channels/gullies needs to be adequate to meet local surface water drainage requirements.</li> <li>▪ 13.1 welcome reference to designing out crime principles.</li> <li>▪ 13.10 Suggested change in bold "Having regard to local circumstance a <b>minimum</b> of 35% of homes should normally be affordable housing. The <b>maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing will be sort when negotiating individual sites</b>. In considering the <b>maximum reasonable amount</b> of affordable housing on <b>individual sites regard will be given to viability; the need to encourage development; the need to promote mixed and balanced communities; and the size and type of affordable housing required locally</b>. The council will also take a strategic view..."</li> <li>▪ 13.11 omission "regard should also be had to emerging changes to affordable housing policy at the national and <b>regional levels</b>"</li> <li>▪ 13.11 omission: council must indicate tenure split (social rented/intermediate). Should be in general conformity with LP 70/30 split and</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>have regard to emerging 60/40 split in draft replacement LP. If council split is not in general conformity council should provide robust justification.</p>		
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include more emphasis on the sequential approach</li> <li>• Include flood zones on fig. 14</li> <li>• Support for surface water strategy but consider how this could be delivered over phases. Also consider alternatives to underground tanks–</li> <li>• Replace figure 19 with a plan showing distribution of surface water flooding</li> <li>• Important that the level of the tides are considered when referencing site drainage</li> <li>• Para 8.1 sheet piling is being encouraged to be retained when would prefer river wall retreat.</li> <li>• Include reference to green roofs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development has taken account of the sequential approach but this could be acknowledged more explicitly within the SPD</li> <li>• Flood zones are included on fig. 18 and therefore they are not needed on fig. 14</li> <li>• The Council supports SUDS; detailed designs would be subject to further consultation however, the use of underground storage cells could be caveated in the text together with additional wording with regard to the phasing of development and the importance of tide levels</li> <li>• Agree that figure 19 is not required but surface water flooding is not a major issue on the site so illustration is not considered to be required.</li> <li>• Para 8.1 does not explicitly state that retaining the sheet piling is the preferred approach; it states that the preferred approach is a 'simple ridge design' and that walls, gates, barriers and that engineering type solutions should be avoided</li> <li>• Reference to green roofs should be added</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include more explicit references to the sequential approach within para 12.4</li> <li>• Add caveat to underground storage cells at para 12.7</li> <li>• Add new para 12.8 with regard to phased development and tide levels.</li> <li>• Remove figure 19</li> <li>• Add reference to green / bio-diverse roofs in para 12.1</li> </ul>
English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support overall vision of the SPD</li> <li>• Note inaccuracies in Sustainability Appraisal baseline</li> <li>• Minor suggested additions to urban design principles relating to the importance of local context, the setting of heritage buildings and reuse of building stock</li> <li>• Review section of density and height in the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support welcomed</li> <li>• Agree SA baseline needs amendment</li> <li>• Agree minor changes to urban design principles to reflect issues of local context, heritage buildings and reuse of building stock</li> <li>• The scale parameters of future development have been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding urban and heritage context;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include minor text changes in relation to urban design principles as suggested at paras 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5</li> <li>• Amend SA baseline information within SA report document</li> <li>• Add reference to listed structures at to para 13.6</li> </ul>

	<p>context of EH/ CABI guidance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support approach to Carnegie Library building</li> <li>• Include reference to locally listed building and views as well as a map</li> <li>• Include conservation staff in preparation and implementation of the SPD</li> </ul>	<p>further consideration would be given to the impact of development on heritage assets at detailed planning stages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree reference to local listed buildings should be included although all heritage assets are already included in the map at figure 14</li> <li>• The Councils conservation staff would be involved in the preparation and implementation of the SPD</li> </ul>	
Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
Network Rail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential improvements to Erith Station would include delivering step-free access and a potential second exit on platform 2</li> <li>• Network Rail could not fund these improvements but they could potentially be justified as developer contributions arising for the proposed development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments/information noted</li> </ul>	

## General Correspondence

Respondent	Comment Submitted (summary)	Proposed Response	Proposed Change
Erith Riverside Residents Association (ERRA) & standard resident letters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The perceived negative impacts of the proposed development on the amenity of existing dwellings;</li> <li>Objection to the proposal to build near to Carrack and Bosworth Houses and on the Running Horses car park;</li> <li>The loss of existing car parking spaces;</li> <li>The loss of existing low rise flats on Bexley Road given the lack of proposed replacements within the development and the resulting relocation of existing tenants;</li> <li>The perceived damaging effect of building a new two lane road between Carrack and Bosworth Houses;</li> <li>The proposed building on Riverside Gardens;</li> <li>The perceived divisive effect of the proposed land uses and residential mix leading to unsustainable development</li> <li>Objection to the approach taken to transport and the resulting increase in traffic in the area;</li> <li>Object to potential disruption resulting from demolition works</li> <li>Object to possible demolition of Bosworth and Carrack Houses</li> <li>The perceived lack of improvement over the previous proposals and the biased nature of the questionnaire</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EWG is an area which has been identified as being in need of regeneration and as an opportunity to accommodate high quality new development which respects and contributes to the existing community</li> <li>The Council is obliged to plan both in the interests of existing residents and for future demand for residential and other land uses in line with strategic policy objectives</li> <li>The scale parameters of future development have been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding urban and heritage context.</li> <li>The Council has policies to ensure that the amenity of existing residents is protected and the Council will only permit detailed proposals which are in accordance with these policies, for example in relation to daylight, sunlight and overshadowing impacts</li> <li>The proposals include the requirement for appropriate car parking provision although the specific arrangement and allocation of spaces will be a matter for detailed design stages.</li> <li>The SPD seeks a mix of houses and flats to meet housing need within the area. The precise mix and size of dwellings has not been fixed at this stage and would be developed at detailed planning stage with regard to the requirements of the area</li> <li>The SPD proposes the preservation of the existing highway network although additional access roads are proposed into the Core area to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> <li>Remove references to demolition of tower blocks at paras 7.2, 7.6 and 8.9</li> </ul>

ensure good accessibility to new developments and between the town, the station and the riverside. These secondary streets are to be designed at an appropriate scale to complement surrounding development.

- Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this
- The development would be phased and subject to a construction methodology statement to safeguard residents
- The SPD does not seek the removal of the tower blocks but refers to the Councils approach should demolition be proposed by a developer. It is considered that reference to demolition could be removed to avoid confusion.
- The consultation exercise has provided the opportunity to make comments and express any concerns

Erith Town Forum

- Support Bexley College with parking and limited retail
- Support housing on swimming pool site;
- Do not support development higher than 5 storeys
- Concerns over uncertainty and potential displacement for existing residents; do not support any development on Riverside Gardens or any existing green space (Saltford close);
- Further consideration needed in terms of density
- Concerns over flexibility of SPD and need for

- Support welcomed. Comments on height noted . Although some flexibility regarding heights is justified the explicit reference to elements up to seven storeys is not considered necessary
- The scale parameters of future development have been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding urban and heritage context
- Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this
- Development will be delivered in phases and the new residential development will create

- Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD
- Remove references to demolition of tower blocks at

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>rigid ground rules re: height and density</li> <li>Concern over potential for some less attractive sites to be left undeveloped;</li> <li>Need firm commitment on disabled access to station platform</li> </ul>	<p>increased demand. The document is flexible whilst still providing a strategic framework. However, the SPD does state that individual developments will be resisted if they are adjudged to prejudice the delivery of the wider framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD does state that contributions to the provision of disabled access to the London bound platform could be sought from developers</li> </ul>	<p>paras 7.2, 7.6 and 8.9</p>
Regeneration X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support mixed use and principles of development but do not support proposed density</li> <li>do not support any building on Riverside Gardens</li> <li>Concerns about pedestrianisation and associated potential lack of permeability, legibility and passive surveillance</li> <li>Concerned about lack of permeability associated with perimeter blocks</li> <li>Views from existing building to be maintained;</li> <li>Concern regarding public transport infrastructure capacity</li> <li>Error in Fig 9 key</li> <li>Support events and markets on Station Square provided they are high quality</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcome</li> <li>Development has been designed to be highly legible and permeable through the use of urban blocks which clearly define public and private spaces; majority of roads within site are proposed as two way traditional style streets;</li> <li>Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this</li> <li>Maintenance of private views is not a material planning consideration;</li> <li>funding for required infrastructure improvements arising from increased demand are secured via planning obligations with developers.</li> <li>the key has transposed the labelling from station square and mews and will need to be corrected.</li> <li>The scale parameters of future development have been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context</li> <li>Funding for required infrastructure improvements arising from increased demand are secured via planning obligations with developers where appropriate</li> <li>Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> <li>Figure 9 corrected</li> </ul>
Resident (no address supplied)	<p>Concerns about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>additional residential development</li> <li>displacement of existing residents and parking spaces</li> <li>building on Riverside Gardens</li> <li>Bexley College and potential overcrowding in the area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development have been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context</li> <li>Funding for required infrastructure improvements arising from increased demand are secured via planning obligations with developers where appropriate</li> <li>Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open</li> </ul>

Resident (no address supplied)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about building on Riverside Gardens and capacity of local roads and schools</li> </ul>	<p>this stage and the document should better reflect this</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development would be phased and subject to a construction methodology statement to safeguard residents</li> <li>Adequate parking will be secured within the area as part of detailed proposals including a full transport assessment</li> <li>Bexley College is considered to be a major new attraction to the town, increasing footfall and enhancing the viability and vitality of the town centre</li> <li>Funding for required education and infrastructure improvements arising from increased demand would be secured via planning obligations</li> <li>Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this</li> </ul>	<p>Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident (Mortimer Road)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Bexley College proposal;</li> <li>Support building on Riverside Gardens provided at far end although would prefer 3 rather than 5 storeys</li> <li>support preservation of Carnegie Building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcome</li> <li>Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only room for small amount of housing in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is considered to be capacity for the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

(Windrush Court)  
Resident  
(Bramble Croft)

Erith. Would only support College on old tram site and housing on old leisure centre site

- Support regeneration of Riverside Gardens but do not support any loss of existing open space
- concerned about number of new dwellings, potential flexibility on height, potential for piecemeal development
- do not support change of use of Carnegie building
- Concern about capacity of local buses

quantum of development suggested, subject to detailed design

- Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this
- The scale parameters of future development have been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding urban and heritage context although it is considered that clarification on height limits necessary
- Development will be delivered in phases and the new residential development will create increased demand
- Funding for required infrastructure improvements arising from increased demand would be secured where appropriate through planning obligations
- Carnegie is a vacant listed building and appropriate use is needed to safeguard future
- The Council is obliged to plan both in the interests of existing residents and for future demand for residential and other land uses in line with strategic policy objectives
- EWG is an area which has been identified as being in need of regeneration and as an opportunity to accommodate high quality new development which respects and contributes to the existing community
- The scale parameters of future development have been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding urban and heritage context.
- Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect

- Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD

Resident  
(Chandlers Drive)

- Lack of support for proposed development from people of Erith; do not support building on Riverside Gardens; do not support density and scale of development; do not support consultation as questions are leading

- Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD

this

- Questions not considered leading and respondents were free to add additional comments

Resident (Bexley Road)	Response based on ERRA letter (considered separately)		
Resident (Bexley Road)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Preserve existing Riverside Gardens, accept development on swimming pool site and Walnut Tree Road but do not allow development of the gardens</li><li>• Development is profit driven and would be repeating the same mistakes of the 1960s</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this</li><li>• SPD does not seek to replicate a modernist / 1960s approach but secure a more traditional form of urban development</li><li>• The Council is seeking to secure the physical regeneration of the area and meet policy objectives.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li></ul>
Resident (Charlieville)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Object to any development on Riverside Gardens on a variety of grounds: environmental, ecological, amenity, recreation; lack of green space in local area and north of Bexley generally</li><li>• Proposal does not accord with local, strategic and national policy; do not consider play area to be mitigation for loss because it would perform a different / narrower role, no need for development on the gardens as values generated elsewhere would be sufficient</li><li>• Need to take worst case climate change scenario into account including in terms of flooding and selection of tree species;</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this</li><li>• A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted to consider impacts of flooding in the area although this could be made more explicit in the text</li><li>• Flood prevention measures would need to be subject to scrutiny and approval from the Environment Agency and would include consideration of climate change scenarios in line with local, strategic and national planning policy (PPS25)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li><li>• Amend para 12.4 to refer to Flood Risk Assessment</li></ul>

- Proposed Riverside Gardens design is dull / unimaginative / overly formal
- Proposed design for Riverside Gardens is indicative only and would be subject to more a detailed design process which would also consider ecological and sustainability issues

Resident (Park Crescent)

- Support plans for Walnut Tree Depot and Pier Road West but do not support building on Riverside Gardens;
- Core site proposal is overdevelopment and the tower blocks should not be densely packed with new development; centre of core site should be left open
- Support welcomed;
- Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this
- The scale parameters of future development have been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context,
- Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD

Resident (Auckland Hill)

- Erith has great potential; object to building on Riverside Gardens and underground car park (on security grounds);
- Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this
- Any underground parking would need to be designed in accordance with "Secure by Design " principles and would need to have security/ CCTV monitoring / controlled access to prevent misuse
- Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD

Friends of  
Riverside  
Gardens Erith  
(FORGE)

- Object to proposed development;
- Development on Riverside Gardens to fund improvements is not necessary as funding can be obtained from other sources
- Building is inappropriate within the Conservation Area; Flagpole site was a gift to the Council by WM Cory & Sons
- All existing open space is required for growing population;
- Other elements of the proposed development will also cause a loss of other open space and impact on Riverside Gardens. Proposal is contrary to PPG17;
- consultation activity with the community has been poor and has resulted in scheme that is unsuitable for the local community
- Erith has received a disproportionate amount of recent new development, especially of one and two bed flats
- Development in the area is too dense

Resident (no  
address  
supplied)

- Local objectors will be labelled as nimby's; development will cause disruption and misery to the local community
- Why if demand for housing is so great have the swimming pool site, the tram terminus and land behind Morrison's lain vacant for so long?
- Lack of clarity over loss of existing car parking spaces; development will cause a loss of amenity

- Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this
- EWG is an area which has been identified as being in need of regeneration and as an opportunity to accommodate high quality new development which respects and contributes to the existing community;
- PPG 17 does confirm that development of open space may provide opportunities to remedy deficiencies and to exchange the use of one site for another to substitute for any loss. The SPD does propose the provision of new open space facilities as part of the redevelopment which would replace the deficient and underused spaces currently provided
- Consultation activity is in line with national requirements and the recent consultation has included opportunity to express a variety of views;
- The scale parameters of future development have been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding urban and heritage context.
- The Council is obliged to plan both in the interests of existing residents and for future demand for residential and other land uses in line with strategic policy objectives
- EWG is an area which has been identified as being in need of regeneration and as an opportunity to accommodate high quality new development which respects and contributes to the existing community as well as meeting the long term housing needs of the borough.
- Any proposal will be subject to construction

- Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD

- No change

Resident  
(Carrack House)

- Development will cause loss of amenity (daylight and sunlight) to existing dwellings as development will all but touch an existing window
- Clarity needed over new buildings promoting health;
- What kind of jobs are envisaged?
- Lack of clarity over existing car parking; open space needed for air ambulance
- Development will disrupt occupiers of low rise blocks
- Development should not import new social problems; development will disadvantage amenity of existing residents –
- Development is not needed next to Carrack and Bosworth House as there is space elsewhere; walkways/pathways should not be too steep
- Underground parking would not prevent crime; concern over refuse /recycling arrangements, no benefit for existing residents
- Signage to direct skateboarders needed; barriers to prevent cycling on pavements needed; lifts at the station needed;
- Rail, services at capacity
- methodology to minimise disruption
- The purpose of the SPD is to provide a comprehensive policy framework to provide the best possible context for appropriate development to be delivered
- Appropriate Parking is required by the SPD although this will be considered in further detail at planning application stage
- Initial testing has been undertaken to ensure that the new development does not cause an unacceptable impact in terms of daylight and sunlight . The block designs shown are only indicative at this stage and the impact of detailed development proposals will be carried out at the time that planning applications are made. This could be made clearer in the SPD
- the Council will not in any case permit development that has an unacceptable impact on the amenity of existing residents in line with its planning policies
- New development provides the opportunity to create a healthier environment through encourage walking and cycling and the provision of leisure and recreational facilities.
- A variety of jobs opportunities are likely to be created in the retail, community, education and business sectors depending on occupiers;
- The development would be phased and subject to a construction methodology statement to safeguard residents
- Council policies aim to secure mixed and balanced community in safe environment through quality design
- More detailed consideration of site levels and
- Add text to para 5.1 to stress indicative nature of block designs.

- Will police services be able to cope; will roads be renamed; will post codes remain the same?
- Will more postmen/post vans come to the area?

topography would be undertaken at the detailed application stages

- All levels and slopes would need to be accessible to people with disabilities in accordance with the DDA
- Any underground parking would need to be designed in accordance with "Secure by Design" principles and would need to have security/ CCTV monitoring / controlled access to prevent misuse
- Car parking details are set in the SPD although would also be considered in further detail at planning application stage
- Detailed public realm requirements such as signage and barriers would be considered at detailed planning stage
- Funding for required infrastructure improvements arising from increased demand will be sought where appropriate via planning obligations
- Post codes and postal services are not in the Council's control but would anticipate that Royal Mail would provide adequate services to existing and new residents and businesses

Resident (no address supplied)

- Riverside Gardens needs improving as it does not currently provide views and needs something better than shrubbery
- Desirability of including the Erith landfill site as a potential 'village' development and also land which would be released
- From Bexley College relocation; need to improve traffic flows at the junction of Bexley Rd and Bronze Age Way and reducing bottlenecks from James Watt Way to Larner Rd including need for environmental

- Support welcome
- Erith landfill site is not within the scope of this SPD
- Funding for necessary road infrastructure and public realm improvements would be secured via planning obligations where appropriate. The SPD does highlight the need for an improved junction at Queens Road.

improvements.

Resident (no address supplied)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on Riverside Gardens; Parking assessment needed: Morrison's have no obligation to provide parking and it may not always be available</li> <li>Pier Rd car park is not adequate.</li> <li>Car park needed for Erith Station</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this</li> <li>Funding for required infrastructure improvements arising from increased demand would be secured via planning obligations where appropriate</li> <li>The SPD seeks the provision of appropriate parking. Car parking would be considered in further detail at planning application stage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident (no address supplied)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Car parking space privately owned on corner of Cross Street and Bexley Rd</li> <li>What will happen to compensate for its loss?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD seeks adequate parking as part of any development. Car parking details would also be considered in further detail at planning application stage</li> <li>Agreements / permissions would need to be reached with existing owners regarding any loss of existing spaces. The SPD does not affect private property rights</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident (Badlow Close) Resident (Avenue Road)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No relevant information or comments submitted regarding the SPD</li> <li>Object to building on Riverside Gardens; existing health and education infrastructure not sufficient to accommodate new development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments</li> <li>Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this</li> <li>Funding for required education and infrastructure improvements arising from increased demand would be secured via</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on</li> </ul>

		planning obligations where appropriate	the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD
Resident (Lesney Park)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about flexibility over building scale;</li> <li>Bosworth and Carrick House should not be replicated as were a past mistake; safeguards needed to ensure past mistakes are not repeated in terms of completion of all aspects of the development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development have been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding urban and heritage context .However clarity is considered to be required over heights</li> <li>The purpose of the SPD is to provide a comprehensive policy framework to provide the best possible context for appropriate development to be delivered</li> <li>the SPD does state that individual developments will be resisted if they are adjudged to prejudice the delivery of the wider framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend para 7.9 to remove reference to seven story elements</li> </ul>
Resident (Bexley Road)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support improvements to Riverside Gardens but object to new building</li> <li>Object to 5 storey buildings along the High Street as they will form a wall and cause overshadowing to the town centre approach; Bexley College relaxation will cause loss of trees and be highly visible</li> <li>Density of new development near to tower blocks will be too high and leave limited room for access, servicing, gardening; parking provision needs clarifying</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcome</li> <li>Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this</li> <li>The scale parameters of future development have been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context</li> <li>The development is not expected to cause undue overshadowing but detailed design would be tested at planning application stage to ensure that the amenity of existing residents is preserved</li> <li>New development would include new landscaping which will retain trees and/or plant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>

new and replacement trees where possible and appropriate

- The SPD seeks an appropriate level of parking and access. Car parking and access will be considered in further detail at planning application stage

Resident  
(Avenue Road)

- Object to building on Riverside Gardens; Gardens should be improved with planting and open areas not buildings

- Current market conditions make the development at Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this
- The plans include improvements to the gardens which would include new planting and open areas

- Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.5, 7.7 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered in the light of existing planning policies on Urban Open Space and the vision and principles of the SPD

Standard Letter  
from 50 local  
residents

- Same points raised as Erith Riverside Residents Association submission see above
- See proposed council response above
- See proposed changes above

<b>Questionnaire Comments</b>			
<b>Question 1 - Do you agree that the mix of uses proposed for the site will create a sustainable community and benefit the town centre as a whole?</b>			
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment Submitted</b>	<b>Proposed Response</b>	<b>Proposed Change</b>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think that the mixture of different shops will complement each other well.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bringing difference to the current area is always a good thing - good, clean and attractive green area will work well for the children and elders.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA12 3AS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes I agree the mixed use will work well as long as the existing units do not suffer.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, it will stop it from just being a housing estate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ideal location but it is currently not being taken advantage of.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident N18 2XL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>But developing more about the core of the housing where we have the small green space would make the area a bit more attractive to developers and buyers and would eventually increase the value of the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>But there should be more one or two buildings for the community. So that they can have activities for those living in that area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed; community uses are included in the scheme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SW1W 9ST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There could be provisions for more sport and recreation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed. Recreational provision is encouraged through the proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The idea of developing a whole area is good for the borough and community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident BR7 6HW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes I agree, it means the areas target market can widen for the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident E1 2OY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do agree the town centre needs an improvement and the mix proposed seems to include everything I could think of.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SL6 8DU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I like the creation of the open space. To me this also gives a clear view to the river.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Erith is in dire need for regeneration, however to do so will require more than just a few shops and houses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>this proposal needs to be considered in the context of the Council's wider regeneration objectives and initiatives for the town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SE1 7EH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The regeneration of Erith will help boost its economy and make Erith more vibrant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA17 6JX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This will attract more people to go in there instead of Bexleyheath Shopping Centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More space and flexibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident E21 5JS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For sure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Looks good. About time Erith moved forward. Most of it seems to be speculation at a time when money is short.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support/welcome; the proposals have been designed to be realistic and deliverable although it is acknowledged that there will most likely need to be market recovery before the scheme can be fully implemented; it worth noting that developers have already expressed an interest in the early phases of the scheme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident BR8 7UA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am uncertain, as some of the commercial uses could take business away from the town centre or many won't be able to compete with Morrisons.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SPD seeks to ensure that EWG complements the primary shopping area. Any proposals outside of the main shopping area will need to prove they do not have an adverse impact on the town centre. SPD allows for flexibility in terms of commercial uses should this issue arise.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA6 7LU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I believe that it is very important that they don't put too many retail units there at once as it could de-value the commercial property market in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will be delivered in phases and the new residential development will create increased demand. Any proposals outside of main shopping area will need to prove they do not have an adverse impact on the town centre. SPD allows for flexibility in commercial uses should this issue arise.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3DF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do not think the mix is balanced - it is seriously top heavy with residential. Where are all these new residents going? - Not enough employment in Erith; - One real pub left in Erith (town); - No restaurants, cinema, bowling or ice rink. If people live here, they will spend all their money elsewhere, and use cars to get there. No mention is made of sustainability in regards housing for example grey water recycling and renewable energy (solar panels).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a need for the quantum of housing proposed. The number of proposed residential units has however significantly reduced compared to the number previously proposed. The SPD proposes a range of uses which would likely include a small number of cafe/restaurant type uses as well as shops; sustainability is discussed at section 12 of the SPD and will inherently form part of all schemes that come forward for each site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SE2 9TJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing in close proximity to the Riverside Gardens will be an intrusion. Business development is welcome in Erith but please find another site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is considered to be a long standing regeneration opportunity.</li> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>

Resident DA8 1AD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likes the public art already in the town and would like to see more. If the fish is to be moved it should go onto a central space where it can be seen from all angles and not subject to vandalism. Could the Carnegie building be used as an art gallery - say an out station to the British Museum or National Gallery or the Tate?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public art could form part of the proposals, subject to discussions at the detailed planning stages; investigations are continuing in relation to the Carnegie building to secure an appropriate and sustainable future use</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3PT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Care to be taken in allocation of housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development will include an appropriate tenure split having regard to adopted policy and local circumstances</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1GL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some not all</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1GL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some not all</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3SH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I like the idea of having an open aspect from the Riverside Gardens to the river. I feel the river is a great aspect to Erith.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed; the proposal is designed to enhance the riverside setting of the site for new and existing residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7 4LZ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can't say at this stage whether proposed mixed use will create a sustainable community as not enough of the proposals are firm - college use is good as is proposed for active frontages, but do find use of these frontages is important. I don't feel that use of perimeter blocks is good urban design and it doesn't encourage permeability or aid legibility. New building in park is unsuitable as too high - the cost of upgrading park can be met from planning gain as from all of the proposed development, not just the proposed building in the park. Walnut Tree Road and roundabout at end should be 'shared space' just as Ashford, Kent which did this. Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development has been designed to be highly legible and permeable through the use of urban blocks which clearly define public and private spaces; majority of roads within site are proposed as two way traditional style streets. The SPD is to provide a broad framework from which appropriate schemes can come forward at the detailed design stage. It is considered that an appropriate level of detail has been provided to developers whilst avoiding being overly prescriptive.</li> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>

	<p>must tell developers what they want to see in detail rather than let developers say what public realm they will provide. Very disappointed that visible display did not show heights of blocks and show views.</p>		
Resident DA8 2PN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would make the town centre much livelier than it is now.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think this is a much needed development in the Erith area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1TB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whatever development is being proposed make it affordable for people.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development will include a proportion of affordable housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3AP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think with the proposed plans (even though they are not set in concrete) will make the area more busy. Even with the development it worries me that it will get overcrowded in the area. There are not enough activities in our local area of Erith for young or old.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A variety of uses are proposed in addition to housing; the density of the scheme is in line with the Council's adopted policy.</li> <li>Scheme seeks to encourage community uses to support population growth and will allow ability to revitalise town centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident - Check	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support (?) and swimming. - Support college. - Need new ?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If housing is not too extensive or high. No deal must be made to curtail green space, in fact more is needed because of the amount of people you intend to house. Please look at transport, as this amount of people will need to get to work etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements to transport are to be sought through planning obligations where appropriate.</li> <li>Open Space is proposed to be enhanced as a result of development.</li> <li>A height and density strategy is set out in the SPD.</li> <li>The quantum of homes proposed is indicative and considered appropriate given location and nature of area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA17 5UJ - Check	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make better use of space Clean open space Bring more [indistinguishable] in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> <li>The SPD proposes the improvements of Open Space to ensure its more efficient use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA8 3AF - Check	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presently the site looks like a waste of space with only the [indistinguishable] on our High Street</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response possible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7 6QT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsure. Developments along West Street have not been a great success with many problems. Also development in town centre still has vacant properties and poor sales of flats resulted in absentee landlords who neglected their responsibilities to maintain integrity of buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will be delivered in phases and the new residential development will create increased demand, The document is to be flexible whilst still providing a strategic framework. The SPD allows for flexibility of uses to respond to market conditions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3AS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep gardens as they are. Enough room for people to move about.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1P4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More people More shops.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7 6QT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not sure. I am concerned that a small development as outlined will eventually lead to more development of the whole of the Riverside Gardens.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open</li> </ul>

			Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is a very good idea because it's related to Erith Development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very good explanation of proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3NS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work done so far is a joke. Do not want anymore.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted / no response.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3AW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As long as it brings somewhere for teenagers to go and not just used as a place for them to get into mischief.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is intended that the development will be safe and secure through careful design; a mix of land uses are proposed in the SPD to create a sustainable community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1RB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will generate more business within the town centre. In the hope of creating a friendly environment/community. Opening up the river park, so people can enjoy open space and the view of the river.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Upon looking at the proposals for this development, I feel this would benefit the area and hopefully encourage more people to visit the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With all the proposed 5/7 storey blocks of flats all views of the river to the general public will be denied. Where are the people at present living in the area be rehoused during work (if Bosworth, Carrack, Cross Street and low rise flats are demolished you will need lots of temporary housing. The folk at present living in Erith are quite happy as we are and do not want to have many more years of disruption in our lives while building work is in progress. Our riverside gardens will give us less open</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The planning system cannot protect private views but it is intended that the level of interaction and views out to the river will be improved through the regeneration of the Gardens; the interests of existing residents would be protected during any redevelopment of existing dwellings; the connectivity of the area is also expected to be improved under the proposals.</li> <li>There are services from Erith to Charing Cross and the 602 and 669 although school bus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>

	<p>space when the area near the post-office is altered. Regarding Transport - trains do not go to Charing Cross from Erith - only go to Cannon Street. Buses 602, 669 do not serve the public being school buses to Cleeve Park and Townley Grammar. (1 bus journey in each direction morning and afternoon). How much more difficult will it be for people across the town when roundabout alterations take place? Disabled access (also buggies) to UP platform at Erith should be given priority.</p>	<p>services are available for use by the general public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> <li>• Improvements to Queen Road Junction do not form part of SPD but will be designed to ensure improved pedestrian access.</li> <li>• Improvements of accessibility at Erith Station will be sought through planning gain.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I wouldn't care. I don't live in that area or visit it at all.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted / no response.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think it is a good idea making a good use of a space which wasn't used a lot and trying to make it more usable and a residential area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• But no takeaways.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no explicit plans for takeaways (use class A5) in the scheme; however the acceptability of such uses as part of detailed proposals would need to be considered by the Council; it would not be appropriate to include detailed restrictions on the potential uses at this stage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1QR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I was told that a college would be opening soon. There's a good side and terrible side to it. It will be beneficial for the young adult due to learning/maybe employment. It will be detrimental to the older generation as noise would be a hazard. Economically, I really do not see the benefit. How will someone in their fifties benefit from it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noise will be managed on site through detailed design and restrictions on the planning approval where appropriate.</li> <li>• Economic benefit to be realised from regeneration of both EWG &amp; Old College Site and resulting increases in footfall and patronage of local businesses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gives a good outlook, open to greenery.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA8 1SB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please, please put some traffic calming in place along Bexley Road, between the post office and the old Town Hall - it is a race track, making it dangerous for pedestrians to cross, especially older people.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements to the public realm around Bexley Road are proposed but cannot be considered in detail in the SPD. They will be subject to detailed proposals at a later stage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do agree, but I would lose all daylight if building went on gardens.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council's planning policies protect residential amenity and the Council will not permit development which has an unacceptable impact.</li> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mixes of uses is essential but with consultation with decision makers. Some use of the proposed new facilities would be of little interest to those using the area as a transit use. This is witnessed at the moment with the bus terminus area of the town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> <li>The SPD will help to create a mixed, balanced and stable community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1NB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create opportunities, jobs, housing and future investment within the borough and economy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2AG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think that it will be good if we put something to make the gardens exciting to interact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will benefit everyone if it is carried out in the interest of the residents not simply for Council money making benefits.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The aim of the scheme is to provide lasting regeneration for the area that also benefits the local community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2HR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As long as it's keeping with what is planned. I was not happy with the last proposals, I know we will have to get something, this looks a bit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

	better.		
Resident DA17 6JD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need more commercial for residential but there is the threat that with more people crime will rise would be nice to have high quality housing to attract professionals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mix of uses is proposed to create a sustainable community including different housing types and tenures. Increased activity will reduce crime through increased surveillance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2BH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Got to be well designed. Not really as there is already a lot of housing in the area ie. flats.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD proposes a mixture of houses and flats and, in line with adopted planning policy, an appropriate mix of unit sizes will also be sought.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I object to the proposals to the erection of a building on the Riverside Gateway site. The gardens are already small enough and any building on the site will substantially reduce its value. It may also inhibit my view across the area from my house.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> <li>The planning system cannot protect private views but the Council's planning policies protect residential amenity and the Council will not permit development which has an unacceptable impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2BA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anything that improves how it looks and safety has to be good.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1EX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should leave block off of gardens, or one level/stores.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>

Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that there will not be enough education provision. Will burden existing schools even further than they are now. NOTE: Did not want to respond to remaining questions. Just wanted to comment on schools growth.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where appropriate the Council will seek financial contributions to education provision to compensate for increased demand via planning obligations with developers where appropriate. The SPD makes reference to these and other planning obligations requirements in para</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green space to extend to pier. - More accessible to Morrisons. - Education is key.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed development is designed to enhance open spaces at the site and improve local accessibility; where appropriate the Council will seek financial contributions to education provision to compensate for increased demand via planning obligations with developers where appropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not happy that a building will be put on the flagpole site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is already too much high density housing in Erith/Thamesmead and Slade Green. This causes antisocial behaviour and does not help sustainable communities. Children need either gardens or green spaces and Erith is lacking both. If there is to be more high rise housing it should be south of borough that should be looked at eg. Sidcup, Blackfen, Welling etc. Due to concerns mentioned above, a decision has already been made to demolish Lamer Road Tower</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EWG is an identified regeneration area that will help seek to address some of the identified needs and concerns in the town. The SPD seeks to provide an appropriate strategic framework to ensure that comprehensive proposals come forward in a phased manner.</li> <li>High quality design solutions are sought which address issues of anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>The SPD seeks to secure appropriate and improved green space provision and does not seek the demolition of the tower blocks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> <li>Remove references to</li> </ul>

	Blocks because of problems mentioned above.	Reference to potential demolition is proposed to be removed to clarify this point.	demolition of tower blocks at paras 7.2, 7.6 and 8.9
Resident SE28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wants to see more boutiques.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retail uses are proposed as part of the scheme.</li> <li>The detail of these cannot be prescribed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident ME17 1DD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mix of things to do is always better. But not too much stuff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. The SPD seeks an appropriate mix and density of provision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think adding a mixture of entertainment/landmarks/restaurants will help the community feel safer etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Because there will be more attractions for teenagers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcome.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7 5NT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think the mix of uses of land will be good because it will attract people.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA17 6DA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will provide a safe environment for the local area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will provide a safe environment for the local environment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA10 2JH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a safer environment for the public.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes because they offer different land uses and will provide entertainment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>People will feel safer and more people will go out to places.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will provide a safer environment for local residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2AB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The town centre is a bit quiet and that affects businesses. Should the proposed project get underway it will help community and the town</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

	centre as a whole.		
Resident DA8 1SB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are very vigorously against ANY building, either low rise or high rise on Riverside Gardens, along Erith High Street, and near to and surrounding Bosworth House and Carrack House. This will seriously compromise our privacy and safety. We have very little green area in Erith. PLEASE LEAVE IT ALONE. Also, can we please have traffic calming measures installed in Bexley Road, between the Post Office and the Town Hall. This road is a race track - especially in the evening.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public realm enhancements are proposed in the SPD to improve Bexley Road.</li> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> <li>The SPD seeks to improve the quality of Open Space in the area and will require the protection of residential amenity and safety.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nothing for children to do and there will be more.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mix of uses is proposed including new play space for children.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parts of that area look really run down and spoil the aesthetic view. Completely agree with only building low level developments. Pleased that consideration has been given to getting rid of the subways which are not pleasant to walk through on your own. If gardens are to be developed, make sure maintenance plans are in place to keep them looking good all year round and not left to get overgrown and unsightly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> <li>The SPD seeks design for the the public which is easy to maintain to ensure sustainability although this will need to be specified more strongly in the SPD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add reference to ease of maintenance at para 4.4</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1LL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think the development of the gardens would be a good idea. With a children's playground, as there is definitely a need for one in that particular area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leave some trees and flowers so that families and elderly people can sit and enjoy. Too many people in this area already, nowhere for the children to play. Where will they go if</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EWG is an identified regeneration area that will help seek to address some of the identified needs and concerns in the town. The SPD seeks to provide an appropriate strategic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

	<p>more people come in? Suggest you contact local people for volunteers to keep gardens in order - would volunteer!</p>	<p>framework to ensure that comprehensive proposals come forward in a phased manner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhanced open spaces are proposed including improvements to Riverside Gardens and new play space for children.</li> </ul>	
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You should not have to build more flats and you should really build something for the kids to play on like a park next to the pub something for kids to play on.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhanced open spaces are proposed including improvements to Riverside Gardens and new play space for children; the SPD proposes a mixture of houses and flats and an appropriate mix of unit sizes will also be sought.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA18 4DG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For private housing but only more shops once you have filled the rest of the shops. College move good idea.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed; the SPD allows for flexibility of land uses whilst still meeting the overall objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No more houses needed. Enough empty shops - don't need any more.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a strategic need for housing in London including within Bexley, which the Council is required to deliver; the SPD allows for flexibility of land uses whilst still meeting the overall objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3RJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Erith needs redevelopment drastically.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2LH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The underpath-walkway from station is a great idea.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As it will provide a safe environment for local residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2AL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like gardens not to change, swimming pool area to be made into swings and slides for young children.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Children's play space is proposed as part of the development.</li> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and</li> </ul>

			principles of the SPD
Resident DA16 1BL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many more uses will attract more people to the area therefore increasing activity and social behaviour along with more jobs and sense of community. I think this should be encouraged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3DQ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overloaded, why have college here, put in Bexleyheath.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The college has expressed a strong interest in moving to EWG to enable it to better meet demand in the area and the use is considered an appropriate use for the site and will help create a mixed-use sustainable community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As more people would want to visit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA1 4DF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With lots of uses there are lots of things to do.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3DY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not too many houses/flats as it will feel overcrowded.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the density of the scheme has been reduced compared to previous proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Because it might give youths more to do than hanging around.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1QW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feels there are not enough services to support residential development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mix of uses is proposed to create a sustainable community and, where appropriate, contribution to infrastructure will be sought through planning obligations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not fun.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SE28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think it will benefit the community for youths.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, because if it's all the same thing it will get congested.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3AW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do not agree with building on the Riverside Gardens at all. It is a small plot of land but</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at</li> </ul>

	widely used by families.	this stage and the document should better reflect this.	paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are already unused units in Erith - so how do you think you will get people to use the new areas?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a strategic need for housing in London including within Bexley which the Council is required to deliver.</li> <li>New housing will cater for identified need within high quality, mixed use development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3DG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We have enough development in Erith, green space is needed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development will regenerate the area and provide new homes as well as enhanced green spaces for existing and new residents in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will attract a wider range of age groups.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2DA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anything to improve the town. River should be used more.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> <li>Proposals seek to improve access to the river.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By putting different shops and activities it will attract more age groups to the town centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think that a land that is beneficial would be one that has security for open space. Also, different uses of a land would help the wider population.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1TX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally. Building heights should not block views of sea. Gardens should not be ruined. Gardens should not cater for anti-social behaviour but cater for the needs of a more affluent group of people. Should not build on flagpole site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> <li>The SPD seeks to create and preserve views of river.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on</li> </ul>

			the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD
Resident DA1 4JR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think that it would be better to have more vegetation and green areas and add more parks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development will regenerate the area and provide enhanced green spaces for existing and new residents in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7 4TX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With an open space, leisure and socialising will be easier and community will have an outlet.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>But would like to have commercial areas kept separate from residential.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mixed use development is recognised as being beneficial in order to help create sustainable communities and more efficient use of urban land. The types of commercial uses proposed are unlikely to cause major disturbance to residential areas in a town centre context and the Council will be able to scrutinise design details at planning application stage to ensure that residential amenity is appropriately protected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3DE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will attract more people to Erith and the river.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA15 8AD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No plans to increase health and welfare services. Not sure if increasing numbers of residents will draw retail to area. Will local air quality be considered? A lot of lorries (foreign as well as UK) polluting atmosphere at roundabout. Traffic congestion. No additional parking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contributions to social infrastructure will be made through planning obligations where relevant in line with the Council's policy requirements; air quality is and will continue to be considered as part of the planning and detailed application process. Traffic congestion and parking will be considered in detail as part of individual proposals but the SPD is considered to provide an appropriate framework.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2NT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will attract more people to Erith and the river.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA7 6LH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By having a mix of uses, you can attract a range of people from young to old and you also can bring people to the area. They should put in restaurants or cafe in the park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I can see the benefit of opening up the river area more, and we (Forge) are just in the process of encouraging groups to go back into that area now that the police and Ward Security have kept out and removed the undesirables. Apart from the Summer Festival, for a lot of people without gardens, they can go there, picnic, sunbathe and a variety of other activities. I don't believe anything over 2 storeys (inc ground) should be built as it will spoil one of the only really nice, fulfilling views left. If anything should be built, a kids' play facility (sail ponds, rope ladders, slides etc - modest entrance fee) is needed - not an eyesore plonked in Riverside Gardens.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> <li>Play facilities are proposed within the SPD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You can attract a range of people and this will generate a busy and good community. However, I feel that sometimes you can just have retail shops and boring open spaces, so I feel that an ice-rink, skate park - things that would bring interest for teenagers. Also a graffiti wall.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed; there is flexibility in terms of the non-residential uses proposed. However at this stage no space has been specifically identified for a new ice or skate park or graffiti wall within the EWG site.</li> <li>The detailed design of open spaces will be the subject of future work.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7 6NZ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Because there is something for everyone. We would enjoy things like: - Ice rink; - Skate Park; - Graffiti Wall.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed; there is flexibility in terms of the non-residential uses proposed. However at this stage no space has been specifically identified for a new ice or skate park or graffiti wall within the EWG site.</li> <li>The detailed design of open spaces will be the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

		subject of future work.	
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I perceive realistically the motive for the build is to make money, and other people living in a new block will only add crime - drugs, theft, public order, littering, fraud and a nuisance to a place in Erith which is now very calm, and enjoyable to live in, plus the view for which where I live cost more will be taken away.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The primary objective is to deliver lasting regeneration for the area and provide new, well designed mix of housing units.</li> <li>The planning system does not protect existing views but seeks to safeguard residential amenity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7 5PE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Because that means there is something for everybody. Although they may need something for teenagers like an ice-rink or skate park or graffiti wall.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed; there is flexibility in terms of the non-residential uses proposed. However at this stage no space has been specifically identified for a new ice or skate park or graffiti wall within the EWG site. The detailed design of Open Space will be the subject of future work.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land to be used was a gift from William Cory to Erith we have had enough flats built in this area and do not need more.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a strategic need for housing in London including within Bexley which the Council is required to deliver.</li> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1TB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do agree, however after living in Erith and experiencing vandalism caused by people renting as oppose to buying, I would like to see the buildings sold on the general market as opposed to housing associations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A combination of affordable and market housing will be provided which is a requirement of national, regional and local planning policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I agree that the area needs to be regenerated but the "vision" will not benefit the residents only those that will make money from such plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional housing is required in Bexley to meet need and demand; the Council is obliged to plan for the future as well as in the interests of existing residents; the proposed development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

		has the potential to deliver lasting regeneration in the area.	
Resident DA8 1AH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not necessarily.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No response.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3BL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We do not need any more residential units in this area. The schools do not have the capacity to accept any more children. Already they are having to reopen a school that was closed and increase form entries at several schools just to enable existing children in the area to be able to go to school.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a strategic need for housing in London including within Bexley which the Council is required to deliver; Contributions to social infrastructure including education will be made where appropriate through planning obligations in line with the Council's policy requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>

<b>Questionnaire Comments</b>			
<b>Question 2 – Previous masterplans produced by developers showed a large number of residential units including high rise buildings, do you think eh reduced units and suggested heights in the draft UDP are an improvement on this?</b>			
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment Submitted</b>	<b>Proposed Response</b>	<b>Proposed Change</b>
Resident DA18 4DY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintenance of the high rise is always on the high side if you take into consideration the long time effect.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA12 3AS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mixed - I am not convinced as dependent on cost, high rise will generate more sales, but it is for local people or people from outside.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council would not control who the market housing is occupied by; the social housing would be allocated in line with the Council's housing policies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trying to fit too many residential properties in such a small area, ie. tower blocks, will make this area become too much like a Council Estate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The intention is to create a sustainable, mixed community to include affordable and market housing in relatively low rise blocks and traditional houses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Take full advantage of location.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EWG is an identified regeneration area that will help seek to address some of the identified needs and concerns in the town. The SPD seeks to provide an appropriate strategic framework to ensure that comprehensive proposals come forward in a phased manner.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some people would like to see tall buildings so that they can be attracted to the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted; but it is considered that lower rise development to that which was previously proposed is more viable and will better meet demand, although the SPD does not prohibit taller buildings if they are appropriately designed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SW1W 9ST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They are less over powering.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think there is an opportunity to change the image of Erith, although 5 storey buildings will improve this 6, 7, 8 storeys will create a new look and open up possibilities for more high rise structures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted; but it is considered that lower rise development to that which was previously proposed is more viable and better meets demand although the SPD does not prohibit taller buildings where they are appropriately designed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident E1 2OY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Erith is already a residential area so it was a good idea to reduce the units.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SE2 9JL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think it is not a bad idea to have the building in the same height so that the top of the building at the back will also have rear views.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SL6 8DU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High rise buildings are obviously good because I think this is still best to provide space than covering a large space area with kind of Victorian residential.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted; but it is considered that lower rise development to that which was previously proposed is more viable and will better meet demand although the SPD does not prohibit taller buildings where they are appropriately designed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SE1 3EA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They could be much higher high rise buildings allowed. More than 3 storeys. High rise buildings will attract more people to Erith (it's beneficial).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted; but it is considered that lower rise development to that which was previously proposed is more viable and will better meet demand although the SPD does not prohibit taller buildings where they are appropriately designed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possibly one high rise - landmark building could act as a beacon for Erith, to outsiders as a form of recognition.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted; but it is considered that lower rise development to that which was previously proposed is more viable and will better meet demand although the SPD does not prohibit taller buildings where they are appropriately designed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SE1 7EH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will prevent complications arising in the future. It helps prevent obstructions of the neighbours views and make it friendly to the locals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not to wish to block view.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning does not protect individual views although general views of the River from the wider area are sought to be protected and enhanced.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You can fit more people and use space on a high rise.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted; but it is considered that lower rise development to that which was previously proposed is more viable and will better meet demand although the SPD does not prohibit taller buildings where they are appropriately designed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident E21 5JS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For real.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gives a better planning and delivery outcome.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident BR8 7UA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Taller buildings will only make the area feel like Central London e.g. Peckham/Brixton.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. but it is considered that lower rise development to that which was previously proposed is more viable and will better meet demand although the SPD does not prohibit taller buildings where they are appropriately designed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3DF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is an improvement - but certainly a long way from the best/ideal. Building heights should be kept at the same level of the existing low levels (2/3 storey). Any higher restricts the views of the river to the residents of Bexley Road and nearby.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed. The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SE2 9TJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visually more acceptable. Erith and district are already densely populated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed. The proposed development will help to regenerate the area and the SPD sets out a framework for an appropriate form of development which will enhance the area and safeguard the amenity of existing residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3PT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>But prefer 3 storey height only.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed; The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context. Clarity is, however, considered to be required on the degree of flexibility with regard to heights.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove references to demolition of tower blocks at paras 7.2, 7.6 and 8.9</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2QE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do prefer the reduced units, but have a concern that it will reduce the facilities and thus may not be attractive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A range of land uses is still proposed within the framework.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA8 3SH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I was quite concerned about the high number of residential units in the last plan. This plan is a great improvement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2PN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, the reduced units would be a good improvement. Before now, I didn't know that the garden existed because the high rise residential units obscured my view. I think the present points/plans highlighted in this framework are a good start.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1TB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested heights are okay provided there's enough space for families to spend quality time with their kids e.g. play area, parks etc. Children love their playing space.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Enhanced Open Spaces and play facilities are proposed within the SPD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3AP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am concerned that everybody will be in everyone's face. I think it will also make it an enclosed area as well. We only have to look at Thamesmead, West Street and Manor Road as lessons to be learned from over builds. Nowhere in the document does it refer to disabled access to any buildings. I do hope that rules and regulations of new builds will take into account the Accessible Housing Register Guidelines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development reflects current best practice in urban design through the use of perimeter blocks with clearly defined spaces and streets; new buildings would need to ensure that they are accessible to people with disabilities - this would be controlled at detailed design stage and will need to be in accordance with adopted planning policy and building regulations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA17 5UJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need houses not flats.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To meet the identified need, a mix of houses and flats are proposed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good for our High Street.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7 6QT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An improvement on previous designs but still too high.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3AS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>So long as you keep large area for community gardens.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed; the gardens are to be retained and also new spaces are to be created.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA7 6QT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Again, I am unsure that once the genie is out of the bottle more will follow. I do not think a cafe is viable as there are many unused units in the town centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I also agree that too many new homes would not be a good idea now also I do not agree too much with tall buildings on the green river front.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> <li>There is an identified need for new homes which must be met.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3AW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes don't mind more high rise buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context although the SPD does not prohibit taller buildings it is appropriately designed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1RB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better to keep buildings at a minimum height and not to create a concrete jungle.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context although the SPD does not prohibit taller buildings it is appropriately designed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5/7 storey blocks are still too high and proportion of houses to flats is wrong. We have and need families to live here, not commute as they normally do not contribute to local communities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development is considered to respect surrounding context although clarity is required regarding the degree of flexibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend para 7.9 to remove reference to seven story elements</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They should be more high to reduce urban sprawl (using less land).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development is considered to respect surrounding context although clarity is required regarding the degree of flexibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend para 7.9 to remove reference to seven story elements</li> </ul>

Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do not like to see more than 5 storeys of flats being built.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context although clarity is required regarding the degree of flexibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend para 7.9 to remove reference to seven story elements</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better than taller buildings. Fire hazard an issue.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed; fire safety is not an issue for consideration within the SPD and would be dealt with via building regulations / at detailed stage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1QR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Again house would be beneficial to a lot of homeless people. Over-crowding an area is not really economical. It just creates chaos and ASBO. Bexley needs to think about its community. How will the community benefit? What are the attractions/distractions? Is Bexley spending unnecessary tax money?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is demand for housing in Bexley and the Council is obliged to plan for the future; the development will be designed to be a safe and secure area; the development will be predominantly funded by developers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too many high rise buildings on this end of the borough (northern).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current proposal is for lower rise development than previous proposals. The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please, no more high rise buildings - we don't want a concrete jungle!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current proposal is for lower rise development than previous proposals. The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context.</li> <li>Clarity will however be provided on degree of flexibility regarding heights.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend para 7.9 to remove reference to seven story elements</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As outlined so far, yes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>But could build heights reducing to maximum 7 storeys due to fire hazards etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fire hazards are a matter for building control at detailed design stage.</li> </ul>	
Resident DA8 1SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low rise units only should be built and definitely the amount of dwellings reduced. The area is highly populated already.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is an identified need for additional dwellings in the area.</li> <li>Building heights selected are considered to be a sustainable form of development and supported by current urban design and best practice.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA17 6JD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better than high rises.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A genuine High Street will be a great enhancement to the town centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(Not sure) - Height not an issue, however, if it is done right.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted/no response.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think houses are the most popular option and build sustainable communities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed; a mix of houses and flats are proposed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident ME17 1DD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tall buildings make things look dark and ugly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale parameters of future development have been carefully analysed to respect surrounding context although clarity is required regarding the degree of flexibility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend para 7.9 to remove reference to seven story elements</li> </ul>
Resident DA17 6DA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes. I feel that high rise blocks won't benefit people.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I feel high rise buildings won't benefit people, and get more illegal immigrants.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted/no response.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA10 2JH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High rised blocks won't benefit people.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context.</li> <li>lower scale than previous development proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They will benefit people and promote areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I feel that high rise blocks will not benefit people and will be an eyesore.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any residential buildings on the river front gardens are not acceptable or traffic roadways through our estate also 5 storey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2,</li> </ul>

	flats next to the two blocks are unacceptable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new development would need to be designed to integrate well with the existing blocks.</li> </ul>	7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD
Resident DA8 1SB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>But please do not surround us with any more buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted/no response.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why not houses instead of flats?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mix of houses and flats are proposed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large high rise buildings should be a thing of the past and are a blot on the landscape.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1LL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would bring people to the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No new flats in this particular area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EWG is an identified regeneration area that will help seek to address some of the identified needs and concerns in the town. The SPD seeks to provide an appropriate strategic framework to ensure that comprehensive proposals come forward in a phased manner.</li> <li>There is demand for housing in Bexley, and in Erith, and the Council is obliged to plan for the future.</li> <li>A mix of housing and flats is proposed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA18 4DG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low rise is better than towers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No more than three storeys.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context and meets the requisite housing need although clarity is required with regard to degree of flexibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend para 7.9 to remove reference to seven story elements</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3RJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shouldn't have anything 8 floors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I feel that high rise blocks will not benefit people, and will be an eye-sore.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context and meets the requisite housing need although clarity is required with regard to degree of flexibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA1 4SW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tall buildings will give an enclosed feeling to the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context and meets the requisite housing need although clarity is required with regard to degree of flexibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA16 1BL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area will be less enclosed and be more open for a more free effect and open space.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3DQ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Still think it's too dense.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EWG is an identified regeneration area that will help seek to address some of the identified needs and concerns in the town. The SPD seeks to provide an appropriate strategic framework to ensure that comprehensive proposals come forward in a phased manner.</li> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context and meets the requisite housing need although clarity is required regarding degree of flexibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend para 7.9 to remove reference to seven story elements</li> </ul>
Resident DA7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As it won't be as built up area and would make the area more attractive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA1 4DF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If we have smaller buildings or any other uses we can build more things.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Because it may make Erith more attractive looking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It makes the town look nicer.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1QW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Don't need to be any higher.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Just because people don't like it don't mean you have to do it, we are running out of space, do what you need to do.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>However, I do not like high rise except for old style - Victorian buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context and meets the requisite housing need although clarity is required regarding degree of flexibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend para 7.9 to remove reference to seven story elements</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I like taller buildings. I think they look better. They give a skyline.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted; The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context and meets the requisite housing need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Definitely lower rise buildings are needed as Erith has far too many high rise as it is.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The height matters because who around wants a 22 storey flat next to a small house etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2DA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Don't want them high - like Lerner Road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Because the density is better.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too many high rise buildings destroy an area leading to less space for nature.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context and meets the requisite housing need although clarity is required regarding degree of flexibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend para 7.9 to remove reference to seven story elements .</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1TX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An improvement from the previous plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA1 4JR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restricting building height is a better idea makes Erith more of countryside.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7 4TX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tall buildings aren't good to look at and can pull an area down and look to build up or industrial with large grey buildings the area looks ugly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context and meets the requisite housing need although clarity is required regarding degree of flexibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend para 7.9 to remove reference to seven story elements .</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3DE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The big tower blocks are ugly and are hard to keep clean and attractive and the towers obstruct views to the river.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context and meets the requisite housing need although clarity is required regarding degree of flexibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend para 7.9 to remove reference to seven story elements .</li> </ul>
Resident DA15 8AD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Previous plans not seen. Buildings ought to be kept below 3-4 storeys as family numbers will exceed a sustainable level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context and meets the requisite housing need although clarity is required regarding degree of flexibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend para 7.9 to remove reference to seven story elements</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2NT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High rise buildings are not attractive and are difficult to keep clean. They can obstruct views to the river.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context and meets the requisite housing need although clarity is required regarding degree of flexibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend para 7.9 to remove reference to seven story elements .</li> </ul>

Resident DA7 6NZ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The big ones aren't nice to look at and they suggest anti-social behaviour.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lower is better, but previous plans to make the park better should be concentrated on, not via adding more blocks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We do not require more of any building to take place we need some space otherwise it will be very heavily built up with no green space available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a need for the Council to deliver additional housing within Bexley and the proposal is for a comprehensive regeneration of the area which includes new development as well as enhancements to the gardens.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1TB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I currently have a view over the river, which is why I purchased the flat and is also a good selling point, so I would agree with anything that doesn't obstruct my view.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning does not protect individual views.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I agree that NO building high-rise or otherwise should be built on the riverfront area. It will set a precedent and there will be no stopping future further development as I do not believe that a green recreational area is any developer\councils high priority. I purchased my property with a River view not to be ruined and devalued by having a building overlooking me and blocking any river view I had, If the developers insist on building on the land myself and other residents of my block</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> <li>Impact of any development proposal on neighbouring properties will be considered as part of planning process.</li> <li>Planning does not protect individual views.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>

	will get legal advice and seek compensation as we all believe such development will drastically effect the value of our properties.		
Resident DA8 3BL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As stated in question 2, there are already too many families in Erith. Just reducing the heights makes no difference. Also, having closed Queen Mary's, the Maternity units in the other hospitals cannot cope as it is.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contributions to social infrastructure will be sought where appropriate via planning obligations with developers in line with the Council's policies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
<b>Questionnaire Comments</b>			
<b>Question 3 – Do you think development across the Erith Western Gateway should be used as an opportunity to create and improve open spaces and places of interest?</b>			
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment Submitted</b>	<b>Proposed Response</b>	<b>Proposed Change</b>
Resident DA18 4DY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This will attract tourists from London using water transportation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA12 3AS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The open spaces are good but will the local people use it? Not sure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is considered that high quality well designed spaces are likely to be well used</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This should happen in most areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident N18 2XL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This will improve the conurbations in the area, and people will feel comfortable to move and walk around the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Later on in the years the area will be busy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SW1W 9ST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open spaces provide opportunity for recreation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small parts of greenery around the new developments. Some big enough for sports etc. just so that area does not become too concrete.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD welcomes the provision of a variety of open spaces to create an appropriate environment and provide required facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident E1 2OY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open spaces and places of interest will make sure that the area is more inviting that is what is needed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident SE2 9JL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I don't think you need to think it will take away anything from Bexley Town Centre because the college will be then a whole new generation that will not use to Bexley will be using the Erith Town Centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident RM20 4AY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The River Thames along the area will be a key attraction for residents and people living around the area to visit when the weather is good. Say during summer not just for the view and walk around and along the river.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SL6 8DU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This kind of development is a good idea simply because people are always interested in areas with open spaces and around rivers and lakes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SE1 7EH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More open spaces creates a relaxing realm.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More business and amenities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident BR8 7UA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is still an unsafe area, more open ground will only make meeting points for anti-social behaviour.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is considered that the perimeter block layout with clearly defined streets and spaces is likely to be secure form of urban development; development would be designed in line with Secured by Design principles. Buildings will be designed to maximise self surveillance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA6 7LU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are not many places of interest in Erith so it could use some.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA8 3DF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current proposals in the draft SPD do not address Q3. Re: Figure 12.1 - Riverside Gardens is being reduced in size. 2. Play Square - how small this is - currently there is open space in this vicinity - so it is not new. 3. Station Square - can hardly be classed as open space if cars are allowed in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The play square will be well designed and will be more functional than the current spaces. Station Square is intended to be a flexible open space which can accommodate car parking but also other functions.</li> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident SE2 9TJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is very little public open space in the area and emphasis should be placed on maintaining the serenity of what there is. Any development should be set well back the other side of the road; the gardens should not become the private park of these flats excluding the general public.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD seeks to ensure high quality public open space is delivered in parallel with new buildings as set out in the SPD; there are no plans to privatise Riverside Gardens</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3SH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Erith has a great history - much more so than Bexleyheath or Welling and I think this should be built okay.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3AP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>But not to take parts of the open spaces away.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>

Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to improve gardens rather than buildings. No flats.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD seeks to ensure high quality public open space is delivered in parallel with new buildings as set out in the SPD; a mix of houses and flats are proposed for the area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7 6QT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Definitely create and improve open spaces etc and exploit river views. Also means that river front and foreshore must be maintained and kept clean and tidy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The gardens should be designed so as to aid effective and affordable maintenance in the long term. This could be made clearer in the document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend para 4.4 to refer to maintenance issues.</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3AS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>So long as people know what is going on and are duly informed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further consultations in relation to detailed development proposals will be undertaken as part of the planning application process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7 6QT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If it is what the people who currently live, work and play in the area require.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council is obliged to plan for the future as well as for existing residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3AW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need more family friendly facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mix of uses and enhanced open spaces are proposed in a safe and accessible environment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1RB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Definitely, so much more community spirit would be created. Perhaps, a weekend market could be included in the design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A range of Open Spaces are proposed within the SPD which would be suitable for events.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We need wider views to see the river and shipping as the only riverside available in the borough and between Greenwich and Gravesend (most people cannot manage the walks across the marshes).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD seeks to enhance views of the river and access to it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>But no building on Riverside Gardens</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>

Resident DA8 1QR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Young people in Bexley do not really have a place to call their own. They need more activities areas: such as ice cream cafes, nightclubs, something that would make the riverside attractive and appealing to them. They need somewhere they can have fun and relax and meet other people.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mix of uses and enhanced open spaces are proposed including improvements to Riverside Gardens</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA18 4DY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This will attract tourists from London using water transportation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many of the properties are high rise flats with no gardens so the riverside gardens are the only place for those facilities to go.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mix of houses and mid-rise flats are proposed in conjunction with open space improvements; sufficient open space and private amenity space will need to be provided in line with planning policy requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2HR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As long as it benefits all the community (older generation) as well as young.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA17 6JD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be used for people.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA17 6DA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I would however like to keep riverside gardens the way it is.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>

Resident DA8 2BH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Play space. - Sensory gardens. - More spaces for children. - Allotments would be beneficial.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD proposes a series of open spaces to meet the needs of residents and visitors; this includes enhancements to Riverside Gardens and new play space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I hope that the practice of incorporating sculptures can be extended</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunities for public art will be considered as part of any detailed proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Good idea, but it all needs to work together. - Needs sign boards, more security. - Gardens as a place people want to visit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose of the SPD is to ensure a coordinated approach to the regeneration of the area; development would be designed in line with Secured by Design principles.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is not enough green space.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD proposes a series of open spaces to meet the needs of residents and visitors; this includes enhancements to Riverside Gardens and new play space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident ME17 1DD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are not enough places to go</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mix of uses are proposed in conjunction with open space improvements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A variety of interests across the age groups is essential to balance and maintain community spirit and involvement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mix of uses are proposed in conjunction with open space improvements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA17 6DA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It's a small place so you can't really build on it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area is considered to be in need of regeneration and has the potential to deliver new housing, open space improvements and other uses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It's a small place so you can't really build on it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EWG is an identified regeneration area that will help seek to address some of the identified needs and concerns in the town. The SPD seeks to provide an appropriate strategic framework to ensure that comprehensive proposals come forward in a phased manner.</li> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context and meets the requisite needs including housing and open space improvements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA10 2JH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It's a small place so you can't really build on it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EWG is an identified regeneration area that will help seek to address some of the identified needs and concerns in the town. The SPD seeks to provide an appropriate strategic framework to ensure that comprehensive proposals come forward in a phased manner.</li> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context and meets the requisite needs including housing and open space improvements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Because there are less entertainment points.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More people will want to visit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add a little play area; a nice sea view when you are eating your lunch.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A play area is proposed; Open Spaces will include appropriate seating.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WITHOUT BUILDINGS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The regeneration of the area is not possible without redevelopment to address local housing need and additional/improved services and facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are so congested now that will bring more traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development will include improvements to local transport infrastructure where necessary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA8 2AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We need to create more community spaces and family friendly places. There are many elderly in Erith who also need to be given consideration as they get a very poor deal generally. We need to create areas that people will use, take ownership of and work together to prevent vandalism etc. We need more community spirit. Real consideration must be given to the play spaces to make sure they work well and are not just the same old, same old, but allow for creativity, imagination and co-operation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD proposes a series of open spaces to meet the needs of residents and visitors; this includes enhancements to Riverside Gardens and new play space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA18 4DG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle agree with it but could be start of development of whole gardens.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2LH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Erith has improved but it could get better.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>But as it is a small space things can't be excessively built.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The density and scale of the scheme is less than previously proposed and considered appropriate for the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA1 4SW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There aren't any good open spaces at current. Creating more open spaces will encourage people to view an area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA16 1BL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>People will go there more and be more interesting and safe.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will be an improvement as more people would visit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA1 4DF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If we can improve these places we may get more people to go there.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Erith is not too pleasant safety wise. Will play a big part in community cohesion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsure about the development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted/no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes because it would be a great view and lovely for days out for a family etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2DA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Erith is a nice place - needs improving. People don't have gardens.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would be good for days out with family etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1TX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very careful planning is needed to achieve that need to balance needs of affluent population (working professionals) against anti-social/benefit culture/attitudes. CCTV monitoring should be a benefit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is intended to create a high quality mixed tenure community; development would be designed in line with Secured by Design principles.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3DE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open spaces.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted/no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2NT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open spaces</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted/no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7 6LH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They can add needed services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contributions to infrastructure would be sought where appropriate through planning obligation with developers in line with the Council's policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With restrictions. I would suggest an open meeting with Councillor O'Neill, to better put our case.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted/no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes - but not by plonking a tower block in it!!!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any</li> </ul>

			proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD
Resident DA8 1AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make more of the riverside so people can enjoy the river and use the area of shrubs and walkway and the river defences should still be maintain in case of floods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both of these issues are covered in the SPD; it is intended to enhance Riverside Gardens and improve/redesign flood defences if possible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1TB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the riverside gardens were more attractive and there was more things going on, it would bring people here instead of drinkers in the gardens who you then feel intimidated by. It would require good policing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development would be designed in line with Secured by Design principles / in consultation with the Crime Prevention Design officer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NOT at the cost of de-valuing mine and other existing properties in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The effect on property values is not a material planning consideration; however the development would enhance the attractiveness of the area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loaded question. We need open spaces in Erith. The ONLY one we have is Riverfront, and this should not be an opportunity to take part of this area to fund improvements!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3BL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Riverside Gardens is the only area you can view the Thames. We should be making the most of it, including riverboat trips. Also, further east, there could be a Country Park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development includes plans to improve Riverside Gardens</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

<p>Resident DA8 2BA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area should not be turned into a housing estate. The rest of the town needs full access to green spaces like the waterfront area, without feeling they are imposing on a neighbourhood.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EWG is an identified regeneration area that will help seek to address some of the identified needs and concerns in the town. The SPD seeks to provide an appropriate strategic framework to ensure that comprehensive proposals come forward in a phased manner.</li> <li>The scale parameters of future development has been carefully analysed so that it respects the surrounding context and meets the requisite needs including housing and open space improvements. The area would comprise a variety of building types, land uses and high quality open spaces; the Riverside Gardens would be improved and maintained for public use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
-----------------------------	---	---	---

<b>Questionnaire Comments</b>			
<b>Question 4 – Do you agree with the approach taken to transport and access which seeks to largely preserve the existing road network whilst also improving and increasing links between the station, the river and the town?</b>			
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment Submitted</b>	<b>Proposed Response</b>	<b>Proposed Change</b>
Resident DA12 3AS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transport works well.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will cause too much disruption, not only where the site is completed, also whilst on-going works.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The approach is to preserve the existing network as far as possible; the impact of construction works will be controlled through a Construction Methodology Statement; the development would occur in phases to minimise disruption</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not so keen on the one way system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two way working will be pursued where viable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have bright lights and cameras at night, for people to feel comfortable walking in the night.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scheme would be designed to ensure safe places were created.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SW1W 9ST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was no information about transport other than trains. Also what will happen with parking?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on bus routes and parking areas is provided in the SPD; it is not currently intended to alter routes. The approach to parking is also stated in the SPD with detailed proposals coming forward on part of proposed schemes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport is dire.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident E1 2OY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport links are very important so I absolutely agree.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident RM20 4AY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As people don't really feel safe walking through tunnels it will be of great importance to close the tunnel from the train station to the development area by creating an over pass instead.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An improved pedestrian link to the station is proposed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident SL6 8DU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do agree to the road connections network within the area together with the one way system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SE1 7EH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing it will be costly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted; developers will need to contribute to the costs of infrastructure improvements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Erith has a lot of transport places but not well connected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted – SPD seeks to improve interconnections locally.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident BR8 7UA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good access to the river is required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved access to the river is proposed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SE20 8JS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft should consider play area for children/parking space.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The issues are considered in the SPD; parking areas and play space are proposed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3DF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 35% is affordable, 65% will be sold or rented at market prices, suggesting people will need to work in London to afford. No mention of improving train provision - trains are currently overcrowding, expensive, and relatively slow - why are there no fast trains from Erith? Buses for schools from Erith are currently overcrowded, if the population of Erith is to increase these services need to be substantially improved. Car parking for residents has been glossed over - is there going to be an attempt to limit number of cars per dwelling?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where appropriate contributions to transportation will be sought via planning obligations with developers; adequate car parking spaces for new dwellings will be sought in accordance with adopted planning policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SE2 9TJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In general the existing network is adequate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1GL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think Erith Station should have an access route than the "up" platform</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A contribution to the provision of disabled access to the London bound platform is referenced in the SPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1GL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think Erith Station should have an access route than the "up" platform</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A contribution to the provision of disabled access to the London bound platform is referenced in the SPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA8 2PN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes because I am a very old-fashioned individual and would still love the traditional locations of the station and road networks to be preserved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3AP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The problem is you can increase access but if you can't use the station then that seems a sad situation to me. There is at present no access to the London platform at Erith. If new builds are made under the accessible housing guidelines property of new builds should be accessible to elderly disabled and families. If we ask people at these areas to move into the Erith area then all forms of transport should be in place.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A contribution to the provision of disabled access to the London bound platform; new housing development will need to be designed to meet the needs of all sections of society including disabled residents in line with policy. However, the SPD does not make explicit the policy requirement for 10% of new homes to be accessible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add reference to London Plan requirements at para 9.2.</li> </ul>
Resident DA7 6QT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good, clear signage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signage would be considered at detailed planning stage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3AS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep as it is</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Erith has been identified as requiring regeneration to address significant issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1P4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus route needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing bus routes are accessible but will be reviewed as part of detailed proposals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7 6QT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• River transport would be an asset with the 2012 Olympics such a short distance from Erith as the crow flies. We could be improving transport links to ensure that hotels etc in Bexley are filled during that time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SPD seeks to secure long term enhanced accessibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1RB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The flow of traffic needs to be improved to alleviate congestion at Bronze Age Way, maybe the river could be put to better use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support welcomed; the impact of a development on Bronze Age Way would be considered at detailed planning stage and appropriate mitigation identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA8 1QR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There really is no access to the river. Many residents do not even know about the riverside. I have spoken to so many people living around that area. The riverside is practically hidden. We need to make it accessible to everyone by having more exits and advertising attractions such as boats, activities that will take place, not just plain water.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved access to the river through enhancing Riverside Gardens is a key objective of the SPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Take away roundabout (fish) and replace with traffic lights. Traffic lights at Queens Road. Drivers feel they should not be requested to stop.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes such as this would require detailed testing and are beyond the current scope of the SPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to see detailed plans of road layouts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed plans would be provided at detailed planning stages</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New road layout for Erith</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD seeks that development can be achieved whilst preserving the broad layout of roads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creating more roads may give access to more crimes and escape from crime scenes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scheme is designed to be safe and secure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2HR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I feel that we still have many subways and 'unsafe' areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scheme is designed to be safe and secure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA17 6JD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As long as buses still come around.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing bus routes are accessible but will be reviewed as part of detailed proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Parking should be an issue - especially with Bexley College coming in. - And existing residents and visitors. - Bi-road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Levels of parking for new residents and other uses will be assessed to ensure adequate provision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(Unsure) - Bends in connections; try to make straighter to enhance views to river. - Safety and footpaths; isolation in certain parts might still be an issue. - Especially concerned around train station.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scheme has the potential to improve the relationship of the area with the river; the scheme is designed to be safe and secure.</li> <li>Further development of proposals will be undertaken at detailed design stage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With the extra population will the fast trains stop at Erith as they used to?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This issue is not within the scope of the SPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA7 5NT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maybe a footpath instead of a road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not clear where this is referring to; however the scheme includes a traditional streetscape to accommodate vehicles and pedestrians effectively</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA17 6DA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I feel that the transport is fine, but each bus stop could do with a shelter and those electric things.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed; contributions to transport are likely to be sought and particular requirements for the area will be prioritised</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transport is amazing but annoying when buses are late.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support/welcome; bus reliability and frequency is not within the scope of the SPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA10 2JH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transport is fine at the minute.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The buses are too rare and take a long time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bus reliability and frequency is not within the scope of the SPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transport is fine at the moment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport in this area is appropriate for all ages and the green area is easily accessible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As long as it is pedestrian only, with NO vehicular traffic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would not be realistic or desirable to ban all vehicular traffic; the scheme includes a traditional streetscape to accommodate vehicles and pedestrians effectively</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to see plans to take the lorries down a different route to the Marshes etc. Any improvements that benefit ALL the people can only be a good thing, however I think reducing parking etc will limit the amount of people who may come to the town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rerouting of lorry movements outside the development area is not within the scope of the SDP. Adequate parking is sought in the development framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA18 4DG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No tunnels into town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better links to river would be good.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved connection to the river is a key objective of the scheme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2LH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any improvements are good for this area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I feel transport in this area is appropriate for all ages and the green space is easily accessible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA1 4SW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As there is nowhere really to stop within the one-way system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scheme includes a traditional streetscape to accommodate vehicles and pedestrians effectively</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3DQ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why did we have Bronze Age Way built?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This issue is outside the remit of the SPD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As it will make it easier for people to get to those areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA1 4DF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If we keep all the old roads then people who have remembered them can still go down them.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3DY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transport links are not great - so could be improved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. The SPD seeks to improve links in the town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I use the public transport and think it is fine. I walk through the subway late at night and have had no problems.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes because adding more transport costs a lot of money.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2DA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As long as bus stops stay where they are or are made more central. Anything to improve station access.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1TX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Walnut Tree Road should revert back to two-way system. Worked better previously.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD does not rule this out however two way working would need to be considered in the context of potential impacts on the wider network.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creating more roads is not good as it could increase crime by providing increased escape routes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New streets do not necessarily lead to more crime; the scheme is designed to be safe and secure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3DE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport should allow people to go to the river.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>River transport is not within the scope of the SPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA15 8AD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not a realistic approach considering residential types. And transport needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The approach is considered to be realistic in the context of residential and transport needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA8 2NT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allows people to travel down to the river.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A great improvement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You should look to introduce the Catamaran service you have been talking about for years Increasing the number of residences will have a major impact on those of us who are already using an overcrowded train system - Does part of your plan consist of increasing the number of trains running in and out of London??n...I'm sure the answer to that is NO.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where appropriate contributions to transport will be sought from developers via planning obligations. Improvements to train frequency and river service are not within the Council's control, however the Council do lobby strongly for such improvements.</li> <li>Additional population will assist case for transport improvements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2JN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I would have liked to see the river used as a means of transport with the inclusion of a pier for passenger ferry use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where appropriate contributions to transport will be sought from developers via planning obligations .</li> <li>River services are not within the control of the Council, however the Council do lobby strongly for such services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3BL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quite frankly what Erith (or rather the London Borough of Bexley) needs is a connection to the London Underground network. Bexley is the only London Borough without the Tube. All towns in Bexley are poorly served with transport. I used to live in Acton where there are no fewer than 7 stations!! 4 Tube and 3 rail. Coming to Erith was something of a shock. Also, Bexley residents pay the same amount on their rates for TfL as residents in all the other boroughs that do have the Tube.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area is served by heavy rail and bus services; an extension to the underground is not within the scope of this SPD and is unlikely to be viable. However, the development of the area does offer the opportunity to improve existing public transport modes in the area.</li> <li>Strategic transport improvements are a recognised need and the Council is lobbying strongly for these.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2BA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I know this is unlikely, but knowing there will be a further increase in commuters, the council should put pressure on the rail companies to add extra services at peak time, or add an extra stop to the current fast Abbey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council will continue to lobby for improved rail services through Erith.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

	Wood to Dartford services.		
--	----------------------------	--	--

<b>Questionnaire Comments</b>			
<b>Question 5 – Do you have any other comments or suggestions relating to the draft Erith Western gateway SPD?</b>			
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment Submitted</b>	<b>Proposed Response</b>	<b>Proposed Change</b>
Resident DA18 4DY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I suggest the river transportation should be improved on to create a better alternative.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rail services are not under the control of the Council, however the Council will continue to lobby for the introduction of seven services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA12 3AS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spoken about concerns to presenter at college.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SE2 9JL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I will suggest another car park near the river garden.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD indicates a broad approach to parking which is considered adequate given the nature of the area. Detailed proposals will be developed at a later stage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SL6 8DU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I also agree with all the improvements that are going to be done.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support/welcome</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judging from what I see of Erith, regenerating the area will require an astronomical amount of capital - good luck.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident SE1 7EH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No its perfect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good intentions so far from Erith and Bexley Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think it is a good idea. The place looks dead there is need for some action.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident BR8 7UA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do not know enough about the area to comment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA8 3DF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Flood prevention, I believe, is very costly, and not always successful. By building on Riverside Gardens not only do you build on 'Green' land it is also on a flood plain. 3 reasons why it should not be built on - this is ignoring any emotional appeal. Will there be improved and more logical cycle routes in Erith? This SPD does not address any issues of employment, no proposals here to attract a substantial business (ie. hotel). No proposals for leisure, existing leisure centre cannot provide sufficient facilities for current population.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> <li>The SPD proposes a street scope which will encourage cycling whilst the opportunity will also be taken to rationalise cycle routes where possible.</li> <li>The SPD proposes a mixed land use including commercial uses and potential leisure uses.</li> <li>Flood defence improvements are sought where possible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident SE2 9TJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why build it at all? There is too much social housing in the north of the borough already; emphasis should be to create a more balanced community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mix of social and market housing is proposed to create a mixed and balanced community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2PN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think it's a great idea but the major hurdle would be to convince developers. I also wish to pray that in the future negotiations between the Council and the developers on this SPD project, the Council residents interests should [not] be compromised especially in terms of how much rents will be paid.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developers have been consulted as part of the SPD process and the development has been designed to be realistic and deliverable.</li> <li>The issue of rent is outside the control of the Council but is subject to regulation in the context of affordable housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3AP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do hope if new builds go ahead that the local Council keep some control over the buildings and not let the problems of Pier Road rear its head again. Any new builds should make sure the local Council keeps control of what goes on in them. I do think the College is a good idea which will be built on the area proposed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council will retain control of the broad use of buildings where possible through the planning system and relevant conditions on planning approvals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very good proposal for our High Street. We need to be proud and showcase our High Street at our west end.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bring work to Erith for the people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development is likely to generate new employment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7 6QT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any development must be tightly controlled and NO bulk sales of properties to absentee landlords</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sale of private accommodation is not a planning matter however the Council will seek undertakings regarding the sale strategy as part of the marketing of its sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1P4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need bus stop by Morrison's</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is outside the scope of the SPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7 6QT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No flats should be sold to absentee landlords. The area should be kept clean and beautiful flower beds and landscaping. The area should be entrusted to the people of Erith to ensure no further development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council will seek to ensure that new landscaping is maintained.</li> <li>The sale of private accommodation is not a planning matter however the Council will seek ? regarding the sale strategy and part of the marketing of its sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport, buses and trains appear to be very good at the moment, and as explained they will remain or improve further.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1RB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep plugging away with the plans! Ensure that any new buildings are environmentally friendly and to a high standard, so money is injected into the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> <li>The SPD seeks to ensure principles of sustainable design and construction are incorporated into proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes - take note of the people who live and work here and have the interest of the area at heart.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preserve all history of Erith in the Conservation Area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EWG is an identified regeneration area that will help seek to address some of the identified needs and concerns in the town. The SPD seeks to provide an appropriate strategic framework to ensure that comprehensive proposals come forward in a phased manner.</li> <li>The scale and design parameters of future development have been carefully analysed so that they respect the surrounding urban and heritage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA8 1QR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am very disappointed. Living by the riverside has no interest whatsoever. Hardly anyone goes by. There should be shops around the waterfront or some form of relaxation. When one thinks of the riverside it should give you a feeling of calm, relax and enjoy. People should feel happy and not bored. Please devise a plan that will attract people into investing in Erith or Bexley.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scheme has been designed to improve the relationship of the area with the river through enhancing the Riverside Gardens and introducing new uses to the area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Just keep all of the green area. It's a pleasant break from all the big buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Worried about building on riverfront as the preserved tree on Walnut Tree Road is at my window and a building would block all my daylight. Yes All - I repeat all.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amenity of existing residents will be protected and part of the consideration of detailed proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not as of yet but I reserve the right to make further comment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1NB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfied with the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In general development is a good thing. However building heights and creating access may lead to crime.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD provides for high quality sustainable development in line with current urban design best practice and will seek to create a safe and secure environment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA8 1SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provisions that the current residents of the riverside estate area have available to them should not be reduced only improved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> <li>The SPD further provides for a variety of uses in the EWG area for residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2HR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please just keep some open space/areas that are accessible to all the community. I have seen many proposals and they change while work-in-progress. If the community agree then they agree to changes being proposed now.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3RD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Get rid of fish. So far development has been excellent. Wants to see more.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fish sculpture is outside the scope of the SPD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA17 6DA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A good class of retail will be needed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retail will be an acceptable use in the area provided it does not impact adversely on the core shopping area of the town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2BH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It's a shame that you have to build flats on every piece of open ground it would be a pleasant change to see more environmental places.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open</li> </ul>

			Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD
Resident DA8 1AD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please get with it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2BA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local play area would be great.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1EX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Just the block on the gardens; blocks view and takes up gardens.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• - More renewable energy. - Safety issue; concerned about break-ins, robberies. - Will new development just be more opportunity for break ins etc. - Orbit towers. - Needs policing - with all people. - Would be nice if you had street views, not just aerial.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council supports renewable energy as part of development schemes but cannot insist on a level that would compromise the viability of the development or be beyond policy requirements; the scheme is designed to be safe and secure and provide for a high quality attractive development catering for a broad spectrum of the population; street views would be provided at detailed planning stage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why Western Gateway and to where?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is considered the western entrance to the town centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stop building so many high density housing units in one small area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council needs to provide new housing in the area and EWG is long standing regeneration site; the density is a reduction compared to that previously proposed and is</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>

		considered appropriate to the area.	
Resident ME17 1DD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More entertainment for teens! ie basket courts etc. Also an American Football Pitch would be amazing or an ice hockey rink.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A mix of uses and a series of high quality open spaces are proposed but there are no specific plans for the leisure use suggested within the EWG site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA17 6DA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA10 2JH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think that it's a good plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think it is a good idea to renovate Erith.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support welcomed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I feel if you do improve Erith more people will visit which will increase profit but will cause traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport issues including traffic impact have been integral to the design process and the Council will seek financial contributions to improve transport through planning obligations with developers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2AB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Erith is considered one of the poor areas in London. I hope the SPD will help to portray Erith in a different light if it is done.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SPD aims to promote sustainable regeneration in the area which will improve the towns wider image.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3DJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Just leave Erith alone. No more redevelopment please.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area is considered to be in need of regeneration and development provides an opportunity to provide more housing and other facilities in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 2AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes please, let's not waste money on any more fish sculptures that provide very little and aren't even that nice to look at. As a working woman I find I am rarely home in time to attend meetings etc in the evening. I know and appreciate you can't meet everybody's</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support welcomed; further consultations will be undertaken in relation to detailed proposals at the planning application stage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>

	needs but perhaps every now and again one could be on a Saturday. Road shows like the one in Morrison's today are very helpful.		
Resident DA18 4DG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seating needed - not enough there, existing seating overgrown and [indistinct]. Most see river from gardens.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The enhanced and new open spaces would include high quality fixtures, including seating.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3RJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consult the people of Erith often.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further consultations will be undertaken in relation to detailed proposals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I feel if you do improve the wall blocking the view to the river it may cause safety problems if a young children's park was built there, also the wall is there for a reason and it may cause problems.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The wall is part of the existing flood defences which are to be redesigned if possible or otherwise retained.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA1 4SW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add more entertainment facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal includes a sustainable mix of land uses which could include such uses although there are no current plans for specific entertainment uses within EWG.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA16 1BL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More entertainment like cinema or swimming centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal includes a sustainable mix of land uses which could include such uses although there are no current plans for a cinema or swimming pool within EWG.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make an area where you can play football etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Informal recreation will be possible in the open spaces; there are no specific / current plans for a dedicated football area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA1 4DF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes we could improve on the places that are already there. Maybe we can remove places or add new facilities like sports areas etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements to existing open spaces are proposed as part of the proposals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1QW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need better shops. M&amp;S. BHS.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council cannot control the occupier mix of shops, but it is the aspiration that high quality retailers will be attracted to the EWG.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>

Resident DA8 1QW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wetherspoons in Carneige. Need better DDA to the station.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A new use is being sought for the Carnegie Library building which is yet to be determined but which will have to preserve the ? of the building and meet the stated objectives of the Erith Western Gateway. Contributions to improve the station access may be sought where appropriate as specified in the APD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3AW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With all these new building proposals being made where will all the children play, where are the schools that are going to cater for them and hospitals to care for them? As it is at the moment children can play on the grass on the Riverside Gardens.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where appropriate the Council will seek financial contributions to social infrastructure via planning obligations with developers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think it will be more likely to happen if you leave the gardens - as the public do not want them to be developed - I know this is obviously the prime site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More places for teenagers to go to.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal includes a sustainable mix of land uses although no specific uses for teenagers are currently proposed within EWG</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think this is a great way of getting others interests etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA7 4TX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A basketball court or football/basketball cage should be made as a youth outlet. American football facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mix of uses and a series of high quality open spaces are proposed but there are no specific plans at this stage for the leisure uses suggested within the EWG site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development is good - only concern is being displaced from Orbit Housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support/welcome. The SPD does not propose the demolition of the Orbit Towers although</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove references to demolition of tower blocks at</li> </ul>

reference is made to the potential of such proposals. Coming forward their references are proposed to be removed to ensure clarity on this point.

paras 7.2, 7.6 and 8.9

Resident DA7 6LH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The builds should be wavy to fit with the river and nearby area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The exact form of the buildings would be considered at detail design and planning stage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You need to tap into the mood and feelings of a changing community (for the better) before you take any drastic steps.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consultation for the SPD is designed to seek the views of residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I would suggest a meeting, public with local Councillors and planners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consultation for the SPD is designed to seek the views of residents; further consultations will be undertaken at planning application stage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We do not need more flats in this area of Erith</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council is obliged to plan for future growth in the area and a mix of flats and houses are proposed which is considered appropriate to the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1TB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the views of residents living in the immediate area, as we have been the ones supporting the local shops the most</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local residents views have been sought and considered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 1SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think that although the area is in desperate need of improvement you have not considered the impact on homebuyers already in the area. If your developers insist on building on the riverfront, they should only be given planning permission to build next to the Old Police station building or on the site where the old Erith Sport centre once stood where it doesn't affect existing residents views and also re-sell value of their properties. It makes me so angry that the decision appears to be out of the residents hands and in the hands of those who are only interested in making money.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council is promoting the development to regenerate the area and provide new housing as well as enhanced open spaces and other uses; the effect of the development on property process is not a material planning consideration but it is considered that the proposal has the potential to improve the attractiveness of the area</li> <li>Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>

Resident DA8 1AH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. I am opposed to any part of the Riverfront area, given to 'the people', to be 'sold off' as a short term funding exercise to improve the rest of this area. Once it's gone.....it's gone!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current market conditions make the development of Riverside Gardens unviable at this stage and the document should better reflect this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove detailed proposals to build on Riverside Gardens at paragraphs 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9 and 10.5 and refer instead at para 7.1 to any proposals being considered on the basis of existing planning policies e.g. on Urban Open Space, and the vision and principles of the SPD</li> </ul>
Resident DA8 3BL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This area of Bexley already suffers the noxious smells from the sewer works at Belvedere and we are getting the new incinerator. Let's have something really nice in Erith/Belvedere for a change.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support welcomed; the Council is promoting high quality sustainable development through the SPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change</li> </ul>