

Dear Louise

I write to give you the comments of the East Greenwich Residents Group on the planning application for redevelopment of the Alcatel-Lucent site at Christchurch Way SE10.

Our sincere apologies for the late submission of this response, but as you know there is a lot for the group and residents to consider at the present time given all the current and recent applications in East Greenwich including the new Lovells application and IKEA. Furthermore, as Cathedral and Alcatel held further consultation events last week, members of the group wanted to take advantage of the opportunity to see updated plans before submitting our response. We do hope that given the reasons provided that you will take into account the collective views of the group.

There are a number of areas from the community's perspective that cause real concern with the redevelopment of the Alcatel-Lucent site.

### **Density of development**

From the community's perspective, the density level for the scheme of 863 HRH is totally unacceptable and exceeds the high figure of 779 HRH approved for Enderbys.

The basis for justifying 863 HRH is predicated on the area securing a PTAL 4 rating, however this density figure is still in excess of the London Plan range of 400-700 HRH.

When viewed in the context of the high number of units already consented in the immediate surrounding area, it is doubtful and certainly unclear as to how this pocket of East Greenwich can sustain a second development with such an elevated density level. At present we are looking at a potential 849 units under the revised Lovells scheme, 770 units for Enderbys under the consented scheme, 645 units at Greenwich square and the Peltons (number of units not readily available on the internet).

We are seriously concerned about the impact these densities will have on the already overburdened local transport networks and social infrastructure and the seeming absence of a coherent vision and robust masterplan for the west Peninsular area which anticipates the impact of these high density developments and articulates measures to accommodate the influx of new residents and the needs of those already living in the local community. From the community's perspective there is a growing disconnect between what is technically allowable and what is socially acceptable for the area. We are extremely worried about what we see as a growing trend for developers to use the permission granted to Enderbys to drive densities in the area even higher.

### **Loss of industry and business space**

We are concerned to see the loss of employment generating space for yet more residential units.

It is crucial to note that the development is not preserving ***the going concern status of the Alcatel site and*** the viability of the Alcatel site is not in any way predicated on the sale of the development land. This is a capital raising exercise solely for funding the refurbishment of the factory and creating a more pleasant working environment for current Alcatel employees.

We understand the economic purpose of the scheme from Alcatel's perspective, but take issue with the fact that there are no plans at this time or future commitments secured to support local employment or apprenticeships resulting from the investment into the business and the sale of the development land.

The impact of the residential development should therefore be considered in its entirety and not in the context of any substantial business benefits or gains for the borough and the local community.

### **Housing**

We are alarmed at the low level of family housing at 17% which is under the provisions of the Council's Core Strategy Policy H2. Of even greater concern is the low level of affordable housing at 14.7% which is less than half the figure of 35% set down in the Council's Core strategy Policy H3.

As such we believe the development is failing to meet the profile of housing needs required by the community and the standards set by the Council to accommodate the borough's needs.

### **Height**

We believe the 18-storey tower block on such a small site of 0.83 Hectares and in such close proximity to Christchurch way would over shadow and dominate both new homes within the Telegraph development and existing homes in the Christchurch Way area. This block will be four storeys higher than the tallest block at Enderbys which is 14 storeys high. It will also set yet another dangerous precedent for a high tower block away from the river front area and will exacerbate the dominating effect of the high level blocks already consented at Enderbys. The inclusion of the 18 storey block with its current design will alter the character of the area for ever.

### **Community benefits and parking**

The only discernible benefit for the existing community from this high density development is the incorporation of linear garden. Whilst we welcome the developers efforts to make the most of this space and to provide a flexible area for all age groups, given the future density level of the area and the size of the space it is unclear whether it would provide a practical solution for public play. It is important to note that in context of the proportions of the whole of the development, this linear Park is so small that it was not even visible on model that had been mocked up for the recent consultation events.

In terms of parking provision for the residential element of the development excluding the courtyard housing only 112 spaces are being provided. Whilst we appreciate the need and prevailing Government policy to reduce dependency on cars, we consider that the resultant ratio of 0.44 per unit represents a significant under-provision.

### **Access**

We are also concerned that Christchurch Way will still carry traffic into the new development and may open that fairly quiet road to much more traffic than it can cope with. Cathedral has no control over the private roadway, access being shared with Enderby, who will be responsible for controlled entry bollards. From the CGI of the overall site, including Morden Wharf, it would appear that the road could be extended up the Peninsular to service developments up to the Dome over the next 4 to 8 years, but with access limited to cycles, pedestrians and construction traffic, residents and Alcatel workforce. We hope this situation will be closely monitored, but ask that the road should not be used for any future building schemes once the Blackwall access is built.

### **Community identity and general design**

Whilst we note that much has been made by the developer regarding the "*redevelopment of this historic manufacturing site*" in its press release, we note there is nothing to reflect "*the rich history in the manufacturing of rope, cable and submarine telecommunications since the 1850s*" in either the landscaping or the design of the residential elements. It is clear that the developer has given much thought to the quality of design; yet the overall development does not appear to incorporate any elements which capture the industrial/manufacturing character or history of the site and as such completely severs links with the past and the identity of the West Peninsular area.

We provide by contrast the example of anchor iron wharf at the end of Lassell street which has an industrial look and feel and compliments the form and materials of the nearby power station.

### **Consultation**

The efforts by the developers to communicate and engage with the broader community are most welcome and we look forward to continuing engagement.

In the final analysis there will be only a tiny benefit to the community in the form of a strip of land as a play space under the current Alcatel plans. The offer to the community is almost non existent compared to the amenities on offer under the Enderbys scheme and the new Lovells proposals. We ask the council to seriously evaluate what is being proposed here

and to act in the interest of its residents by insisting that Cathedral meets the London Plan and the Greenwich Council Strategies in respect of housing density and family and affordable housing provision.

There are interesting elements to the scheme, however in view of the density levels we are all united in the view that it is the community that will be paying the price for the Alcatel factory refurbishment. We ask the council to reduce the density in order to avoid the over development of the site and the further overburdening of infrastructure.

We also ask the council to seek local employment and training commitments from Alcatel and to seize the opportunity for local people to benefit from training in a highly-skilled industry that has a long heritage in the area.

As the current proposals stand under the scheme, we believe the application should be rejected.

Lastly, we ask the council to take a holistic and coherent approach to the development of the Peninsular West area and to secure substantial community facilities and amenities as part of the development of this large area, rather than being offered piecemeal benefits at individual sites.

Yours sincerely

East Greenwich Residents Association