

Appendix C

Draft River Corridor Improvement Plan SPD – Preliminary Consultation Results		
Questions	Agree	Disagree
1. Are the aims and objectives of the RCIP clear?	8	0
2. Do you think the design and development guidelines (section 6) give a clear message to developers, landowners, community groups, the Council and other interested parties about how development near river corridors should take place?	7	1
3. Do you agree with the joined up approach to development and the aspiration of bringing rivers back to the heart of Lewisham's developments and open spaces, as set out in this policy?	8	0
4. Can you think of any other benefits that an 'integrated approach' would bring?	n/a	n/a
5. Do you agree that Full river restoration should be the starting point for discussions about river improvements, followed by a 'sliding scale' to Partial restoration and In-channel enhancements.	8	0
6. Do you agree that all new development should treat the river as a key part of the site, the place and any public spaces?	8	0
7. Do you agree with the aspiration for all new development to improve both visual and physical access to and along the river?	8	0
8. Do you agree that all new development should protect and improve local wildlife?	8	0
9. Do you agree with the measures set out at parts a-h of the draft policy?	8	0
10. Do you agree with the approach taken to managing flood risk?	8	0
11. Do you agree with the approach taken to managing and maintaining areas near rivers?	8	0
12 Do you agree with the approach taken to managing new development in the Thames River and Deptford Creek area?	8	0

Appendix C

13. Do you agree with the approach taken to managing new development in the Ravensbourne, Pool, Quaggy and Kyd Brook areas?	8	0

As can be seen above there was general support for the approach and policies in the draft SPD. Regarding question 2 the respondent did not think that section 6 was clear but did not make any suggestions for improving the document.

In addition to the answers made to the online questionnaire individual responses were received from:

Environment Agency
Historic England
Marine Management Organisation
QWAG – Quaggy Water Action Group
Transport for London

Environment Agency summary of reply. The EA support the draft SPD. Their main comment was that the SPD should be informed by the latest environmental, data and projects.

Historic England summary of reply. They support the references to the historic environment in the draft SPD. The main points raised are that the draft SPD falls short in identifying and promoting opportunities to enhance or protect the historic environment. This includes opportunities for greater access and understanding of the historic environment as shaped by the river network. In addition they consider the SPD could give more emphasis to heritage issues in particular assets such as archaeology and landscape features.

Marine Management Organisation summary of reply. They have no specific comments on draft SPD but draw attention to the role of the organisation in preparing plans for inshore and offshore waters.

Quaggy Water Action Group (QWAG) summary of reply. They provide a very detailed page by page response. This details errors and suggested corrections to the text and maps.