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Introduction

• Lend Lease, the council’s developer for the Heygate Estate area, will soon be releasing its masterplan for the area. It is now over 5 years since any public consultation has taken place on how the area might look in the future, and the Elephant Amenity Network stepped into the breach with a public event on Saturday 4th June at Crossways Church SE17 1SL.

• The aim of the event was to identify about what benefits people want to see from the regeneration and to imagine together what could be achieved - to help influence the regeneration which is due to take place over the next 15 years. The event was based around a series of workshops led by local people with intimate knowledge of the topics. Each workshop lasted 90 minutes, with detailed notes taken and noting areas of agreement for things that must be done and things that mustn’t be done, as well as noting where further debate was needed.

• An introductory plenary session led by Stephen Hill set out the principles of the theory of “placemaking”. This involves a participative process that facilitates people’s inbuilt drive to shape the “places”/ areas in which they live to be channelled positively. He concluded that the professions and government have much to learn from communities, and that this is to their political and professional advantage.

• This document summarises the discussions that took place in these workshops, and summarises the factors and processes that we will look to those leading the regeneration to address and incorporate.
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Lend Lease’s masterplan and the E&C SPD

• The new masterplan is not the only relevant document to define the future of the area; attention must be paid to the shape and content of other planning documents and how they will interact with the masterplan.

• The new masterplan, being prepared by Lend Lease, will outline the layout and design of the future development of the Heygate area, and provide detailed guidance for future planning applications. Masterplan consultation will be via the Regeneration Forum’.

• In parallel with this, Southwark council is currently preparing a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (draft being developed) for the Heygate and the wider Elephant & Castle area. This document fits under Southwark’s Core Strategy (which was recently adopted by the council). In fact, the masterplan should be informed by this (and other relevant SPDs including the Enterprise Quarter SPD/OAF, Affordable housing SPD and the Walworth Road SPD).

• The council must ensure the SPD is finalised before completion of the masterplan, and it is important that interactions between Lend Lease’s masterplan and the Elephant & Castle SPD are monitored and all issues about consistency addressed.

• The masterplan must also consider the provisions of the new London plan, particularly for those policies where supporting documents relating to Southwark’s Core Strategy are out of date.

• Issues where interaction, mutual influence and conflict could emerge are: housing, services, transport, public spaces, community spaces, spatial layout, accessibility, parking, shopping and jobs. Most of these areas were specifically considered by the workshops summarised in this report.

• The planning system also contains a new level, “neighbourhood planning” which aims to give communities the power to develop plans for their area - this is outlined in the next two pages.
Planning designations

There are a range of different planning designations covering the area - these plans give show how they inter-relate.

Elephant & Castle Planning Areas

upakan Designations

Heygate footprint (Lend Lease area)
Neighbourhood planning - what is it?

- Neighbourhood planning is a set of new planning tools introduced by the government to give local communities more powers to decide what happens where in their areas. It is not yet being applied in the Elephant & Castle. These tools are additional to existing plans, policy guidance or development documents, and do not replace them.

- The most important instruments are Neighbourhood Development Orders and Neighbourhood Development Plans.

- Other tools are being introduced that will help deliver (make happen) the neighbourhood plans. These are Community Right To Build and Opportunities To Secure Community Assets.

- A Neighbourhood is not defined and neither are the area and composition of a neighbourhood fixed. The Neighbourhood Forum identifies the Neighbourhood Area and its boundaries. The Council(s) will approve it and Designate the area as a Neighbourhood. Neighbourhood areas are not bound to wards or even Borough boundaries - particularly relevant at Elephant & Castle which is at the boundary of four wards in Southwark and very close to the border with Lambeth.

- A neighbourhood plan is a set of policies and provisions in relation to the development and change of use of the neighbourhood area. The plans must comply with the local plan (Core Strategy) policies, targets (for housing, jobs, etc) and area designations. They must also comply also with all planning documents sitting above the Core Strategy (London Plan, National Spatial Strategy, EU directives). They can concern one or any number of issues: from green spaces or transport only to a broad range of themes and problems usually provided for in local development plans.

- Once the neighbourhood plan is adopted, all planning applications submitted for development and change of use in the neighbourhood area will be assessed against its provisions. The plans are likely to consist of a vision for the neighbourhood, a set of objectives (social, economic, environmental), local infrastructures and service needs, design guidance, a programme/schedule of actions and a programme for monitoring.
Neighbourhood plans - how do they work?

• **Neighbourhood Development Orders** remove the need for planning applications, by automatically granting permissions for certain uses and developments in certain areas. Without a planning application there is no consultation; however it is the community that promotes and proposes the orders. They can be an incentive for certain developments and uses and can facilitate the process.

• A **Neighbourhood Forum** is the body responsible for initiating and preparing the neighbourhood plans/orders. Any group of local residents, community organisations, business groups, even people who can demonstrate an interest in living in a neighbourhood can initiate the process to become a forum. The minimum number of members of a forum is 21 (this may change during future parliamentary debates.)

• Before designating the forum, the Local Council must assess that the organisation or group of residents has a **constitution**, aim to foster the **wellbeing** of the area and that membership is open to all those living, wanting to live and working in the area.

• Once designated, the forum can begin preparing its **Neighbourhood Plan**. This plan does not ensure that development will come forward - but only that, when it does, it will occur according to the principles of the plan.

• Development can come from developers. Community organisations and Neighbourhood Forums can engage developers during preparation of neighbourhood plans.

• Under **Community Right to Build Orders**, some small scale development that meets local need can be brought forward by community groups without a traditional planning application. These orders must be approved by referendum (50% +1.)

• Existing neighbourhood forums in Southwark currently include:
  • Bermondsey Neighbourhood Forum ([http://bermondseyforum.org/](http://bermondseyforum.org/))
  • Bankside ([http://www.betterbankside.co.uk/brf](http://www.betterbankside.co.uk/brf))
Workshop Summaries
## Organisers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair</strong></td>
<td>Jerry Flynn (Southwark resident, formerly of Heygate Estate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening plenary</strong></td>
<td>Stephen Hill (Land economist/spatial planner and a Director at C₂O Futureplanners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td>Steve Lancashire (Southwark resident, independent consultant, former councillor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shopping</strong></td>
<td>Richard Lee (Townsend St resident) with Vally Wilson (Rodney Road shopping parade), John Wallington (East Street market traders), Shamim Uddin (Elephant &amp; Castle Shopping Centre traders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jobs</strong></td>
<td>Adrian Glasspool (Current Heygate Estate resident), Seeta Rajani (Newington resident, environmental consultant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interim uses</strong></td>
<td>Paul McGann (Walworth resident, landscape architect), Godson Egbo (Director of Studioseventi architects, based in Hannibal Hse), Luke Miller (Brandon St resident)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trees and Biodiversity</strong></td>
<td>Guy Mannes-Abbott (Balfour St resident, writer and critic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Massing and Density</strong></td>
<td>Sanna Wennberg (Balfour St resident, architect,)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td>Steve Lancashire (Southwark resident, former councillor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td>Jeremy Leach (Walworth resident, Southwark Living Streets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
<td>Elena Besussi (Town planner, neighbourhood planning)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing
Summary

Must do

- Affordable housing for all - based on income/minimum wage - need for rent control and both public and private housing
- Mixture of tenures and households
- Need for challenge to Council’s vision and motives
- Importance of community spaces and facilities/amenities
- Need to recognise existing fabric (lifestyle) of existing population
- Community involvement through design workshops (with Urban Design London or New London Architecture) for people to consider preparing standards.

Mustn’t do

- Segregation of rich and poor people

Next step

- Workshops and visits to other places with Lend Lease

Reasons I like my home

- Amenities: pub / cycle route / dentist
- Trees on Heygate
- Shopping centre
- Traffic
- Too expensive
- Feeling unsafe
- Heygate Estate
- Dirt and dust
- Don’t meet neighbours
- Crossing roads
- Empty buildings

Reasons I dislike my home
Housing
Cost, tenure, affordability and facilities

Cost/tenure/affordability
• Effect of buy to let and second home purchases is that people buy with no stake in the area
• Need for Council housing - only affordable option
• Need for ‘rent caps’ and a definition of affordability - should be related to earnings rather than market rents
• ‘Intermediate’ (shared ownership) is not affordable - see Arch St development
• People are having to move out of the area because it’s getting too expensive
• Not enough for all types including shared households and single people
• RSL (Registered Social Landlord) rents too high
• Added value of housing as a result of improved range and quality of local services
• ‘Regeneration’ should improve quality of life, be affordable for local people and is not just about projects and buildings

Facilities
• Important to have access to plots of gardening in dense blocks
• Play areas
• Youth clubs
• Parking
• Shared spaces
• Investigate Lend Lease’s ideas for ‘semi-private parks’
• Avoid segregation of rich and poor people
Housing

Design and size

Design and size
• All housing types should be to same space and design standards
• Size needs to reflect modern living and appliances
• Need to have cooking and eating space separate from living and sleeping rooms
• Heygate and Aylesbury rooms good sizes (Parker Morris) - Tabard Gardens about 20% smaller
• New homes at Redwood Housing Co-op (Stamford st) are good sizes
• Need good sound insulation between flats - real noise problems in Elmington
• Ceilings need to be higher
• Separate toilets from bathrooms
• Given rising cost of heating good insulation essential
• Small compact apartment buildings with c. 8 - 12 flats good
• Houses with gardens and flats with good amenity space necessary
• Towers ok for some - great views but not very neighbourly
• Street access for children for children important
• Important to assess priority needs
• Mix is important to create more stable places for both families and individuals
• Existing large family flats are a valuable resource
• Consider option of knocking through in existing council blocks
• Character of area should shape design and type of housing needed
Shopping

Context

Must do

• Very important for the “business model” that is followed for street markets throughout the Elephant and Castle takes account of the unsuccessful model that was used over the last 3 years at East Street market, and of the preferred business model of the East Street traders.

• That the benefits of existing street markets and local shopping parades (such as reducing need to travel, providing local services, providing healthy living and affordable food etc), and which are part of the community, are recognised and measures to counter the effects on these facilities of the new businesses that arrive are implemented.

Mustn’t do

• Consider the Elephant & Castle “town centre”, comprising the shopping centre and Walworth Road high street, as a separate zone to the local shopping parades and street markets. Instead all should be considered part of one integrated retail offer for the Elephant and Castle.

Open to debate

• Whether the existing Shopping Centre should be demolished. Local people have a lot more warmth towards the shopping centre than is conveyed by the Council. However, several participants wanted the High Street proposal put back in. More discussion is needed on how to achieve:
  ▪ the potential benefits of the High Street, and
  ▪ the diverse and affordable shops that can currently be found in the shopping centre, and
  ▪ where to relocate the shopping centre traders at an affordable rent.

• Responsibilities for the development of the shopping centre. Should one organisation be in charge of everything or should there be a separation of responsibilities between St Modwen, Lend Lease, Oakmayne and the Council?

Other ideas

• Examples of parts of London where there is a good mix of chain stores and independent shops include Marylebone High Street and Shoreditch.
Shopping
The shopping centre

Shamim Uddin - Elephant & Castle Shopping centre

• Shopping centre has been operating since 1965.
• Since opening, three floors of retail space have been reduced to two.
• Small traders moved into the area in the 1980s when the larger businesses moved out.
• The traders have received support from the Mayor of London’s office, and from what was then the Commission for Race Equality. There was a lot of participation from the traders.
• A problem now is very high service charges.
• It is not understood why CPOs are not being used to buy out the traders in the shopping centre.
• Concerns that the building has “concrete cancer” which would mean that extending the shopping centre is not economically viable.

• Lend Lease, St Modwen’s, Oakmayne and the Council should come together on retail. It comes across they are involved as different entities and it would be better if one entity took charge, which should be Lend Lease as they won the procurement.
Shopping Markets

John Wallington - East Street Market

- It was formerly known as East Lane market, after being moved in 1880 from the Walworth Road to make room for proposed tram lines. Street traders were forced into side streets, i.e. Westmoreland Road, Draper Street etc as well as East Lane. These have now all disappeared and East Street as it is now known is fighting hard to keep alive.

- There used to be a consultative forum between traders and the Council but this ended with the traders being told by the council “you will be moving to the Elephant and Castle”

- Three and a half years ago the market was given over to a private company to run, so people from Liverpool replaced the Council’s market officers and the traders were unhappy about this. The market has declined through bad administration and is now in debt by £880,000.

- Southwark Council has now ended the contract that has put the market into so much debt. The current fee for market traders is £320.00 per month, but to recuperate the debt it has been suggested the market trader’s fees will need to be greatly increased. Traders want to see regular control of the market and an end to ad hoc management. Southwark Council has recently, the 1st April 2011, taken the management back "in house" and there now seems to be some consultation, but more is required.

- The market traders have their own detailed business plan, produced 5 years ago with a grant from the Mayor of London. They would like to see more attention given to this.

- Traders helped pay for the market office in Dawes Street. In May 2011, a non-slip road surface for East Street was unveiled, together with a blue plaque for the market, but much more investment is needed.

- If the expansion of the Shopping Centre means that the outside market stalls there have to go, then there is room for these traders to come to East Street. Markets provide lots of different services and shops and market stalls complement each other.
Shopping
Local shops

Vally Wilson - Rodney Road traders

• Rodney Road shopping parade has been listed previously as a housing site and may still be (not informed by Southwark Council).
• Many of the Council’s other proposed housing sites are business sites, industrial and warehousing, providing desperately needed jobs to the local population.
• Many local shopping parades have been demolished or await demolition to make way for housing. For example, Thurlow Street, New Church Road, Heygate Street, Manor Place, Westmorland Road, Newington Causeway shopping parade.
• Walworth Road is becoming a cloned high street as multinational chain stores move in, pushing out the well-established independent retailers.
• Local businesses need to be part of the Elephant regeneration, not just the multinational chain stores that are most likely to be able to pay the high rents.
• Small scale provision of local amenity shops and services outside of High Streets/ Town Centres should be protected.
• Need examples from other parts of London on how we can get affordable business rents (and not just transitional relief) as part of the development.
Jobs

Summary

Must do

• Support existing businesses in the area through the transition in the form of affordable rent/rates, or provision of workshop/garage/office space - integrated with interim use proposals. Note Patrick Blunt from 'Business Extra' on Walworth rd. has 180 local businesses in hardship on his books and is keen to be involved in this.
• Ensure that as many of the new jobs as possible go to local residents, with a local jobs target. i.e. 30% (as per King's Cross & similar schemes.)
• Establish comprehensive training schemes in view of high numbers of unemployed & unskilled jobseekers in the area. This could be community-based employment & training consortium, working together with local vocational training colleges (Southwark College), and training & employment agencies (Southwark Works.)
• Establish a Youth Outreach Group to liaise with local schools and to consider apprenticeship schemes.
• Encourage jobs that don't necessarily rely on academic skill but on entrepreneurship, including trades - i.e. if you are a furniture maker and a small business then you pay a much lower rent etc. until you reach a certain turnover. This is preferable to a discount period where rent rises without reference to turnover. This can also be facilitated with provision of workshops (e.g. like Pullens Yard) at low rents. This can be achieved early by linking with the interim uses proposal (e.g. existing garages/maisonettes on the Heygate Estate as workshops.)
• It was agreed that retail jobs should not dominate.

Open to debate

• Definition of 'local jobs'. Does this mean Southwark residents only? or does it extend to the surrounding boroughs. i.e. Lambeth? Or could it be a job you could walk or cycle to within a time period that needs to be identified. It was noted that local economy and local jobs support each other, and that they generate a coherent approach to building resilient communities; a job could become local through the ownership of the shop or service being local and through money stopping in the local community.
• How long must a “local” have lived in the borough to qualify as one, or does this include people moving into the borough as a result of the regeneration scheme?
• What should be the mix between retail, office, manufacturing, service sector, cultural and creative industries?

It was noted that the figure quoted by Lend Lease/Southwark of 4-5,000 new jobs doesn't at present take into account where jobs may be lost elsewhere (e.g. closing a branch in one part of London and re-opening at the Elephant and Castle) nor is it clear how many of the jobs will be permanent, the levels of income they will generate and the phasing of the jobs over a 15 year period. This is needed.
Interim uses

Summary

What is interim use?

- Making use of the abundant natural and built resources of the Heygate Estate site during the extended period (up to fifteen years) over which it is to be demolished and replaced with new development.
- Also called “meanwhile use”, interim use was recognised in a government initiative in 2009 and can bring benefits to all involved, Council, developer and community.
- In this case, it is also intended to provide a way of bringing forward in time some of the community benefits of regeneration.

Must do

- Act fast – need to have “in principle” agreements before outline planning application(s).
- Ensure the Elephant and Castle SPD planning policy document includes conditions for interim uses during consultation this year.
- Consider access and safety issues at all times in developing proposals.
- Consider buildings as well as natural resources
- Establish a physical presence - could be unit in shopping centre, building on estate etc. - to assist in sharing skills, ideas and publicity.
- Ensure that demolition and construction plans include appropriate access arrangements - across all potential sites within the area.
- Be savvy - consider why Southwark and Lend Lease should be interested in any proposal: there are lots of reasons - both policy-driven and commercial. Outline a short “business case” - which sets out why it is a good idea and why it helps Southwark Council, Lend Lease and the community.
- Think like a marketing person - identify target users and means of getting in touch with them.
- Think of interim use at all scales - from half hour walks to long big events.
- Identify potential sponsors.

Mustn’t do

- Fencing off of the Heygate Estate site/no interim uses; A colossal and inexcusable waste of resources.
Interim uses

Objectives

Main objectives of interim use

- Providing needed amenities and benefits immediately, not in 15 years.
- Improving the image of the Elephant: challenge the negative view that many people who don’t know the area have of it.
- Improving social / community links and helping maintain continuity.
- Keep/regain feel of community throughout the disruptive process of re-housing and re-development.
- Providing a community hub.
- Health / welfare benefits to users.

“...The Elephant & Castle shopping centre is one of the few [shopping centres] that feels like it is part of the community - it is a very alive place and it is used by one of the most diverse communities in Europe. This is a place full of surprises and one that feels owned by the community. It's a great place, I really like it." (Royal Court Theatre artistic director Dominic Cooke referring to their performance programme at the shopping centre)

Ideas for interim use

- Allotments / container gardens
- Art events - develop cultural connections with South Bank Centre, ELEFEST (http://www.elefest.org.uk/)
- Use of some existing buildings as artists’ studios
- Football space - replacing loss of Elephant Park
- Parkour/ free running activities
- Workspace and business Incubator units, art spaces
- “Alternative Olympics” - helping to put Southwark on the map for tourism etc during 2012
- Temporary pools - Olympic legacy?
- Elephant & Castle bienniale
- Band practice spaces
- Immersive theatre
- “Secret” cinema
- Dance events / choreographic walks
- Tree canopy walks
- Architectural & urban walks/ cycle tours
- Bee keeping
- Horticultural therapy/ training (cf Gardeing Leave' at the Royal Chelsea Hospital (www.gardeningleave.org/) Open House / Open Garden weekends
- Lido (http://southwarklido.wordpress.com/)
Interim uses
Improving the image of the Elephant:
Words that sum up attendees’ current image of Elephant and castle area
We suggest making the most of the Heygate’s assets to redress its representation as an ‘estate from hell’ and create an interim heaven, a venue for community and visitors over the next few years and a positive alternative to hoarding it off. Interventions are [comparatively] modest, appropriate to a temporary site, and focus on possibilities for key spaces, reinforced by strategic improvements to accessibility and legibility which are part of the eventual masterplan anyway.
Interim uses

Outside space: Coordinating demolition with access is critical

Benefiting the community by increasing the “permeability” of the Heygate site is a key aim of the MAKE masterplan. By identifying a few of the important proposed new pedestrian and cycle routes, and prioritising them in the demolition and construction programme, interim uses can also be maximised across the site.
Interim uses
Ideas for temporary use of existing buildings

• A range of possible interim uses of the maisonette block on Wansey street before demolition were discussed as a case study of an idea with potential for wider application to other buildings across the site during the demolition process. The maisonettes comprise three bedrooms, a living room and a bathroom, with ground floor garden area.

• This will require Southwark’s policy of destruction prior to “making secure” to be changed, but even if this has been implemented, the length of time over which the regeneration is programmed makes this worth considering. Possible uses identified include:

  • **Small business and artists’ studio “clusters.”** Uses could be for artists’ studios (clustering three or four fine artists together for example), or as small business clusters, with one maisonette forming a suite of offices. The buildings allow flexibility for expansion and growth for developing businesses. A good successful example of this is in Hannibal House and the shopping centre where basic rental opportunities are provided for small businesses – a model transferable to Wansey St. This has obvious advantages for providing temporary homes for displaced businesses, while the shopping centre is upgraded or replaced. Income, using the current example of rates for a small office in Hannibal House, could be £375/month, multiplied by rooms (at, say, a lower rate of £200/month) could bring up to £20,000 per month for the Wansey St maisonette block. Current finance constraints mean Southwark must examine this opportunity.

  • **Art space.** Minor modifications to the ground floor of the maisonettes could create gallery rooms. External space could be used for temporary pavilions or for a sculpture court to display work made in the studios (cf Bold Tendencies project in Peckham.)

  • **Community art project:** continuing the Studio at the Elephant idea (run by Rebecca Davies and Eva Sajovic) into the Heygate Estate area which engages local people in a non-political way about the changes brought by regeneration.

  • **Supermarket/café** occupying the ground floor of one or more maisonettes, perhaps selling produce grown on site.

  • **Ground floor** retail by modifying the ground floor layouts, something we understand the developer is investigating.

  • **Educational/vocational training space** connecting with Southwark Community College to provide live, on-site training for trainee plumbers, decorators, electricians and other trades which will be in great demand throughout the regeneration period.
Interim uses

Ideas for temporary use of buildings: Wansey St case study

Wansey Street SE17

2011

Meanwhile... til 2016?

Imagined by Godson Egbo ©
Interim uses

Other issues raised

Demographics

- Young people tend to be most attuned to the modernist aesthetic / architecture and thus interested.
- Large student community and few venues or places to go without leaving area.
- Gardening appeals to huge range of people across cultures and ages.
- Empty buildings offer huge potential to attract artistic/creative people to the area - who may then stay.

Good examples

- Cineroleum - derelict petrol station in Clerkenwell used as a cinema (http://www.cineroleum.co.uk)
- Urban physic garden (Union St) (www.physicgarden.org.uk)
- Union St Orchard (www.unionstreeorchard.org.uk)
- Seizure (Harper Road) by Roger Hiorns (http://www.artangel.org.uk/projects/2008/seizure)
- Growing communities in Hackney (www.growingcommunities.org)
- Studio at the Elephant at the Shopping Centre (http://studioattheelephant.blogspot.com/)
- Royal Court at the Shopping Centre (http://www.london-se1.co.uk/news/view/4326)
- Transformation of buildings: http://www.afrikamuseum.nl/blog/inspiration/modernistic-buildings-transformed

Practicalities

- Interim use needs recognition in the forthcoming Elephant & Castle SPD.
- Interim uses can range from a half hour talk to an activity lasting years.
- Helpful to set up some form of organisation to assist in enabling activities (but not defining them!).
- Note differences in obligations of council versus private land owners in terms of sanctioning interim uses.
- Potential precedent of 2011 street party arrangements.

People to get in touch with

- Punchdrunk theatre company (http://www.punchdrunk.org.uk/)
- Youmebumbumtrain (http://bumbumtrain.co.uk/)  
- Latin American Workers Association
- Jordans Cereals
- Southwark Childrens’ Services and Events teams
- Southwark Community College
- Nike
- Red Bull
- London Association of Bee Keepers
- And many more.....
Trees and Biodiversity

The background

Extract from 1969 masterplan

Generous provision of tree planting is regarded as essential. In view of the need for immediate effect and rapid establishment, semi-mature trees, of small and medium sizes, are proposed. Creating this feeling of immediate maturity is important on high density housing schemes, especially in reducing the incidence of damage or vandalism.
Trees and Biodiversity

The “Peoples CAVAT” tree valuation


The GLA and Mayor want to increase tree canopy cover as a major part of meeting the real challenges of climate change in London by 5% before 2025, and another 5% by 2050.

Total est. value £18m
Trees and Biodiversity

Workshop comments

Must do

• Protect priority trees
  ▪ All perimeter trees, on all streets; New Kent and Walworth Roads, Heygate, Wansey and Balfour Streets, Rodney and Victory Place to be protected and enhanced.
  ▪ All significant clusters of trees mid-site must be protected, and their habitat enhanced, as promised in the Master-Plan Agreement [which speaks of “ensuring existing habitats are enhanced.”]
  ▪ The 80-100 trees in the Elephant & Castle Urban Forest at the west end of the Forest must be protected and enhanced. It is recognised that this is more contentious, but it was agreed that approaching new high rise luxury apartments to the immediate E or NE through this unique habitat would be a major asset; if the shopping centre is to remain, and the arches thus to stay blocked then this is an open and shut case and raises the quality and marketability of the redevelopment.

• Recognise value of non-priority trees that have to be moved, and retain their value by local replacement
  ▪ If remaining trees must be moved, their value must be openly recognised and retained on the site by replacements.
  ▪ Where that is not possible on site, consultation with residents should be held to determine where else in the area immediately around the footprint they should be planted, recognising that this is meant to be a “community wide regeneration”, with radiating connectivity and added pedestrian porosity. Ideas include avenues of 25 year old London Planes and other species, radiating out from the footprint in every direction; to the river and local parks to the east, west, north and south.

• Implement a legacy tree map and planned programme for their preservation/ enhancement
  ▪ Details of this plan should be consulted upon and discussed before any planning application can proceed. This requires the developer to undertake a CAVAT survey now, using an approved list of independent surveyors supplied to them by the Forestry Commission. This will then form the basis for comparison of welfare value with the People's CAVAT and Southwark Council’s new valuation to form the basis for real consultation.
### Massing / Density

Current Heygate Estate site characteristics

#### SITE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Sq m</th>
<th>% of Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building/podium area at ground level</td>
<td>10,474</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car access area</td>
<td>9,917</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian space</td>
<td>13,785</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised walkway area</td>
<td>5,301</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green open space (soft landscape)</td>
<td>20,223</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure open space (hard landscape)</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (site area)</td>
<td>61,382</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SITE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Sq m</th>
<th>% of Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building/podium area at ground level</td>
<td>5,743</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car access area</td>
<td>7,860</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian space</td>
<td>6,481</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised walkway area</td>
<td>2,233</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green open space (soft landscape)</td>
<td>5,018</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure open space (hard landscape)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (site area)</td>
<td>27,335</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SITE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Sq m</th>
<th>% of Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building/podium area at ground level</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car access area</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian space</td>
<td>2,751</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised walkway area</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green open space (soft landscape)</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure open space (hard landscape)</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (site area)</td>
<td>10,419</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Sq m</th>
<th>% of Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building/podium area at ground level</td>
<td>18,614</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car access area</td>
<td>18,762</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian space</td>
<td>23,017</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised walkway area</td>
<td>8,801</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green open space (soft landscape)</td>
<td>27,979</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure open space (hard landscape)</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (site area)</td>
<td>99,136</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Massing** = building shapes and volume  
**Density** = building height and proximity to others  
**Public Realm** = the ground and the space that is open for people to enjoy and share
Massing = building shapes and volume  
Density = building height and proximity to others  
Public Realm = the ground and the space that is open for people to enjoy and share

Masterplan characteristics (as of June 2011)

SITE 1
- Building/podium area at ground level: 39,076 sq m (56%)
- Car access area: 6,120 sq m (9%)
- Pedestrian space: 12,753 sq m (18%)
- Raised walkway area: 0 sq m (0%)
- Green open space (soft landscape): 1,329 sq m (2%)
- Leisure open space (hard landscape): 10,459 sq m (15%)
- Total site area: 69,737 sq m (100%)

SITE 2
- Building/podium area at ground level: 16,645 sq m (57%)
- Car access area: 2,816 sq m (10%)
- Pedestrian space: 7,114 sq m (24%)
- Raised walkway area: 0 sq m (0%)
- Green open space (soft landscape): 0 sq m (0%)
- Leisure open space (hard landscape): 2,555 sq m (9%)
- Total site area: 29,130 sq m (100%)

SITE 3
- Building/podium area at ground level: 7,505 sq m (70%)
- Car access area: 1,432 sq m (14%)
- Pedestrian space: 1,668 sq m (16%)
- Raised walkway area: 0 sq m (0%)
- Green open space (soft landscape): 0 sq m (0%)
- Leisure open space (hard landscape): 0 sq m (0%)
- Total site area: 10,605 sq m (100%)

TOTAL
- Building/podium area at ground level: 63,226 sq m (64%)
- Car access area: 10,368 sq m (10%)
- Pedestrian space: 21,535 sq m (22%)
- Raised walkway area: 0 sq m (0%)
- Green open space (soft landscape): 1,329 sq m (1%)
- Leisure open space (hard landscape): 13,014 sq m (13%)
- Total site area: 109,472 sq m (110%)

Image and analysis by Sanna Wennberg
Massing / Density Principles

- The existing masterplan developed by MAKE, and included in the regeneration agreement between Southwark council and Lend Lease, is now outdated, but no replacement is publicly available.

- The analysis of the existing masterplan shows:
  - an increase in the built footprint from 18,612m² to 63,226m².
  - virtual elimination of green open space (reduced from 27,979m² to 1,329m²) and an overall reduction in open space (including both soft/green and hard landscaping) of over 50%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANGE IN LAND USE: MAKE vs existing</th>
<th>000 Sq m</th>
<th>% of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building/podium area at ground level</td>
<td>44,612</td>
<td>240%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car access area</td>
<td>-8,394</td>
<td>-45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian space</td>
<td>-1,482</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised walkway area</td>
<td>-8,801</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green open space (soft landscape)</td>
<td>-26,650</td>
<td>-95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure open space (hard landscape)</td>
<td>11,051</td>
<td>563%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (site area)</td>
<td>10,336</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Massing is influenced by London-wide sightlines as well as requirements for solar penetration and amenity space.
Massing / Density

Workshop comments (1)

Must do

1. Developer and Local Authority to do design exploration sessions with local people immediately, and not after planning application submission or indeed once the master plan brief is too developed and fixed. This should feed into the briefing from the developer to the designer.

2. Establish how the community can influence the design in a positive way; a list of proposals rather than just protesting or saying “save this.”

3. Consultation should instead be Participation, and Forum meetings should be design sessions and not just presentation sessions. This could feed into the development of a neighbourhood plan linking to the SPD.

4. Design should draw on local knowledge (to date it feels as if there is nothing on the site valued by the masterplanners.)

5. Developers, designers and officers should also state clearly what they feel is valuable on the site (which may be a physical element or something less tangible), then communicate how this maps to the community’s vision, and then show how they will ensure that these aspects are retained and enhanced (as per their pledge in the draft master plan document.)

6. A sense of space and place at ground level is crucial. Permeability won’t work if it is driven by design. The public realm should be as varied as possible and (most importantly) there should be provision for green spaces not only over-designed public realm. This way they will become “spontaneous spaces” fostering true community connectivity. This includes the central route through Phase 3 and via Heygate street.

7. Focus on the entry points is crucial. Introducing an access road for cars where it is suitable for the buildings is not an adequate design approach. The success of permeability and improved connectivity between the new developments and the existing urban context depends on how the entry points are designed and signalled.

8. Clarity is needed on what the car access roads and car parking arrangements are intended to be for the site ASAP.

9. The building footprints/layouts should be adjusted so that as many of the existing trees as possible are retained; it is believed that this will make for a more interesting building arrangement instead of the “boring” repetition of podium blocks with towers of different heights top. There should be a concerted effort to keep some of the existing green spaces to create a varied and positive social open spaces. The important view is from the ground, not the air.

10. Create a varied residential design to attract a mix of people of all ages and social backgrounds. It is the new inhabitants that ultimately will determine whether the aspiration of connecting existing and new communities is achieved.
Massing / Density
Workshop comments (2)

Mustn’t do

• Don’t replicate Empire Square - this is not a good model for creating an urban environment that aspires to “connecting’ the communities; it is in effect a Gated Development.

• Avoid the negative Public Realm precedent of recent developments such as, MORE London, Oz, Printworks and SE Central. The public realm benefits derived from these developments have not included public, green, usable, safe and connected public realm for either existing or new residents.

• No road access into the Heygate site on the axis of Falmouth road. This road would require removal of an enormous tree (CAVAT value ca £300,000); this is an example of a proposal which will not enhance the connectivity any better in that location than in a place where which does not require tree felling. Designers and developers must visit the site again and again, in all seasons and times of day, and must have objectives beyond squeezing in as many housing units as possible.

• The design must not comprise a repetitive massing strategy where all blocks are based on podiums which reduce the open space at ground level. This creates a sense of exclusion and limits public appreciation of semi-private space. Not all connecting routes to/from/through the site need to provide car access.

• The buildings should not come out as far onto the pavement as the draft plans show - the broad pavement on New Kent Road is a major asset and cycle facility too.

• The building mass must not be over imposing and disproportionately high against existing small residential streets - suggesting tapering towards the edges.
Services

Summary

• As the population of the Elephant & Castle increases, how do we deal with the pressure on local services?
• New residential, hotel and office developments, with increased densities and with new families and activities moving into the area, will require services to be provided to ensure that everyone (person or business) has access to health, education, accessible and affordable community and leisure spaces, faith premises, affordable energy and telecommunication and that public safety is maintained.
• Services can also steer the direction of how the area will look and work in the future; they can be designed to avoid the area becoming predominantly a dormitory for people working elsewhere, or for retail to dominate. Local services for businesses are the infrastructure needed to ensure diversity of employers/jobs and opportunities to set up new businesses.
• Southwark Council describes these changes in its planning documents (the preparatory document for the Core Strategy, the Elephant and Castle SPD) but the image that emerges from these descriptions is coarse and patchy. And yet all the future planning for the area will be based on this information!

Must do

• We, the local community, can develop an interesting, live, detailed and accurate record of recent changes: where are new residents living? Who are they? Which type of changes are happening where? Not just the big changes introduced by statement developments like the Strata/O-Central, but all changes. We have the local knowledge that is needed to plan for the area, we can share it.
• We can assess how the services in the area work. Residents, workers and other community or residents organisations know better than anyone else where current service provision is lacking or OK. Perhaps services are there (e.g. community spaces), but they are too difficult/too expensive to use, or their working hours are not suitable. There can be too much of something too; loan and betting shops have increased markedly recently.
• Accessibility and affordability, real or perceived, are key to good service provision. If we want to address this, we need to understand how the changes that we see interact with the services that we have at the moment. A balanced and diverse provision of accessible and affordable services is at the basis of planning for long term sustainable neighbourhood. This must be incorporated in the Elephant and Castle SPD.
Land Use

Discussion topics and aspirations (1)

The workshop, using an abridged “Planning for Real” method, focused on looking at a map of the area and consider opportunities and challenges, people’s perceptions of good and bad things. A Planning for Real booklet was available explaining the other elements of the process.

Area likes

• Surface crossings - but need one near bridge on New Kent Road
• Walking and cycle routes - need to be prioritised
• Green areas - near paths
• Local businesses
• Retail offer
• Allotments
• Squash courts
• Travel choices
• Trees

Aspirations: public realm/local facilities

See also pages 17 (jobs), 26-28 (trees), 34 (services), 29-33 massing/ density and 18-25 (interim uses)

• There was a very strong response on this issue, with a strong feeling the public realm needed to be multi-purpose, very thoroughly discussed with local residents, and carefully designed in the light of these discussions.

• The following specific suggestions were made:
  • Cinema
  • Natural play trails - Go Ape was specifically suggested as an example (www.goape.co.uk)
  • GPs - area well served but the premises of some (Princess St) need to be improved
  • Victory School will need to be expanded - the need for places at all levels needs to be thoroughly researched
  • Piazza style spaces where loitering and interchange was acceptable and encouraged
  • Swimming pool needs regenerating and squash courts must be kept
  • Youth club and Community Centres
  • Allotments - mentioned a few times

Area dislikes

• Tesco
• Empty flats
• Dirty inaccessible railway station
Land Use
Discussion topics and aspirations (2)

Aspirations for Housing
See also pages 10-12
• The need for all types of size tenure - but the priority had to be affordable.
• A suggestion that there should be 30% council housing was endorsed by others.
• Housing should be well mixed throughout the area.
• There should be 20% renewables and a rainwater harvesting process.

Aspirations for Transport
See also pages 37-42
• The excellent public transport options was seen as a big asset
• There were mixed views on whether there should be better connections between the rail, tube and bus - these largely benefit non-local people.
• It was felt that good connections to East Street was important (see “shopping” heading)

Aspirations for Commerce
See also pages 13-17 (shopping) and 23-24 (interim uses of buildings)
• Important to fill commercial gaps
• Small scale businesses and creative commercial spaces should be encouraged.
• The retail offer should be varied and complement existing activities - the diverse range of ethnic food outlets was to be encouraged.
• East St market should to be developed rather than undermined, although there were mixed views on the quality of produce offered there.
• It was a unanimous view that the retail offer should not just be branches of chain stores and expensive independent ones.
• Shops should be dispersed around the area.
• A suggestion for some “nursery” opportunities for shops and other businesses setting up.
• There needs to be some small scale business space.
Transport

Summary

Must do

• Develop a plan for the next 20 years that involves some early delivery (such as the cycling and pedestrian route from Brandon St through to Falmouth Rd) of benefits for pedestrians and cyclists.
• Key groups to meet with TfL, Southwark Council, Lend Lease and St Modwen to develop a coherent plan for the TfL roads in the area that offer benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users rather than solely prioritising vehicles as at present.
• Organising a walkabout to look at issues concerning the northern roundabout and public transport interchange areas in and around the Shopping Centre.
• Safe surface-level crossings.
• The Shopping Centre redevelopment must create a safe and attractive interchange.
• Clear signage through the whole area.

Mustn’t do

• Heygate St should not remain car only (without pavements.)
• Loss of regeneration improvements owing to initial intransigence of TfL - people need to be able to cross the New Kent Road in a number of places.
• Losing transport regeneration improvements through deals being done behind closed doors.
• Fencing off and demolition of the whole site in one phase over a long period.
• The Shopping Centre should not be built up to the edge of the roads so that southbound bus users continue to be crammed into a small, unsafe and unpleasant area as now.

Open to debate

• Although the aim is very much for a “car lite” development, the amount of car parking for residents needs to be debated as there are dangers of a class divide between different parking provision for residents in private and social housing developments.
Transport

The quality of the public transport provision in the local area

Bus services - the routes served and the bus stops (location and their quality (e.g. crowding at E&C Shopping Centre).

• The current subway provision is very poor. For those who are not frequent visitors, it is very easy to get lost in the subways and the Bakerloo interchange is especially confusing.
• The current lifts are inefficient.
• The interchange space in front of the Shopping Centre is very unclear and mostly very crowded. There is insufficient space altogether for the numbers of people who wish to use the area.
• The route to the Shopping Centre (and hence the railway and Northern Line tube) from the bus stops outside the Tabernacle is incredibly complicated and convoluted – road crossings should be undertaken at surface level.
• If the Shopping Centre is to be retained or even its size increased, then much more space is needed in front for bus interchange purposes.

Train services - routes served and the station must be considered.

• In the long term there is interest in the idea of the extension of Bakerloo line south-east to Lewisham with possible routes via the OKR and Camberwell.
• The railway station is of a very poor quality and needs to be improved.
• Routes between the station and the Shopping Centre are very poor and the current walkway is utterly inadequate.
• The aspiration for a tram in south London remains, as a high quality alternative to buses.
• A process is needed that brings planning for real into the frame to assess the interchange needs and improvements. This should involve Network Rail and the operator of the rail services that pass through the E&C as well as TfL.
Transport
The provision for motor vehicles

Role & place of motor vehicles in the redevelopments
• Little parking is needed as the site is so central and the goal has always been for a car-free/car-lite development with safe streets and spaces for residents and visitors, pedestrians and cyclists.
• Concern that development will cave in to a demand for large scale parking provision for the Shopping Centre.

Movement within and around the area.
• Safe movement for pedestrians and cyclists is the priority.
• It is possible to reduce the need for car ownership significantly with high quality access to motor vehicles such as through car clubs and car hire.

Parking provision for residents.
• Concerns of a divide between the provision that will occur for private residents for whom large amounts of car parking will be built (as in the new schemes in West Walworth) and those living in social housing who may be allowed no parking as has occurred with the housing that has been built for former Heygate residents.
Transport
Walking and cycling

What role should walking and cycling play overall in the area?

- Cycling is very intimidating in the area at present with high numbers of casualties amongst cyclists and pedestrians. Any car carrying streets need to be designed to a maximum 20mph speed limit. Residential streets should be designed as HomeZones.
- Improved signage is needed to show those on foot and cyclists their way round the area.
- Low traffic streets designed to 20mph max will inevitably be good and usable for pedestrians and cyclists.

What routes are most needed into the area from surrounding areas?

- Elephant Rd is now very poor for pedestrians and is a complete free-for-all with vehicles all over the place and is the access to the shopping centre car park.
- There is a strong need to open up the railway arches to allow access into the Shopping Centre.
- Need to identify key walking and cycling routes within the Heygate footprint area and build some early in the redevelopment process. A good example would be the route from the top of Brandon St through to Falmouth Rd which could easily be made as an early cycling through route within the Heygate Estate site.

Crossing the TfL roads.

- Crossing the OKR to the Globe Academy is very difficult and the formal crossings in that area are underprovided for. On the existing crossing there is an extremely long wait for pedestrians of up to 90 seconds and in addition the green man phase is extremely short.
- Surface crossings are needed at the northern roundabout along with safe provision for pedestrians and cyclists.
- The northern roundabout should be removed, and TfL’s objections challenged.

What key routes within the Heygate area do people wish to see?

- Cyclists and pedestrians can share the space and traffic free routes within the area BUT clearly segregated routes (even if they are side-by-side) are needed (witness how unclear it is for cyclists on the newly created parts of Rye Lane).
Southwark Living Streets Walkabout: Improvements recommended to the existing roads and streets.

1. Improving Roads & Streets In The Heygate Area.
   - New Kent Rd:
     - Formal surface level crossing needed at western end of NKR.
     - Formal crossings needed at Elephant Rd, Meadow Rd, Falmouth Rd and Harper Rd.
     - Toucan crossings needed throughout to encourage pedestrian and cycling movements.
     - Wall along southern edge of NKR to be removed.

2. Rodney Place
   - Carriageway capacity to be rationalised and protected cycle lanes created on both sides.
   - Western wall to be removed and pavement created.
   - Vehicles to be able to travel at no more than 20mph.
   - Crossing needed at exit from Victory Park.

3. Rodney Road
   - Western side of road to be opened up and pavement created.
   - Victory Place to be opened up for cyclists and east-west crossing created.
   - Protected cycle lanes needed; max vehicle speeds 20mph.

4. Balfour St
   - Carriageway capacity to be reduced (eg protected parking build-outs).
   - Greening with trees and planting. Give consideration given to designing the street as a Green Link.
   - Junction with Rodney Rd retains too much capacity and should be tightened up to make safer for cyclists and pedestrians.

5. Heygate St
   - At least 3 formal crossings needed but more than that purpose of road to be rethought. At present the street severs the area east-west.
   - Street needs to be crossable by pedestrians and cyclists.
   - Carriageway capacity to be reduced; genuine 20mph speed limit.
   - Opportunities for:
     - Tree lined boulevard; protected cycle lanes.
     - Green fingers across the road (as proposed across Albany Rd between Burgess Park and the Aylesbury Estate).

6. Walworth Rd
   - Role of northern section remains unclear in terms of use by motor vehicles.
   - Continue Walworth Rd project north to the E&C. Reduce the 4 lanes to 2 lanes (along with plentiful provision for bus stops).
   - Safe crossing needed at Hampton St with links east-west between the Newington Estate, Walworth Rd & E&C.
   - Longer term create crossing from Wansey St through to Amelia St development through the KwikFit garage site.

7. Elephant Rd
   - Needs to be a safe space that pedestrians and cyclists can cross freely and safely between Heygate and E&C. Any traffic needs to be minimal and moving at walking pace (HomeZone/Shared space principles).
   - Permeability essential through the arches to reduce need to access via the Walworth Rd or NKR.

Map Source: http://www.openstreetmap.org

Recommendations by Southwark Living Streets www.southwarklivingstreets.org.uk
Transport
Walking and cycling routes

This map attempts to identify the routes that are needed into and within the Heygate area with a Green Link hub being created (1) with a further green link west towards the E&C Centre. Green Links would also continue south into East Walworth and north into Borough & Bankside.

- **East-west link** connecting Bricklayers Arms area, Victory Place, Wansey St through across the Walworth Rd to the Amelia St development and Pasley Park in Newington.
- Green Link route to Salisbury Row Park and points south (to Burgess Park).
- Types Of Routes/Links
  - Walking/Cycling Route
  - Green Link
  - Cycle Superhighway 5 (CS5)

**CS5**
- Quiet route to Borough Tube via Bath Terrace & Trinity Church Square
- Links to LCN+23 & CS5
- Green Link
- LCN+23 – maintain but make more direct

**Map Source:** http://www.openstreetmap.org

Recommendations by Southwark Living Streets [www.southwarklivingstreets.org.uk](http://www.southwarklivingstreets.org.uk)
Next Steps

• A wide and diverse range of ideas and recommendations have been outlined in this report. Many things that the event participants feel have to happen have been identified, alongside things that must be avoided.

• In many areas, the need for more debate has been identified. To address the aspirations set out in this report, and these areas of debate, a number of actions are required that cut across many of the participants in the regeneration. For example Southwark and Lend Lease must work with the community to:

  • implement a truly participative process that allows for the creativity, energy and knowledge of local people to contribute to the shape of the final outcome of the regeneration - and to let their knowledge of the area benefit the emerging plans. This is the basis of “placemaking” and successful planning.

  • identify needed benefits and facilities that can be delivered early - by planning the demolition and construction programme in recognition of this objective;

  • develop the workshop themes into participatory working groups - for example Lend Lease attended the retail and jobs workshop and concluded that the workshop groups could be a powerful force for interacting with Lend Lease on these topics as a wide range of interests were represented. This needs to be extended to other areas; for example for a housing topic area working group to include Housing Association and co-op tenants, council tenants, owner occupiers, new residents to the area as well as established residents and residents of new developments, those on the housing waiting list, and relevant local agencies;

  • overcome the jargon that cripples the planning process. Enabling effective community involvement through funding support from national/London-wide agencies/bodies will help here. For example, within the area of housing, community involvement could be facilitated through design workshops with bodies such as Urban Design London or New London Architecture to help people to contribute to the preparation of standards.

• As from now, the ideas set out here should help to shape the planning framework against which Lend Lease’s masterplan, as well as the large number of other development sites north, east, south and west of the Elephant and Castle, will be judged. Southwark’s emerging Elephant & Castle SPD (Supplementary Planning Document) has to incorporate, and be seen to incorporate, community views - to avoid any suspicion of being driven by the needs of the private sector developers alone.
Conclusions

• In 2005 Southwark Council commissioned a leaflet & DVD about the regeneration of the Elephant & Castle called “Cleared for Action”; the name alone makes it plain that clearing people, buildings, trees and any record of the current neighbourhood was the first objective of the regeneration - starting from a “clean sheet.” This is now inconceivable.

• Since this time a negative image of the Heygate Estate and Elephant & Castle in the press has been encouraged through negative comments & opportunistic location filming to help justify demolition of housing barely 40 years old. This is against both Lend Lease & Southwark’s long term interests.

• This report shows how important and valuable many features of the existing area are to residents and local traders; the trees, the markets, the open space, the opportunities for small and new businesses, the mix of housing types and sizes, and the mix of cultures to name a few. The “clean sheet” approach is incompatible with these values. If the regeneration is to benefit local people - and provide these benefits early during the 15 year regeneration programme - a new philosophy is needed that addresses these concerns and aspirations directly, one which also provides some continuity during a time of major change.

• Furthermore, explicit consideration of the phasing of the regeneration to provide early benefits is critical. This could include vocational training opportunities, new walking/cycling routes, and a wide range of interim site uses to meet evident latent demand. This uses can, amongst other tangible benefits, provide ready made opportunities for business relocation during the various stages of the regeneration programme.

• Having failed to meet commitments to re-house Heygate Estate residents locally and in one move during the top-down regeneration process to date, officers and politicians will now be judged on their ability to learn from this failure, and on their success in implementing truly community-based participation processes to shape the emerging plans. There is evidence¹ that in the long run this can also provide investors/developers with competitive advantage and more stable, longer term returns on investment.

• This report highlights a huge range of ideas and issues to be addressed within the regeneration process. That so many ideas and aspirations are apparent here despite so many false starts in the regeneration process is a testament to the existing and potential character of the area and of its residents and traders.

# Attendance log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Residents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reem Akl</td>
<td>Corinne Turner</td>
<td>Diana Cochrane</td>
<td>Annie Lennox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Hynd</td>
<td>Sue Pell</td>
<td>Freya Smaill</td>
<td>Beverley Ogwang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Gould</td>
<td>Margot Lindsay</td>
<td>Sadie Renwick</td>
<td>Vally Wilson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Hoban</td>
<td>Dolly Mace</td>
<td>Simon Mundy</td>
<td>Adrian Glasspool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charley Allen</td>
<td>John Wallington</td>
<td>Sean White</td>
<td>Guy Mannes-Abbott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deirdre McGrath</td>
<td>Jim Lodge</td>
<td>Celia Cronin</td>
<td>Chris (56a Infoshop)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Reynolds</td>
<td>Stephanie Lodge</td>
<td>Steve Lancashire</td>
<td>Mara Ferreri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louie Siet</td>
<td>Danielle Jennings</td>
<td>Laura Fudge</td>
<td>Chris Mead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Smith</td>
<td>Autra Gattiglia</td>
<td>Peter Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC Ledmah</td>
<td>Nicole Beedell</td>
<td>Shamim Uddin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma Lawrence</td>
<td>Jim Beedell</td>
<td>Ben Mason</td>
<td>Seamus McCartney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Ward</td>
<td>Liliana Dimitrovic</td>
<td>Elena Besussi</td>
<td>Rob Deck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Kaviani</td>
<td>Peter Davis</td>
<td>Paul McGann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Sero</td>
<td>Jamie Smith</td>
<td>Jerry Flynn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Yates</td>
<td>Anthony N B</td>
<td>Richard Lee</td>
<td>Cllr Cathy Bowman (Southwark)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karoliina Hujanen</td>
<td>JJ Johnston</td>
<td>Luke Miller</td>
<td>Cllr Poddy Clark (Southwark)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Stansfield</td>
<td>Hector Castells</td>
<td>Jon Dennison</td>
<td>Cllr Neil Coyle (Southwark)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Lane</td>
<td>Kevin Green</td>
<td>Seeta Rajani</td>
<td>Cllr Patrick Diamond (Southwark)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dainela Miscichowski</td>
<td>Thomas Kronig</td>
<td>Jeremy Leach</td>
<td>Ben Johnson (Southwark)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordi Ruiz</td>
<td>Godson Egbo</td>
<td>Rastko Novakovic</td>
<td>Cllr Darren Merrill (Southwark)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Crawford</td>
<td>Amber Dowell</td>
<td>Eileen Conn</td>
<td>Cllr David Noakes (Southwark)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hicks</td>
<td>Chris Wood</td>
<td>Victoria Briden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanna Wennberg</td>
<td>Elena Baylis</td>
<td>Norma Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apologies for errors and omissions. Please note that the attendance log includes some who attended specific parts of the event.
Jargon Buster

The Core Strategy
• This is the most important local planning document. The Core Strategy sets out the long term planning objectives for the borough (10-15 years) and the strategic planning policies that are needed to deliver these objectives. It is subject to independent examination.

Supplementary Planning Documents
• These provide further detail to support a policy in the Core Strategy. Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) can be issue based (e.g. “affordable housing”) or area based. They are not subject to independent examination.

Masterplan
• This outlines the preferred development for a large site or area, and the overall approach to its layout and design. The masterplan provides detailed guidance for subsequent planning applications.

Outline Planning Application
• An application for planning permission which does not include full details of the proposal, usually only sufficient detail to identify the principles of the proposal; details not submitted at this stages are called “reserved matters”. Details of the reserved matters are then submitted to the local planning authority at a later stage.

London Plan
• The London Plan is the Mayor of London’s strategic planning document. It sets out a social, economic and environmental framework for the future development of London. It provides the London wide context within which individual boroughs must set their local planning policies.

Opportunity Areas
• These are large scale developments providing at least 5,000 jobs and/or 2,500 homes. Dependent on good public transport accessibility, they provide significant increases in density and should provide social infrastructure to support growth. An Opportunity Area Planning Framework is developed in partnership by the Mayor and Borough. Across London there are 33 Opportunity Areas, of which the Elephant & Castle area is one.

Central Activities Zone (CAZ)
• This is the area of Central London where planning policy promotes financial and business services, specialist retail, tourist and cultural uses and activities. It also recognises residential and more local functions.
About the Elephant Amenity Network

• The Elephant Amenity Network has been in existence since March 2009 when a new “Elephant & Castle Regeneration Charter for Community Inclusion and a Better Quality of Life for All” was launched by local people and businesses. This charter has the following principles:
  • Principle 1: Open Masterplanning
  • Principle 2: Benefits for All
  • Principle 3: Housing that Really Is Affordable
• Since that time we have been organising a coalition of local groups and people that includes Council tenants, leaseholders, shopkeepers or market traders or amenity groups (who wish to preserve local open spaces and parks).
• From this we hope to be able to present a more united voice from the local community about what we think and desire from the millions of pounds of regeneration that seems destined to happen at Elephant & Castle and in other places close by in North Southwark.
• We welcome input from everyone within an interest in the area and the regeneration.

We are very grateful for everyone who spared the time to come and contribute their ideas, vision and passion for the area. We would specially like to thank Norma Laurence, Beverley Ogwang and Vally Wilson for working flat out providing everyone with refreshments throughout the entire day, to Balfour St Housing Project for their kind donation which funded vegan food, and to the Reverend Peter Stevenson for allowing us to use the wonderful Crossways Church as our venue.

http://elephantamenity.wordpress.com

Report assembled by Luke Miller - any errors or misrepresentations are entirely his responsibility