OVERVIEW

A. INTRODUCTION

This document summarises the findings of Stage 1 (brief-development and visioning) community consultation undertaken on the Peckham Rye Station Area redevelopment project. The project aims to redevelop public spaces, buildings and railway arches to the front, rear and sides of Peckham Rye Station, but does not include restoration or building work to the station itself.

The aim of this initial focused period of consultation was to build on prior knowledge of community opinion regarding the regeneration of this area (as articulated in Southwark Council’s own draft Area Action Plan and in the reports of local community group Peckham Vision) in order to inform a set of design proposals being prepared by architects Weston Williamson for an intended planning submission in Spring 2014. These design proposals are being prepared by Weston Williamson in response to a brief set by their client Network Rail.

The consultation aimed to:
1. build a deeper understanding of spatial issues and assets in the area around the station in the eyes of those who live and work in the local area i.e. those things people would like to see tackled and those things that people value,
2. draw out aspirations and concerns regarding the possibilities of redevelopment,
3. establish a clearer sense of community priorities for any redevelopment activity and
4. gain some initial feedback on the ‘informed hunches’ of the design team regarding what might be appropriate for the area.

B. PURPOSE OF REPORT

Primary Aim

This report was prepared as a design team report, to inform a set of outline design proposals being prepared by Weston Williamson for the area around Peckham Rye Station.

It therefore focuses specifically on the presentation of information and opinions sourced from community consultation that pertain to the design of this outline scheme, with the intention of:

(a) allowing community opinion where possible – within the scope of the design brief – to influence the nature of designs, and

(b) allowing the design team to learn from the knowledge of local people about their area in order to develop better designs in response.

The purpose of the report is therefore to present ‘intelligence’ to inform the preparation of design proposals, and care should be taken before using it as an ‘evidence base’ for other purposes.

Secondary Aims

Despite this focus, it also presents information received as part of the consultation process that does not directly pertain to the design, such as feedback that questions the overall objectives of the project or the design brief itself. It was felt important to include this both for the benefit of the design team, so that they may question the brief as deemed appropriate within their professional duties, and for the benefit of the client.

In addition, the report has been written in straightforward, concise style and language, to enable it to be shared with the local community itself. This is in line with the stated aim of the project to run an open and accountable design consultation process. It should however be noted that the report is a ‘file note’ in form, and
that available time has been invested in processing data, producing content and providing information that can influence the design process, rather than on producing a ‘slick’ PR style report.

C. SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY UNDERTAKEN AT STAGE 1

i. A 4 hour drop-in event was held on the afternoon of Saturday 30th November 2013 in the Old Waiting Room at Peckham Rye Station. This was attended by between 150 and 200 people.

ii. All information was also made available online at www.peckhamryestation.com. This was publicised via email networks of the client and design teams, a local web forum, on posters in local shops, through two handouts of flyers at peak commuter periods outside Peckham Rye Station, and through delivery of flyers to all properties on Holly Grove, Blenheim Grove and the part of Bellenden Road that links them. The design team also spoke at a meeting of the local Community Council to introduce the project and to raise awareness of the consultation.

iii. After the event on 30th November, the display and feedback forms were also made available at Peckham Library, for those without web access.

iv. A named contact was provided on all material to allow people who could not contribute via any of the previous means to either discuss the material over the phone, or to be sent a hard copy.

v. People were explicitly asked to complete a form in order to allow us to properly document and assess people’s responses in a consistent way, and to be able to compare and contrast answers.

vi. A formal deadline was given for responses to be received to this first focused element of pre-design consultation, in order to facilitate the production of this particular report, allowing direct meaningful input to the initiation of concept design work.

vii. However, it has been made clear wherever possible that feedback is welcome and useful on an ongoing basis, and that the consultation period is ongoing from end November 2013 to early February 2014. It’s simply that we want to highlight those key moments when community input can have the most impact in order to facilitate the most meaningful, useful consultation possible within the project’s programme and scope. The next ‘focused’ moment of community conversation will be around concept designs in mid January.

D. SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED AT STAGE 1

i. 135 people completed a feedback form on the day of the event at Peckham Rye Station.

ii. A further 17 forms were submitted by email.

iii. In addition, a further 34 submissions of feedback were made in other formats. 33 of these via email, primarily in the form of letters or mini-essays, and one in person in the form of an interview with a local business person without easy web access.

iv. No forms were handed in at Peckham Library.

v. Only 2 phone calls were received. Neither of these were to submit a consultation response. One was from a local newspaper interested in discussing the project, and one was from a property agent looking for space for a nightclub.

vi. NB. In terms of feedback received, we are aware that in terms of the population of the local area, responses are unrepresentative demographically. We are relatively low in responses from the young, the elderly and from members of BME groups. This will need to be addressed as part of the ongoing consultation.

E. HOW RESPONSES RECEIVED INFORMED THIS REPORT

i. All information received, either as forms or as submissions in other formats, was processed by the same individual and collated into an Excel data table, upon which analysis could then be conducted, and findings drawn. These findings are primarily qualitative in nature, due to the narrative style of most of the questions. However, one question - that on local community priorities - elicited a quantitative response.

ii. Information has been drawn out of this data table in a way that is appropriate and useful to the work of the design team i.e. it is primarily narrative in form. However, the existence of the data table allows more detailed and statistical analysis to take place should this be required for another purpose at a later date, according to interest and available resources.
BIG PICTURE FINDINGS

F) This is a narrative section that reflects on, and summarises, the specific findings on the next set of pages. It aims to provide a concise and straightforward reference point with regard to overall reception of the proposed redevelopment.

i. **Questions re the overall scope of, and rationale for, the project:** It was clear that many respondents didn’t yet feel particularly able to comment on the specifics of proposals. This was partly due to the fact that we were right at the start of the project, with minimal design proposals to comment on. However, it was additionally and significantly due to the fact that many respondents seem to feel that the project’s fundamental premise of the project is questionable. So their response is focused on the issue of whether development of the nature proposed should be happening at all. A significant number of responses questioned the overall principal of the re-development, and the reasons for it, with concern about impact both upon the character of the area and upon local businesses and commercial and creative activity.

ii. A significant proportion of respondents state that they are in favour of a new square in front of the station. However they are less enthusiastic about the development of other zones, and fear disruption to, and eventual displacement of, independent and creative businesses and activities, and the associated ‘ecology’ of the local economy.

iii. **There is suspicion regarding ‘top-down’ wholesale development:** The project is perceived by a significant proportion of respondents as development of this nature, likely to happen at a worrying rate. Many respondents query whether a more incremental piecemeal redevelopment, or even less redevelopment full stop, might be preferable in terms of long term benefits to the area and community.

iv. **More negative than positive reaction towards the project in its current form:** the majority of respondents express reservations about, or are decidedly against, the redevelopment in its current perceived form. A small minority are completely in favour of it, with the remainder of respondents indicating desire for some kind of improvement to take place, but with some concerns about the nature of this or about its impact upon local businesses. More than one submission has suggested that even those with full knowledge of the Area Action Plan consultation and associated discussion about the regeneration of the immediate area were not aware until recently of the likelihood of wider development beyond the regeneration of the area in front of the station, and do not feel that there has ever been significant community support for this.

v. **General public pride in, and appreciation of, the qualities of Peckham now:** although the majority of respondents would like to see improvements to the area, there is a huge emphasis on the unique and special character of the place now. It is felt that a certain amount of ‘grit’ and ‘edginess’ is integral to that, although much better cleaning and maintenance would be welcome, both by business owners and by the Council. And that the current mix of independent cultural and creative businesses alongside culturally or ethnically specific shops and services is part of its unique identity.

vi. **General appreciation of the station building:** the architecture of the old station, and other aspects of its design, such as the raised platforms with views of south London, are highly valued by a significant proportion of respondents. There is broad support for creating a better setting for the station, that opens it up to view, and places it spatially more at the heart of its community.

vii. Key questions that emerge are less about the specifics of the design, but more about the design brief and process i.e.

   o **Is it possible for the programme to be less rapid**, both at design and delivery stage, to allow for what would be felt to be more ‘considered’ development that is able to be sensitive to the local economy? While some, including local creative businesses, accept the inevitability of change, and are knowledgeable re the phenomenon of artist-led gentrification, they feel that this change would be unnaturally ‘hothoused’ by large-scale redevelopment.

   o Could more emphasis be placed on an **incremental ‘bottom-up’ mode of development**, as opposed to a perceived ‘top-down’ tabula rasa approach? i.e. could the development be phased and parcelled in a way that facilitates this?

   o Could an emphasis be placed on **re-using and adapting existing buildings and facilities** where possible, rather than automatically replacing these?
SPECIFIC FINDINGS

G. APPROACH TO PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Information below is presented according to the format set out in the feedback form, allowing answers to be directly drawn from the 152 feedback form responses as collated in the data table.

Where people chose to submit their responses in another format, it has not always been possible to directly translate these into the format below, particularly when it came to the quantitative question on community priorities, but they have been considered alongside the feedback form data and referred to as appropriate.

It is worth noting that:
(a) these submissions tended to reinforce the key points made by the assembled feedback form data, but to go into greater detail on some points i.e. they were not the source of alternative contrasting points of view, and that
(b) submissions tended to express concerns or reservations about the redevelopment. (However, it is additionally worth noting that this is usually the case with public consultations of this kind; people tend to make this kind of submission when they are worried or angry about something, and it is rare to receive positive submissions unless these are actively solicited.)

The strategy undertaken below is, on the whole, in the interests of clarity and focus for the design team, to present those points that were made by a significant proportion of respondents i.e. not every single issue raised is noted. However, these are all collated in the accompanying data tables.

Exceptions have been made to this principle, given the stated aim of informing design proposals, where an individual has made a point that the consultant feels, in her capacity as a member of the design team, offers an additional interesting perspective or insight that may not already be under consideration.

H. WHAT ISSUES CONCERN RESPONDENTS NOW ABOUT THE STATION AREA, THAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO SEE ADDRESSED? AND WHY?

We presented a plan of the site with what we understood to be key issues marked on it, and asked people to reflect on this and to tell us what they saw the major issues requiring attention as being.

i. In general, there was agreement with the issues that we presented on the boards: poor quality public space, lack of visibility of station from Rye Lane, spaces that feel unsafe to use, too many of the same kind of shop, lack of facilities, visual and spatial clutter.

ii. Cleanliness and maintenance: This was not something we mentioned, but it was one of the major issues raised on forms. A significant proportion of respondents felt that the area is dirty and ill-maintained, and that this might be improved by better waste management and recycling facilities and regimes. Although respondents would like to see the area better maintained and managed, especially the area immediately in front of the station, they are not necessarily convinced that this requires a wholesale ‘tidying up’, just better management of the existing. The ‘grit’ is seen as something that has enabled a certain kind of positive development in Peckham. But there is frustration that a level of ‘grime’ and negative decay has been allowed to accumulate on top of that. There is also fear from a vocal minority that the desired ‘clean-up’ might be a ‘trojan horse’ that allows more destructive ‘regeneration’ i.e. ‘gentrification’ and ‘sanitisation’ in.

iii. Safety: this was raised by a significant proportion of respondents. However, it is important to be clear that for many this was linked to perceptions of safety, rather than direct experience of crime i.e. an area that looks dark and dirty and has hidden corners makes respondents fear that something will happen, even it doesn’t. (Nonetheless, those who live close to the site do report actual incidences of crime and anti-social behavior. The new bike hub in the station, although a valued facility, is said by one local trader to attract drug dealers and takers, and to be used as a hang-out spot.)

iv. Road safety/public realm: a number of respondents commented on the narrowness of the pavement along Rye Lane, exacerbated by the presence of well-used bus stops (many of which discharge large
groups of people in the direction of the station), and would like to see this widened as part of the creation of a better approach to the station, alongside wider consideration of pedestrian and cyclist safety and amenity.

v. **Visual and spatial clutter:** this was a common issue raised, although primarily for the area in front of the station than the rear. There is strong desire among respondents for the area in front of the station to be cleaned and opened up to provide a better visual and spatial frame for the station, and to allow proper use of that space by the community. There are fewer references to clutter at the rear of the station, although more than one respondent suggested that some improvements might be made to the fences and to the relationship to the public realm of the arches and yards along Blenheim Grove.

vi. **Congestion and connectivity:** the three relatively narrow approaches to the station are seen as being inappropriate and inefficient during busy periods, as well as at times feeling unsafe, and attracting rubbish and debris. This is particularly important given the connections that they theoretically provide with both local bus stops (the interchange acting as a significant local transport ‘hub’) and with residential roads on either side.

vii. **‘Better’ range of shops:** while there is tremendous emphasis throughout the consultation on the need to support and retain existing independent businesses, a number of respondents do raise concerns with the current mix of retail in particular on the site. The preponderance of butchers, hairdressers, mobile phone shops, pound shops etc is raised. However, it is important to bear in mind – and a significant minority of respondents specifically request us to do this - that respondents to the consultation so far may well not be those who either use, or run, these shops, and may not see value in them that other members of the community do. A small number of respondents suggest that there is perhaps some cultural prejudice in declared desires by fellow locals to remove the number of hairdressers, meat and veg shops etc, and to see these as “dirty” or “cheap” businesses. The point is made that people who wish to see these establishments move away do not perhaps realise their cultural significance to some of Peckham’s communities.

viii. **Anti-social behavior:** A significant proportion of respondents living close to the site raised this issue, with particular reference to public urination and noise, with links made to night-time activity in the area. Public toilets are seen as a possible solution to this. Requests are also made that night-time activity not be further encouraged, particularly in proximity to housing. NB. A distinction is made between the evening economy, and the night one, with the former being preferable and even desirable.

ix. There is some considerable emphasis in general on the need for **safe (wheelchair accessible) public loos**, reflecting both ongoing local campaigns for these facilities, and a growing national interest in this topic.

x. There is also **some challenge to the idea that areas of the site are vacant’ or ‘underused’ space.** And suggestions that it is already well–used, and that it would be worth the client and design teams really understanding the nature of that use and supporting it.

In general, respondents desire these issues to be addressed for the benefit of both residents and businesses in the area. The majority of respondents emphasise that they would like to see remedial work done to make the area work for the existing community, and not major work that they fear would result in that community being ‘driven away’.

However, a significant proportion also see the benefits of improvements in terms of drawing outsiders in to shop or use facilities in the area, and feel that the current dirty unkempt state of the station area is offputting to people arriving in Peckham for the first time. There is some nostalgia for the Peckham of the past, when it was one of the major shopping destinations of south London.

I. WHAT DO RESPONDENTS SEE AS THE SPECIAL QUALITIES OF THE SITE THAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO SEE RETAINED?

We presented a plan of the site with what we understood to be key assets marked on it. In addition, we presented a blank board on which we asked respondents to draw or write what they felt to be special about Peckham. This board was included partly in response to a request from a local group that people should have an opportunity to draw and respond creatively to the consultation, not just fill in forms, and partly with the objective of allowing respondents to see what others were saying, which feedback forms do not permit. All
respondents chose to write on this board rather than draw, and responses received substantially corroborate with those presented on the feedback forms.

i. There is very strong core of shared opinion among those who took part in the consultation about what they would like to see retained.

ii. A very specific ‘ecology’ and ‘sense of place: While only some respondents use the term ‘ecology’ to describe the positive qualities of the area, a majority of respondents praise the unique, diverse character of Peckham in terms that express the same idea: a unique and integrated combination of low rents, rundown properties, diverse communities, creative types, independent businesses (both cultural/creative/trendy and ethnically specific), light industry etc. A significant proportion of respondents feel that you can’t just reproduce that as a formula; that it takes a while to grow. They don’t want to see it destroyed, or turned into some ‘fake’ version of itself. They also fear an inevitable rise in rents even if any new buildings and spaces are designed to theoretically reaccomodate that activity.

iii. An emergent local economy: It was also explained in a number of submissions that all these different types of businesses support each other within a local economy, buying goods and services from each other. This was seen as something that had begun to flourish in recent years, with the local community – supported by an incoming network of creative businesses and activity – developing their own gradual process of local economic regeneration. There are fears that this might be crushed or damaged by redevelopment. It was pointed out by more than one respondent that these local enterprises are not just focused on profit, but offer cheap spaces and training to younger businesses, and provide jobs and creative and cultural activity and entertainment for other members of the community.

iv. The station architecture: there is praise from a significant proportion of respondents for the station building and desire to see this restored and enhanced. For many, this is not just about the central building, but about other assets such as the brick arches and the raised platforms with their views, and the natural surveillance they offer to streets below.

v. Existing spaces/buildings on Blenheim Grove: The 1930s building on Blenheim Grove (12 to 16) has supporters among a significant minority of respondents, as do some of the creative and cultural occupants of the arches. This is not just about the buildings, but the specific businesses that occupy them. We received written submissions from some of the businesses that occupy those spaces that unsurprisingly argue in their favour, but others also see the value of them as both as pieces of Peckham heritage and an incubators of creativity. One respondent pointed out that in scale 12 to 16 Blenheim Grove formed a good mediator between the intensity of the high street and the residential district beyond. Its architecture is seen as not being flashy or of obvious merit, unlike that of the station, but nonetheless of high quality and valuable, and a contributor to local character. Likewise, while the majority of respondents would like to see the space in front of the station opened up, a few respondents did speak up in favour of the ‘arcade’ buildings to the front of the station, arguing that if cleaned up, they too communicated something of the character of Peckham.

vi. Railway arches: A significant proportion of respondents feel that the arches are really wonderful and would like to see these enhanced and respected. Some suggest that they are already well-used i.e. it’s not about bringing them back into use.

vii. The garden on Holly Grove was specifically mentioned as something of value locally that we had not noted on our plan. There were some concerns that it might be damaged or disrupted by the redevelopment work opposite.

J. WHAT ASPECTS OF THE ARCHITECTS’ INITIAL DESIGN IDEAS DO RESPONDENTS THINK ARE PARTICULARLY GOOD?

We presented an aerial photo of the site with general ‘zones’ indicated, and suggestions of the kind of redevelopment that might be appropriate in each. No specific design proposals were made. The intention was simply to present the architects’ initial response to the site – their professional ‘informed hunches’ – and elicit community response to these.

i. A new station square: The idea of a square at the front, and of an opening up of aspects and access to the station, is almost universally popular, in terms of benefits to both the architecture of the station and the community, in terms of use and the existence of a shared public space at the heart of the neighbourhood.
Although there is some concern about what will happen to existing businesses, and hopes that these will be positively accommodated elsewhere. Some respondents made the point that they would like to ensure that this is not just token or sterile public space, but genuinely useful for community activity.

ii. **Dovedale Court/ rear of station**: There is definite interest in some kind of intervention in Dovedale Court, in terms of opening up access and community activity, including local economic activity. More than one suggestion was made that this might be a better place for inward facing evening economy activity than the roads that face out to residential, although obviously there are back gardens alongside. But there is caution here again here about the ‘driving out’ of existing businesses and possible noise and disruption. There is interest in the idea of a market at the back, although questions re how this would work with the dense development that appears to be suggested around it.

iii. **There is approval and support from a minority re wider development**, and re. specific aspects such as new appropriately-scaled housing, retail and business premises on Holly and Blenheim Groves. However, only the above points receive significant approval and interest. This is not surprising at this stage given that only one board of ideas was presented, and this was very much general ideas or initial pre-design hunches. The next focused phase of consultation will focus in detail on design proposals and solicit more detailed responses.

K. WHAT ASPECTS OF THE ARCHITECTS’ INITIAL DESIGN IDEAS MAKE RESPONDENTS FEEL WORRIED OR CONCERNED?

i. **Wholesale, non-phased, redevelopment**: As discussed in Section F above.

ii. **Development that is not adequately developed and discussed with the local community**: More than one respondent suggests that although there has been much discussion regarding the redevelopment of the front of the site, they have been taken rather by surprise by the scale of proposed redevelopment to the rear and sides, and would like this to proceed with caution and consultation, if at all.

iii. **Loss of architectural and spatial character**: there is a fear that any new development will not be able either to capture or adequately replace the unique ‘layered’ character of the existing architecture of the area.

iv. **Proposed tall corner building**: many respondents voice concern re this, asking why we would open up views to the station only to block them again, and to overshadow new public space, and asking if a taller building would really work within the scale and character of the local area. The particular corner proposed is seen by come as being inappropriate due to the fact that this part of the High Street is already congested and unsafe for pedestrians, and that an accompanying increase in foot-traffic would not be sensible. There is also general concern re. impact of increased density. (Those who were interested in this idea emphasised that any tall building would need to be ‘slender’ and carefully designed to act as a positive ‘marker’ for the station and local area.)

v. **Retail focus**: There is some concern re the perceived focus on retail, rather than a diverse range of business and light industry. This is accompanied by fears about Peckham becoming some kind of clone town, and consumerism/retail driving out other interesting types of community activity.

vi. **Fear of loss of existing independent and creative businesses**: there is fear that the kind of redevelopment proposed will result in smaller, independent businesses and activities being unable to afford rents in new buildings, or being so affected by temporary closure or disruption that they do not survive the redevelopment even if there are designated premises for them at the end of it.

vii. **Fear of loss of ethnically specific businesses**: There is also concern re loss of ethnically specific shops and services, especially as people point out to us that members of some of the local BME communities to not appear to have significantly participated in consultation thus far.

viii. Related to the above 3 points, there is some interest in the ‘types’ of retail or business unit that might be proposed. What kind of business or creative, cultural or community activity might they support? Respondents would like more information on this at the next stage.

ix. **Housing**: A significant proportion of respondents question the wisdom of putting housing anywhere on the site, given its proximity to railway noise and to possible evening/night economy activity.

x. **Concern re impact upon Dovedale Court**: what will be the impact upon existing activities and tenants?

xi. **Concern re impact upon Blenheim Grove**: what will be the impact upon existing activities and tenants?

xii. **Impact upon local amenity from increased night time activity**: i.e. fears re further noise and disruption.

xiii. **Loss of views from the railway platforms**: these views are prized both for themselves, and for the natural surveillance they offer the wider area.
L. WHAT OTHER ISSUES OR IDEAS DO RESPONDENTS FEEL WE SHOULD CONSIDER IN DEVELOPING DESIGN PROPOSALS FOR THE SITE

Those issues raised by a significant number of respondents have been grouped into key areas below.

i. **Phasing.** Fear of a tabula rasa approach. More than one respondent suggests that a Phase 1 could focus on the front of the station, as there is strong community will for that, and then there could be a slower development process to see how to respond to that change, and what else might be appropriate.

ii. **Protection and support for, and engagement with, existing independent businesses on the site,** such as preferential business rates, low rents etc. A request was made for business incubator space.

iii. **Improvements to the station itself:** in addition to general restoration, respondents would like to see lifts, toilets and wider platforms.

iv. **The wider local context:** Again, at that level of local 'ecology/economy, respondents emphasise that we need to consider the relationship of our site to other key sites in the area i.e. not just a spatial/urban design or formal/aesthetic relationship.

v. **Wildlife/nature/greenspace:** Respondents would like to see more greenery/green space etc i.e. not just dense urban. There are suggestions that this be considered in an imaginative and integrated way, as part of the character of any new development, and not just as an add-on.

vi. **Traffic movement:** requests that we consider the impact upon local roads and properties in designing delivery and access strategies.

vii. **Emphasis on the need for high-quality architecture:** those who in favour of redevelopment nonetheless tended to emphasise that it would only work if it were very well considered, and quite possibly brave, and bold and specific, not bland and generic.

viii. **Relationship to existing properties and spaces:**
   a. A significant minority of people stress the need to carefully consider the relationship of the new development to Rye Lane in particular, thinking about transport connectivity, pedestrian safety (the pavement is currently very narrow) and the way in which this space might open up off the High Street.
   b. A suggestion that we should make careful consideration of which arches work better facing IN to the site itself, and which work work better facing out to the wider neighbourhood. Sensitivity at that detailed level to the nature of the place that is being ‘made’. Fears from homes about being at the ‘dirty’ rear of an inward-facing railway arch.
   c. A suggestion that we should think about the relationship with the space immediately behind the MacDonalds on Holly Grove, and the shrubbery immediately behind.

   plus

ix. **More extensive consultation with local people:** a number of respondents feel that the current consultation is too hasty and superficial, and that plans for the sides and rear of the station in particular should be explored and discussed in more depth.
M. WHAT APPEAR TO BE THE COMMUNITY PRIORITIES FOR THE SITE?

As a final question, respondents were presented with a list of 16 statements, largely drawn from the previous consultation on the area conducted by Peckham Vision, with some additions from the design team’s experience of similar schemes. They were asked to select up to 4 of these that they saw as particular priorities for the redevelopment to consider i.e. you might understand these as the criteria for success by which the redevelopment might be judged.

(Caution should be exercised of course in seeing these as definitive data. A ‘sticky dot’ exercise will never produce the results of a deliberative one. And as many respondents emphasised, all of the statements should certainly be considered by any redevelopment of the area. Not to forget that those more specific ones will tend to attract fewer responses than generic ones, unless they are a cause of particular concern in a local area. The exercise is simply to help get some kind of quantitative benchmark, from the perspective of those who took part in this stage of consultation, regarding areas requiring particular attention from the design – and client – team.)

1. Respect and enhance the historic character of the site through design = 68 respondents (50%).
2. Support local independent business = 61 respondents (45%).
3. Preserve and communicate Peckham’s unique character in the design = 55 respondents (40%).
4. Support the presence of a creative, artistic community in the space = 54 respondents. (39%)
5. Ensure that the redevelopment offers something to ALL members of Peckham’s communities = 49 respondents (36%). Emphasis from some on the fact that although creative and cultural businesses were well represented at the consultation, the full diversity of Peckham’s community and business owners was not represented.
6. Make the area around the station cleaner, and easier to keep clean = 34 respondents (25%)
7. Provide more useful facilities, like newsagents, cafes and public toilets = 32 respondents (23%). Massive emphasis on public toilets here. Quite a lot on newsagents.
8. Remove clutter, and make the space around the station feel more open and accessible = 29 respondents (21%)
9. Use high quality materials and finished = 25 respondents (18%)
10. Make the area around the station feel safer = 24 respondents (18%). Interesting in that it does suggest that perceptions of lack of safety may be exactly that, in that personal priorities do not emphasise this as a major issue.
11. Introduce more greenery and planting = 21 respondents (15%)
12. Make it a nice space to spend time, not just to pass through = 21 respondents (15%)
13. Support community activity, such as markets, events and festivals = 18 respondents (13%). Some queries as to whether the space in front of the station would be appropriate for passing time or events anyway, and might be better as an open and pleasant space for circulation and access.
14. Introduce a better and more useful range of shops = 15 respondents (11%). Some queries as to why ‘new’ shops need to be introduced. In terms of new shops desired, the majority of respondents were anti chains, and pro local independent or creative/cultural facilities that are useful for commuters and locals, such as a late-opening pharmacy, a newsagent etc.
15. Allow a wide-range of uses and activities of commercial units, not just shops = 14 respondents (10%).
16. Ensure that noisy night-time activity does not become too dominant = 13 respondents (9%)

Additional priorities

Respondents were also invited to add their own priorities. 7 chose to do so. These included:

- More public consultation (3 people)
- Retention of existing creative businesses in Blenheim Court (2 people)
- Public toilets (1 person)
- Improved connectivity of public transport (bus and rail). (1 person)
- Quality control of businesses (1 person)

NB. The figures above are taken from completed forms, and not from the display that posed this question on the day (see image below of board in its final state at the end of the afternoon). As with the previous ‘interactive’ board,
the display was included with the primary objective of allowing respondents to see what their fellow locals were saying 'live', rather than all of that information being held by the display team. The reasons for this are that (a) this display could not be intensively monitored and that (b) this display does not include the views of those who contributed responses via email. Not everybody chose to participate in this activity; 15 respondents either left this question blank on their form or ticked more than 4 boxes. **This means that the figures above are drawn from 137 forms.**

**Display board as completed on the day**

There are no major deviations between the board on the day and the information provided on feedback forms. The Top 5 are the same in both cases, although their place within the 5 may be slightly different. With regard to other statements, cleanliness was slightly more of a priority on the forms than on the board, provision of greenery and planting, ensuring that noisy night-time activity does not dominate, and encouragement of a wider range of commercial activity (not just shops) slightly less of a priority.

**ENDS 14/01/14**