

Local Meeting Minutes – 2 June 2015

Panel:

Cllr Helen Klier (Chair) **(Cllr)**
John Smith (planning agent) **(JS)**
Roger Sedgley (architect) **(RS)**
Josh Chad (applicant) **(JC)**
Charlie Chad **(CC)**
Nick Chadd (Builder) **(NC)**
Geoff Whittington (Planning officer) **(GW)**

Attendees:

10 residents present **(OBJ)**

7:32pm

The planning agent outlines scheme, referring to previous proposal and subsequent appeal.

The architect sets out the design rationale, acknowledging the need to ensure the scheme does not result in visual harm to neighbours.

The applicant advises he purchased the site after the appeal decision.

7.41pm

Cllr invites questions from residents.

Resident raises concern toward impact of scheme upon rear boundary wall on the Davenport Road side.

JC: A prop wall will be used during demolition; excavation works will then commence; underpinning of wall.

OBJ: How will you navigate around existing garden structures?

NC: Will seek minimal disturbance. Structural engineers will be employed to provide advise.

Resident shows photographs of existing wall within the site where a hole was formed prior to clearance works for equipment. Raises security concerns.

JC: Security alarmed 24/7 during works – site largely protected by surrounding houses.

OBJ: Former trees provided protection – now they are gone. The way it was all done – all of a sudden – was a surprise to residents.

JC: Ecology Report of 2013 advised the trees were considered to be of low value.

Cllr: Works should have waited until September, as advised by Ecologist.

JC: Did not want to interrupt nesting season. Worked in accordance with regulations whereby a qualified Ecologist was present during works. It was an appropriate time to undertake works. Verified by Council's Ecology officer.

OBJ: Previous application was exceptionally designed. Current plans do not truly represent current streetscene – isn't clear from plans what is being proposed.

OBJ: Outlook won't be the same as tree screen has now gone – is completely different to what was originally proposed. Can see all George Lane dwellings.

Cllr: The retention of the existing boundary wall is paramount. It is unique. Acknowledges the destruction of foliage was done legally – but it is the way it was done.

OBJ: Site clearance was not addressed in proposal.

An objector show more photos of views out into the application site.

OBJ: The Wildlife Crime Officer could not attend meeting tonight. (To applicants) You do not live here so you are not aware of birds within the area. The 2013 Ecology Report advised birds may return to the site to breed. Amenity is a huge residential treasure – assists with general well-being. Security feels compromised.

Cllr: Can screening be replaced?

OBJ: It can't.

OBJ: The clearance works were crass.

OBJ: (Reads passage from planning statement) The trees still had 10-15 years left.

JC: Arboricultural survey states they were not of merit.

OBJ: There were high quality trees that have now been felled.

Cllr: Accepts the developers acted properly regarding clearance works.

OBJ: Opportunity missed regarding neighbour meeting prior to clearance works – did you consider dropping a note through doors to advise residents?

JC: No – adhered to Applied Ecology recommendations.

OBJ: No-one approached us to discuss clearance works.

- NC: Initially only bushes were to be removed.
- OBJ: More than bushes were removed – 7 good trees were felled.
- JC: Northern boundary trees remain.
- Cllr: Suggests mitigation measures – can applicants propose replacement planting.
- JC A green roof is proposed and trees within courtyard areas.
- OBJ: Refers to Planning Statement, which advised of the retention of as many trees as feasible along the site boundaries.
- OBJ: There is a discrepancy in what you do and what you say you do.

8.23

- RS: Does not consider security would be compromised by development – it will actually feel safer.
- Refers to window to window distance exceeding 20 metres.
- OBJ: The proposed green roof will take 5 years to grow.
- [Panel disagrees]
- OBJ: The roof is very different to the previous vegetation in terms of height and level of screening. No screening is proposed.
- OBJ: Reiterates that screening loss has not been sufficiently addressed.
- Cllr: Can the applicant make a gesture to plant trees within the Davenport Road gardens. A visit should also be made to see the existing boundary wall from the neighbour's garden.
- JC: We will visit.
- Cllr: Can the hole in the wall within the site be repaired to ease security concerns.
- OBJ: Can residents suggest ideas for boundary treatment.
- NC: Mindful of proposed planting and planning condition regarding the boundary wall.
- Cllr: Boundary wall must be retained.
- NC: Comfortable with wall being retained. Has worked on historic structures previously. There will be minimal inconvenience during works.

OBJ: Does not share confidence considering how applicants dealt with site clearance.

NC responds and give examples of previous work.

OBJ: Does the scheme meet housing standards – will the sunken element receive sufficient light intake.

RS: Yes it is policy compliant. Am excited by the scheme – light intake would be fantastic and a great place to live.

OBJ: (to the applicants) Will you pay for our party wall surveyor.

JC: We will pick up costs.

OBJ: In regard to the boundary wall, I have spoken to the Victorian Society, who consider the existing 2-storey element should be retained – why can't it.

JC: It is in a state of disrepair, and cannot be used for employment purposes. A structural engineer has advised it would not be suitable for residential use. Would be single-aspect only – is not suitably orientated. Not fit for purpose to achieve a suitable development.

8.38

OBJ: The Bat report suggests the building was intact, sound and dry.

JC: Repeats current condition of building. The site is not designated open land – what do you not like about the proposed design.

OBJ: Would be out of character – scale/ size is a concern.

JC: The proposed density is policy compliant.

RS: Facing materials would be similar to existing dwellings.

OBJ: That is not clearly shown in plans. (shows a photo of Lutwiche Road residential scheme, referring to it as a poor form of backland development.

RS: The scheme cannot be compared with proposal – our scheme is sunken, there is a greater distance with neighbouring dwellings, there are no rear windows and is inward looking.

OBJ: What if new windows are formed.

GW: A planning condition would prevent the formation of any new openings without the benefit of planning permission.

8.47

OBJ: Not questioning the workmanship – the issue is the height in relation to neighbouring properties. The site is not huge. Development is too tall.

RS: It isn't. sufficient distance, sunken and no overlooking.

OBJ: Creating visual harm to Davenport Road occupiers.

RS: That is an exaggeration.

OBJ: No it isn't – height will be noticeable. Davenport gardens are relatively small.

RS refers to section plan and explains distances and height.

CIr: Moving on and to sum up, the boundary wall is sacrosanct, possible tree screening.

OBJ: Is there a contingency plan if anything goes wrong regarding boundary wall.

JC: Refers to party wall procedures, and that Building Control/ equivalent would monitor works.

NC: A bi-weekly newsletter will be sent to neighbours during works.

8.58

Discussion regarding drains and sewage.

OBJ: Timescales of works.

JC: Construction would take approximately 40 weeks.

OBJ: Can the applicant propose suitable screening measures to reduce impact of the scheme.

OBJ: Too many dwellings, over developed, noise, visual impact. Number of birds depleted since clearance works.

OBJ: Need for green spaces in London – health and wellbeing.

RS: Good size gardens on Davenport Road.

OBJ: Six dwellings – 25-27 residents potentially. Lighting concerns.

GW: Confirms any external lighting would be conditioned.

Refuse collection and storage discussed.

JC: Will provide elevation plans that propose screening measures in light of tonights meeting.

OBJ: 3-dimensional plans please.

JC: Will consider providing a CGI.

Meeting closes 9.17