

Appendix 1

Local Meeting Minutes  
17<sup>th</sup> November 2017



## Local Meeting minutes 6<sup>th</sup> December 2018

Lewisham Methodist Church Hall - Albion Way SE13



---

Chaired by Councillor Patrick Codd – Lewisham Central Ward

Council Officer - Michael Forrester / Jeremy Ward (LBL)

Applicant Team      James Moody/ Jamie Pearson – Meyer Homes (MH)  
                                James Everitt - EPR Architects (EPR)  
                                Steven Butterworth - Lichfields planning consultant (SB)

Resident (RES) – 23 residents were in attendance.  
10 residents provided apologies they could not attend in advance of the meeting.

Councillor Aisling Gallagher was in attendance

Councillor Kevin Bonavia was in attendance

---

The meeting was introduced by Councillor Patrick Codd, followed by a brief introduction by Meyer Homes as to the scheme and revisions from the previous refused application. .

RES – Even though the height was rejected on the previous scheme - it remains the same - why?

EPR – We believe the height is positive in townscape contribution – the previous benefits in members views were not sufficient – this application is focused on explaining why height is appropriate - and explaining and adding public benefit.

RES – (drawings and visuals were displayed) This scheme does not offer any public benefit. The CGI's submitted are lies.

EPR – The CGI's are accurate from site data and would not be a lie. It is understood that there is concern, but assured that the application material is accurate.

RES – Why was a view from Silk Mills path not produced in the original documents?

MH – They are currently being produced and nearly ready.

RES – This scheme would likely to have a significant impact on Blackheath

EPR – Existing buildings are visible from the heath, which is surrounded by clusters - Canary Wharf and Kidbrooke - view assessment was undertaken.

RES – There is no justification for height – why is there is a range of building heights on building 2 and 3

EPR – Clarified that buildings 2 and 3 are stepped in height, to fit in their surroundings. Composition of a tall building and location is very important. The tall

building has a very small footprint - allowing for a public square and station entrance. A lower building would have larger floor area taking up more space.

RES – The Scheme seems opportunistic. Have not seen anything why this is a public benefit. The Skydeck is also only open for 3 hours a day?

MH - We have gone through business planning exercise for the top floor. We are considering how it would have public access plus for schools. Would also be resident amenity area.

RES – There is no benefit in this scheme. People are losing their skyline - impacts on mental health. Impact on orchard street estate. Residents of this area have a fantastic view at present. We will see more on the main Tesco site when that comes forward.

RES – What else would happen in the future? Scheme does not control the masterplan

EPR – There is a masterplan , but the main Tesco site is not in MH ownership

RES – A petition has been submitted to the Council meeting last Wednesday, stating that all development should be 100% affordable

Cllr Gallagher – The affordable housing component is problematic - only 16 are social rent, 27 Affordable Rent and 30 Discount Market Sale Units. A scheme with 20% is not serving needs of community especially when it is not social rent. LBL policy is 50%, unless agreed.

MH - 20% affordable split into tenure types, scheme has high build cost and other costs including s106 and river works etc. It does not work economically to build 100% social housing. It is about £250k per unit. Which have lower values to be sold as social rent.

RES – wheelchair access/ accessibility - not enough wheelchair housing.

EPR – Every unit is accessible/ adaptable. 10% are wheelchair accessible.

Wheelchair units are located in building B2-B3 because it is more practical. Parking on island site is not appropriate.

RES – viability – The first one was scrutinised and GL Hearn found concerns , is the new one also being assessed?

LBL – GL Hearn are re-instructed and are assessing the scheme now, when finalised it will go online.

RES – There will be 500-600 residents for this site. But in reality there will be more. Only 55 children, so rest are adults who will be using the DLR and train. There will be strains on infrastructure.

MH – The figures for occupancy have been taken from national data and is industry wide accepted. Child yield is calculated from GLA.

RES - Concerned about access arrangements, existing context is crowded and unsafe. What about plans for pedestrians and cyclists to/from development. Gateway promised a better east-west access through the site. This site needs creative thinking as to access arrangements.

EPR – This is a pedestrian led scheme and cycle friendly. There are 9 accessible spaces. London Plan compliant in terms of cycle spaces. Masterplan is centred around trying to achieve reinstatement of Silk Mills Path

RES – How will 600 people get into Lewisham - all via Silk Mills path?

MH – Yes but future would have a station entrance

RES – Where is the Lewisham masterplan - would Silk Mills Paths properties be demolished?

App – The Town Centre Local Plan has a masterplan and site allocations, the Silk Mills Path is shown as being retained.

RES – You need Tesco site to bring forward the river works plans. Intentions for the river are confusing at present.

App – Yes, the actual Chanel work needs Tesco, but the scheme has been fully worked up and flood modelled to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency.

RES – Is there any consultation with CCG and NHS about health provision?

LBL – Yes the Council works with its partners and is developing a strategy for Health across the borough. All developments include CIL payments which fund health infrastructure.

RES – The scheme is not materially different . Lewisham station needs many millions spending. Issue of station access is still there - platform 4.

RES – concerns about Air Quality, during construction

MH – Construction would have an impact but would need to be carefully managed.

**Meeting end 8.30pm.**