

Minutes of Local Meeting 5th January 2012 19:00 – 21:00

Site: Former R. H. Adams LTD Site, Hindsleys Place, SE23

Application no: DC/11/78562

Attendees:

1. Cllr John Paschoud – Chair - CJP
2. Tabitha Lythe – Case Officer - TL
3. Jeff Lowe – Applicant - JG
4. Nick Mansour – Applicant - NM
5. Hugo Braddick – Architect for applicant - HB
6. Richard Hibbert – Forest Hill Society - RH
7. Julie Gough – Resident 12 Westbourne Drive - JG
8. Peter Kalton – Resident 12 Westbourne Drive - PK
9. James Bikett – Resident 12 Westbourne Drive - JB
10. K. Willett – Local resident and Forest Hill Society - KW
11. B. Evans – Resident 18 Westbourne Drive – BE

CJP opens meeting.

HB: Present scheme. Additional information submitted to case officer previously shown. Boards of the existing site shown. Propose 7 live/work units. Character: High quality design and materials picking up on Victorian warehouse rhythms – conducive with live work use. The use would replicate Havelock Walk Mews. The smaller scale individual units would be a more appropriate use in this location than the current allowed use. It would have a better acoustic performance than the existing building. Considered issues of daylight/sunlight and overlooking. Showed Design and Access Statement existing and proposed massing. It's designed so the taller element is at the lower end of the site. Westbourne Drive side reduced from 6 to 4 storeys. The car park will always be there according to the owners which is a negative aspect.

CJP: Have you done shadow and light assessment?

HB: Yes. The sunlight and daylight report shows any impact is within BRE guidelines of acceptability. Overlooking – most windows face east and west (the car park and Hindsleys Place). Those overlooking north and south are high level windows. New plans shown removing window at ground floor level in the northern and elevation and the removal of a window in the southern elevation.

JB: So East side windows remain.

HB: These are views over the car park.

JB: Views to our flats as well.

HB: Amended building lines. Building footprint on OS wrong. Site visit showed overlap. New drawings have been issued to alter building line.

PK: But does still overlap.

HB: Overlap would be 300mm where bricks are.

NM: The building currently overlaps by 0.6m the proposal would only have the brick line overlapping.

HB: Windows set in to avoid overlooking. Balconies facing Westbourne Drive are for kitchens and are expected to be used for plants etc. Balconies facing Hindsleys Place would be more social use. Car parking is minimal because the property is 1min walk from the station. Could have no parking permits allowed in the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).

CJP: Check out CPZ – Hindsley's Place is odd.

JG: Parking – businesses are going to need to park, travel, etc.

JL: Own 40 live/work units and doubt even half of the units have cars.

CJP: Can you give examples?

JL: Havelock Walk - Use my unit more for art exhibits. The neighbour has a car, next 2 don't, neighbour after that does. The parking permits were added as problems were mainly from rail users.

JG: People will travel to the gallery and many by car.

JL: Doubt they will – few come often.

JB: Live/work users intrigued who's going to use them.

JL: Determined to make live/work units that are big enough so that they work as live/work units.

PK: People have cars. We've concluded that they're not car free.

CJP: Car free is a technical term. Two conflicting Council policies. Minimum parking but cars. It only works where public transport is good.

JL: People have got used to R H Adams being vacant. But if it was in use as allowed workshops then there could be many cars parked around.

HB: Council would condition as they see fit.

JG: We're representing others in the street as parking is a big issue. Often can't park own car in car park.

CJP: Declares interest in Lewisham Homes (owner of 12 Westbourne Drive). Have you got sunlight/daylight assessment?

HB: Sunlight/daylight report shows it meets BRE guidelines.

PK: Doesn't represent balconies loss of light.

JG: Properties at 12 Westbourne Drive have balconies.

PK: Loss of light will cause me to move.

JL: Sunlight assessments were done and then redone after discrepancies.

NM: BRE met in statement. Created state that doesn't cause significant loss.

HB: Sunlight hours measured in slightly different way. Windows face due West. In quantitative terms reason scores look low is because it is due west.

CJP: Apart from noon, part of 4 storey 5pm shadows show little impact. Committee should be told about it.

JG: Committee should come on site. It would be another storey so loss of light.

TL: Confirmed been on site.

JG: Number of residents on Westbourne Drive have asked us to represent their views in this presentation. 12 Westbourne Drive is unique as it backs on to the development as well as being immediately adjacent. Concerns that the previous light report was conducted on previous blue print. Documents themselves are quite vague. Deliberately vague. Question to architect if you could tell us the actual increase?

HB: Approx 1m. Sent e-mail back but got no response. It was 600mm.

JG: Concern 4 storey tower exceeds height of building immediately adjacent. No need. Why couldn't it be 3 storeys? Looked at UDP. Noise, light reduction and impact on residents we have concerns about these. Residents there are not likely to work conventional hours. 90% of the residents have children and don't want to be woken in the night. Concerns about how development itself will be demolished.

TL: Construction Management Plan – sign up to considerate constructors programme.

CJP: That is technical stuff so there is no consultation on it.

HB: Code for Sustainable Homes requires signing up to considerate constructors and more done with residents equals more points.

JG: Too many units – seems likely to be for profit. Parking issues – UDP areas highlighted that it questions. Boundary line – development is closer to boundary.

CJP: Useful for committee to have view between 12 and new proposal.

PK: Who will own land left over after boundary change?

NM: Would be left to residents at 12 to use.

JG: Loss of daylight and views from living rooms and balconies.

JB: Loss of views completely.

JG: Blocked in completely and solar panels will be even higher.

NM: Panels would be at 22degrees even though usually 35degrees.

JG: Photos show loss of view and daylight.

JB: Level of roof, is it changed from pitched to flat?

HB: Will be flat – 600mm above from existing building.

JB: Significant point is the building is going from 2 to 3 storeys.

PK: Which windows are assessed in lighting report.

HB: Windows are numbered in the report. Back windows are assessed.

PK: Were back windows definitely assessed?

JG: Doesn't Flat A fail?

NM: Daylight is fine – sunlight is an issue. As it's due west the argument is that it shouldn't be assessed.

JG: Flat 12C is more affected than E and A, probably won't get any light. The vision is seductive but not to belittle impact on neighbours.

NM: Feel as if the development we're putting there will be of benefit to streetscape on both side and will create a community.

BE: Concerned about 4 storey monstrosity. Will slightly affect light in terms of shade. Concern about overlooking. Not against redevelopment. May not be able to sell flat. Development could be done with more sympathy to residents. The height is not appropriate.

PK: No harmony between new building and old. 12 and 18 were built at the same time.

CJP: Committee report will look at outlook and daylight and sunlight and made clear.

PK: The main bit is out of proportion architecturally.

JL: Not doing it for money. 6 storey building was not economically feasible. We looked at lowering it but it didn't sit right.

PK: Go out to consult at earlier stage.

JL: Posted letters to residents.