

**DC/18/108548 - Creekside Village East: Local Meeting Minutes
6th December 2018**



Trinity Laban, Creekside

Chaired by Councillor Paul Maslin – New Cross Ward

Council Officers Michael Forrester and Gareth Clegg (LBL)

Applicant Team Philip Van Reyk – Kitewood (KW)
Bettina Brehler– Squire and Partners (SP)
Simon Chadwick - WYG (WYG)

Residents 21 residents recorded their attendance (RES)

Various members of staff from Trinity Laban (TL) were also in attendance including the Principal, Professor Anthony Bowne

The meeting was introduced by Councillor Paul Maslin, followed by a brief introduction by Squire and Partners as to the scheme and its history.

RES – How many objections have been received?

LBL – We have received circa 85 objections from the planning consultation to date.

RES – How many objections are needed to re-think this scheme?

LBL – It is not about the number, but the planning issues raised.

RES – A lot of people in Creekside Village West are unhappy with this development, particularly about loss of daylight / sunlight, and especially in relation to Adagio Point. There is no objection to development on this site per se, but the scheme is too tall. The building heights should be swapped around to move the tallest element further south on the site and away from Creekside Village West. The Creek Wall may need to be strengthened to facilitate this.

SP – There were various discussions around the placement of buildings at the pre-application stage. We had to look at townscape views as well, and the view toward the Laban Building. There is also a need to take into account the daily operations and requirements of Trinity Laban. We have investigated placing the tower on top of the new Laban facility, but discounted this as it adds a lot of additional structural work because of the open spans required within the Laban facility for the studios and auditorium. This would have had an impact on delivering affordable housing and other landscape works. It is acknowledge that the current design has more of an impact than other options.

RES – Everything has been thought of, except the residents of Creekside Village West. The scheme is totally unacceptable because of its impact on Creekside Village West.

RES – The presentation only shows the best CGI's. The site allocation is for 266 dwellings. The increase to 393 dwellings is a large increase, and this is out of scale

for the area. There is a very low affordable housing provision proposed, given that part of the land is in public ownership. The buildings need to be repositioned on the site. You have chosen profit ahead of residents. Why is the increase in the number of dwellings so huge? Why does it have to be so high? There could be a better layout.

KW – The site history has fragmented this site, which was always anticipated to accommodate a large scale of development as part of the masterplan. This site is now the only one dealing with the Trinity Laban expansion and also has to provide affordable housing.

RES – The GLA have said that the level of affordable housing is still too low.

WYG – there have been further discussions with the GLA in relation to the viability assessment.

RES – this whole development is in order to facilitate the development of Trinity Laban. Existing facilities are already stretched – schools, transport etc. Convoys Wharf will be coming forward down the road which will make the situation even worse.

LBL – the development is CIL liable, and this will be spent on local services and infrastructure.

RES – In principle the development is supported, but the main objection is in relation to daylight impacts and density. The submitted assessment demonstrates that apartments in Adagio Point may experience reductions in daylight of up to 70%. Essential Living is already over double the recommended density per hectare. The application proposal is four times the recommended level of density and there is no consideration for transport and GP surgeries. It is difficult to access trains in the morning or to get a doctor's appointment. There is no access to local amenities. This site should provide a bridge over the Creek as was originally proposed. There could have been better engagement.

WYG – Exhibitions of the scheme were held prior to submission. Density can be applied flexibly on a base by case basis. The CIL figure would be approximately £5 million to spend on services, and this is a mandatory figure and is non-negotiable. The Creek bridge was discussed, but the sheer cost of delivering this scheme affects the viability. Taking TL into account too, the bridge would not be possible.

RES – This scheme is all about Laban. What happens now is everyone is building much higher than the 15 storey average of the area. People moved here and did not expect tall buildings.

LBL – The area was subject to a 2006 masterplan which included buildings of 22 storeys.

RES – The CGI perspective (from the Creek) is misleading. There is an issue with school provision. How many schools have been built? Essential Living got permission for its larger flats and reduced rent.

RES – This is right on the boundary with LBL and RB Greenwich, and that's why the impact on Creekside Village West residents is not a consideration for LBL.

LBL – We have consulted Greenwich on the planning application. We are holding this local meeting as a further means of public engagement.

RES – People apply for a school in LBL, but there is no capacity, so now they go to Crossharbour School on the Isle of Dogs. There is also the traffic impact. The infrastructure will not cope.

RES – School capacity is an issue. The application does not include a school. If you are having four times the density with no provision for schools or doctors that

combined with loss of light mean this needs a re-think, and should take into account the needs of the local community. If the scheme that was lower, with better public amenities it would be received more favourably. There is a need to take into account public concerns. TL is not the only consideration.

RES – Why is it so close to the existing buildings and why so high? What considerations were there? What about emergency access - it will be a bottle neck, and very difficult.

WYG – we have worked with LBL Highways and our transport consultant, and have tracked emergency vehicles in and out of the site, and the buildings. Fire engines can access the buildings. A turning head would be provided as part of the proposals. Tracking drawings are included in the application.

SP – have also worked with a daylight consultant. We recognise that there is an impact and a compromise.

RES – the compromise is the negative impact on surrounding residents.

RES – there is an public open space planned in the development, but it is hidden behind the buildings. There are two amenity areas, but they are separate from the Creekside Village West development. The building could be swapped around and joined to create one large amenity area to make a much better amenity space adjacent to Copperas Street.

RES – what is the driver with Trinity Laban?

RES – every objection is to the height. How do we get the size down?

RES – where is the 9 or 22 storey block?

LBL – that is the previous application which Committee resolved to grant, but the decision was not issued as the s106 agreement was not completed due to the financial downturn.

RES – there is no consideration of the impacts for daylight and sunlight. We bought our flats to have light and airy homes, but this will be lost.

LBL – the scheme is still being assessed.

RES – the submitted daylight documents do not take into account daylight once Essential Living is included. What is the funding arrangement for Trinity Laban? Has the design been tested using a wind tunnel?

WYG – yes there is a microclimate study including wind. The report says there would be an acceptable standard. The daylight and sunlight assessment is being re-looked at again. The existing report does take into account Essential Living. There are two scenarios, one without and one with (cumulative development).

TL – we need the expansion very much, the building would be provided to shell and core provided by the developer. The internal fit out is for us to find. We have not done the detailed design for the fit-out. We are estimating around £15 million, but it needs further design.

RES – what is the cost of the building?

KW – a further £15m

RES – what are the timescales of the application?

LBL – still under consideration but no exact date yet. Any decision to approve the application will need to be referred to the GLA.

RES – what about all the other people who will be affected who haven't been able to attend this meeting?

RES – what sort of height would be acceptable?

Chair – that is difficult to answer, because we are considering the application before us.

RES – this is a question for Trinity Laban. You want to be good neighbours, but how do you feel when hearing about the direct impact on the lives of neighbouring residents?

TL – I am looking at the needs of Trinity Laban, but the planning department will need to look at the scheme.

RES – if you got no money from the Council, then you wouldn't be leaving anyway.

TL – times have changes a lot, and our funding position has changed a lot. We do need to expand. We may not be able to deliver our community benefit programme without this expansion.

RES – this is a unique position on the border between two boroughs. What is the Council doing to communicate with RB Greenwich. Are you a Chair of the Planning Committee?

Chair – I am not a Chair of Planning Committee.

LBL – we are having ongoing dialogue with Greenwich Council.

RES – monies allocated to the Council, can get spent on other projects. Is there a GP surgery being provided? Existing surgeries are not taking on any new patients.

LBL – there is a health strategy across the borough, and we are working with partners including the CCG etc.