

**Virtual Local Meeting Minutes (Microsoft Teams format): 10 January 2022**

**Sun Wharf, Creekside: DC/20/118229**

**Proposal:**

Demolition of all existing buildings and comprehensive redevelopment to provide 3 new buildings ranging in heights of 3 to 19 storeys to provide 220 residential units (C3 Use Class) and 1,132sqm of commercial floorspace (Use Class E) plus 311sqm of commercial floorspace (Use Class E) in a container building, together with associated wheelchair accessible vehicle parking, cycle parking, landscaping, play areas, public realm, improvements to river wall and public riverside walkway and associated works at Sun Wharf, Creekside SE8.

**Panel:**

**Chair:** Cllr Maslin (New Cross Ward) (CllrM)

**Agents:** Mia Scaggiante (MS) (Planning Consultant – Savills)  
Scott Hudson (SH) (Planning Consultant – Savills)  
Jake Snell (JS) (Architect – Stockwool)  
Andrew Proud (AP) (RWDI – Wind/Microclimate consultant)  
Andy Gibbs (AG) (RWDI – Wind/Microclimate Consultant)  
John Barnes (JB) (eb7 – Daylight/ sunlight consultant)  
Nicole Holland (NH) (Ardent – Air Quality Consultant)  
Matt Harmer (MH) (Your Shout – Communications Consultant)  
Julian Thornber (JT) (AA Environmental Limited - Ecology Consultant)  
Brian Cafferkey (BC) (Ardent – Flooding/Riverwall Consultant)  
Andrew Gilnicz (AG) (Ardent – Transport Consultant)  
Lee Dursley (LD) (Ardent – Noise Consultant)

**LBL Planning:** Geoff Whittington (GW)

**Residents:** 33 Attendees

---

Cllr Maslin opened the meeting at 7pm and introduced the panel. The Cllr explained the reason for the meeting, and the main themes to discuss, including design; construction; impacts of development and ecology.

The Developer's architect (Jake Snell) was invited to give a 10 minute presentation of the scheme, which included the key changes from the original submission.

The Chair advised that resident questions had been submitted prior to the meeting. Residents were invited to submit text based questions during the meeting, whilst there would be an opportunity later for residents to speak directly to the panel.

The Chair then read out the neighbour responses received in advance of the meeting.

(ClrM) In regard to design/ scale of development, the design is bland, consisting of largely featureless blocks. There is no recognition of the distinctive historic character and heritage value of the Creekside area – indeed, the Deptford Neighbourhood Plan identified the loss of identity and disregard for history and heritage as an issue for the area. Why can the applicant not devise a plan that does the area justice, given that the site flanks the Deptford Creekside Conservation Area.

(JS) The scheme has been developed in conjunction with the LPA, and presented to 5 DRP reviews, and the proposals were generally well received. Does not consider the scheme to be bland, with intended high quality materiality and detailing. The scheme references the industrial character of the local area.

(ClrM) The proposed painted walls are garish and distasteful. Can the painted walls, at least that of block B2, be removed. Art formed in a brickwork pattern would be preferable, which could be 2D or 3D.

(JS) Fair point raised, but this will be further considered. Only an indicative design has been shown at this stage. Will be worked on with input from neighbouring residents.

(MS) Artwork will be subject to a planning condition.

(ClrM) Concerns have been raised in regard to microclimate and wind tunnelling. As such, there is a clear safety concern for cyclists, pedestrians and occupants. What mitigations will the developers be putting in place to ensure that there is no safety risk for its neighbouring developments.

Andrew Proud (AP) advises that a detailed assessment has been undertaken of the impacts arising from the development, with no particular safety concerns identified within the scheme, with minimal impacts to surrounds.

(MS) Asks AP to advise upon the north-west area of Kent Wharf.

(AP) No safety concern identified, and is a small area. With the Sun Wharf development in place, it would be slightly windier than suitable for a pedestrian thoroughfare – may be resolved by the introduction of a tree or street art.

(MS) The applicant would secure the mitigation in a 106 Agreement.

(ClrM) Concerns raised in regard to neighbour impact – the modelling shows a proposed remaining VSC of just 5.3 for 3 Broadside House, which is considered to be extremely poor by BRE, and is an absolute, not relative, measure. This is unacceptable for single aspect homes and rooms - especially now as homes have become our workplaces.

John Barnes (JB) acknowledges there would be reductions in day/sunlight within the scheme coming forward – there would be affects. Impacts have been reduced since the original submission – there are rooms that would have lower retained daylight, particularly the single aspect units in Kent Wharf. Refers to overhanging balconies being a contributing factor.

(ClrM) Why has revised light modelling only been submitted for the 2nd floor of Broadside House and Portside Court following the omission in the modelling of lips/ overhangs on the balconies, which block part of the sky.

(JB) Acknowledges the lip overhang was incorrectly omitted, and so resubmitted updated details. No additional significant effect.

(Resident) This should have been undertaken to other areas of Kent Wharf.

(ClrM) What was the size of the lip/overhang used in the revised modelling submitted for the 2nd floor of Broadside House and Portside Court.

(JB) 30cm (resident later challenged this, saying he measured it to be 40cm.)

(ClrM) Why does the modelling not account for the metal frames that criss-cross the winter garden balconies of Broadside House and Portside Court, and the balustrades throughout Kent Wharf, as well as window frames.

(JB) Generally window frames are not considered, and would make no difference in this case. Advised there is an independent review on behalf of the LPA where any issues with the methodology can be raised.

(ClrM) In regard to construction concerns - why is Saturday construction work back on the agenda.

(AG) This accords with Lewisham's standard working hours in their good practice guidance.

(MS) This will be secured by condition.

(ClrM) The dust and dirt in the air from construction will be very considerable indeed. Can the applicant change their position on these basic mitigation measures, e.g. MVHR filter replacement, MVHR control upgrades to facilitate summer bypass control, and window cleaning.

(AG) A Construction Environmental Management Plan will be formally submitted to ensure mitigation would be sufficient.

(ClrM) The plans do not provide a prediction on noise levels, as a construction and demolition programme is not available – why not.

(Ardent) Construction Environmental Management Plan will address this, including mitigation.

(ClrM) Can the applicant propose more realistic and clear mitigation measures, rather than asking us to keep our windows shut.

(AG) This detail would be addressed in the Construction Environmental Management Plan.

(ClrM) How can the applicant justify their plans in terms of air quality and the associated health impacts, as well as the impact on climate change during a climate crisis.

(NH) - The volume of construction traffic would be less than the current use of the site, with less emissions. A Construction Environmental Management Plan will ensure measures to control emissions.

(ClrM) The planned construction will permanently destroy Creek habitats, including the Sand Martin/Kingfisher bank. How can the applicant justify this.

(MS) Advises that the statutory body Environment Agency requested the proposed intertidal terrace.

(JT) Bellway preferred to retain the Sand Martin bank, and its loss is sad.

(ClrM) If the Environment Agency believes a 6 metre shift landward is needed to allow for operational access and the intertidal terrace, how can just a 3 metre shift landward suddenly be sufficient to give operational access and an intertidal terrace.

(BC) Time was spent with the EA, and they now raise no objections.

(ClrM) What is the plan for funding of future river wall works/ repairs.

(MS) Will be secured in the s106.

(ClrM) Can the applicant provide any reassurances in relation to asbestos, which may be found during demolition.

(MS) A contamination condition will capture this.

(ClrM) Why did the applicant previously think it was acceptable to force the public to support the plans on their website, in order to find out more. The most recent letter sent to residents from Bellway/ Your Shout contained inaccurate information – it stated that there is "no increase in proximity to existing neighbours". In reality the buildings have moved 3 metres west, towards Kent Wharf. Misleading residents in this way is not a reasonable approach to public consultation. Why is the applicant content with pulling the wool over the eyes of residents and the Council.

(MA) Acknowledges an error in the consultation letter in regard to the 3m move, which was later corrected. There was an ability online to support the proposal, and to obtain further information. This is a part of the consultation process alongside the statutory consultation undertaken by the Council.

At 7:41, ClrM draws a close to reading the email responses, and invites attendees to ask verbal questions, on the proviso they wait for the Cllr's instruction. The issues raised included:

Obj 1: Microclimate, and health and safety.

Obj 2: Height of Block A1, exceeding Kent Wharf. Loss of sunlight concerns.

Obj 3: Many concerns, including biodiversity in Deptford Creek.

Obj 4: Agent of change matter in regard to Cockpit Arts – mitigation issues raised.

Obj 5: Daylight and sunlight, including modelling assessments; Microclimate.

Obj 6: Intertidal terrace, and why the bank has to be removed.

Obj 7: Funding to fix/ maintenance MVHR units.

Obj 8: Wind mitigation measures; and affordable housing/ segregation issues and 'poor doors'.

**Cllr closes the meeting at 8:18pm.**