

Valentines Court 'Local Meeting' minutes

Virtual Meeting at 7pm on 27.07.22

Attendees

The meeting was chaired by Cllr John Paschoud

LBL Planning was represented by Louisa Orchard (Principal Planning Officer).

The applicant team present were as follows:

- Chantelle Barker – Lewisham Homes
- Lis Rodrigues – Lewisham Homes
- Paul Bligh – Lewisham Homes
- Dominique Stephenson – Lewisham Homes
- Angela Bryant – Lewisham Homes
- Chloe Saunter – Montagu Evans (Planning)
- Olivia Powell – Montagu Evans (Planning)
- Nick Pond – Montagu Evans (Heritage)
- Eleni Mente – Levitt Bernstein
- Nicola Jaques – Levitt Bernstein
- Luke Francis - Concilio
- Jen Parker - TTP
- Alice Cook – Right of Light Consulting

The meeting was attended by approximately 20 local residents

Main areas of concern and questions raised

Daylight and Sunlight

1. Assurances were given by the architect during a consultation webinar (which was recorded) that the proposals would meet or exceed the RICS guidelines with regards to daylight and sunlight to existing homes. This was also repeated by various members of the consultation team.
 - Firstly, can you please explain why the submitted proposals deviate from that statement as there are a considerable number of windows that do not meet guidelines to existing homes, particularly to habitable rooms?
 - 16% of all windows within existing homes fail the VSC test, with 45 'habitable' rooms affected
 - 50%+ loss of winter sunlight to some homes
 - 7.5% of all rooms also fail the Daylight Distribution test.
 - Secondly, how have you ensured that impact to daylight and sunlight have been minimised?

- Thirdly, why do you believe this level of impact to be acceptable and how that has been judged as appropriate?
 - The impact to habitable rooms has been ignored with suggestion that a before/after ratio of 0.7 is close to the target of 0.8 and a mitigating factor. This is an additional 10% meaning an overall 30% loss. This seems neither fair nor reasonable.
- Fourthly, why were the consultation team not transparent with residents about the real impact of daylight and sunlight on their homes? They repeatedly confirmed they would meet guidelines over the last 2-3 years and not unreasonably impact existing residents.

2. Can planning permission be granted, whilst my property is not meeting the requirement to daylight based on these plans?

85 to 112 Valentine Court 4.2.23 All rooms with a requirement for daylight pass the daylight distribution test, with the exception of the rooms served by windows 105 and 112 at Flat 91, 117 at Flat 90, 121 at Flat 89, 127 at Flat 88, 153 at Flat 153, 154 & 157 at Flat 98 and 185 & 190 at Flat 93. There are however mitigating factors to consider.

All windows with a requirement for daylight at 85 to 112 Valentine Court pass the Vertical Sky Component test, with the exception of windows 112 at Flat 91, 113 & 117 at Flat 90, 121 at Flat 89, 127 and 131 at Flat 88, 137 at Flat 87, 146 at Flat 85, 152 & 153 at Flat 86, 157 at Flat 98, 158 at Flat 97, 163 at Flat 96, 168 & 173 at Flat 95, 179 at Flat 94, 184 at Flat 92, 185 at Flat 93, 197 at Flat 105, 198, 199 & 202 at Flat 104, 203 at Flat 103, 212 & 213 at Flat 102, 218 at Flat 101, 219 & 223 at Flat 99 and 224 at Flat 100

3. The document DC_22_127024-DESIGN-1099951.pdf, page 44 has a drawing of Block A and No.4 Gaynesford Road, in which the boundary position and access road are incorrectly drawn. The BRE viewing angle is shown as 25 degrees when in fact it varies above 25 degrees along the length of Block A. Block A should be lower in height to be compliant with viewing angle guideline. What is the process for correcting errors reported in design documents?

Overlooking, privacy and security

1. The residents who are most affected by the significant loss of daylight and sunlight in to their 'habitable' rooms, also have to additionally suffer a considerable loss of privacy from the windows/balconies of proposed blocks C+D facing the habitable rooms of Block 61-72 and 73-84 with a short distance between them. The play spaces (PE01, PE02, PE07 and PE08)

further impact this, as they are right outside the windows of their habitable rooms, partly at ground level.

- How have you ensured that overlooking and loss of privacy has been minimised, particularly by windows, balconies and the new play spaces?
 - How have you considered both the loss of daylight and sunlight alongside the loss of privacy to existing homes, particularly when a home is unreasonably impacted by both?
2. The proposals do not appear to attempt to address existing ASB/Crime within the Valentine Court estate, discussing only the designing out of crime from the new buildings.
- How have you worked with the Police, ASB team and Housing officers to gain understand of the existing issues within the estate?
 - How will the proposals seek to reduce ASB within the estate as a whole, and the wider community, not just the new building
 - Can you explain why a 'Targeting Hardening Review' did not take place for this proposal, which the ASB manager said it would
3. The Bampton Road is proposed to become a gate fobbed access to improve security. The current gate is never locked (although it used to be in the past) so it has become a shortcut for children walking to/from school and the wider community. Could you clarify what you are looking to do with this gate and outline what your vision is for how it will operate?
4. The proposed Block A does not seem to comply with DMLP Policy DM33.e which states. "Provide no significant loss of privacy and amenity, and no loss of security for adjoining residential development and private back gardens". How is the planning department assessing this requirement?

Perry Vale and Christmas Estate conservation area

1. Can you explain why your team have offered no explanation as to how the proposed building will "Preserve and enhance" the Conservation area which is a statutory requirement of the NPPF?

Trees, ecology, landscaping

1. The plans outline that some of the roads and pathways will be renewed, which was a key benefit outlined during the consultation, as they are currently in poor and sometime unsafe state. Wider repairs have been held back in places due these proposals.
- It is unclear which pathways within the estate are being retained as is, and which are being renewed. Can you please clarify this?

- Can you please explain what is happening with the existing car entrance by Block B, and the gate there that is currently in place (and unused)?
 - Can you outline the reasoning behind why the shared surfaces have not been included across the estate roads on the South Side, like they have on the North Side?
 - Based on how cars currently speed through the estate, it feels unsafe to have this mixed experience which could cause confusion for drivers and children playing.
2. Lewisham Council declared a climate emergency and we have just recorded record temperatures in London.
- How has the significant reduction in green space and mature trees been judged as appropriate?
 - Why do the new buildings not have solar panels to support green electricity generation? What green initiatives (eg grey water supplies, heat pumps etc.) are you including with the designs, and how do these specifically support the reduction of carbon emissions and other environmental protections?
 - Will you be offsetting the carbon emissions caused by the development?
3. Lewisham Homes struggle to maintain the existing green spaces and it's not clear if these plans have been discussed with Green Services to see if this is something they are capable of looking after effectively. Can you confirm how this has been considered?
4. The Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (PRA) was conducted in February 2022 and no further up to date surveying was completed. The Habitat survey should have covered from spring to late summer to cover the number of later species. Can you please explain why was this not done? The report also makes no mention of the Swifts that live in the estate during the summer months and the 4 nest boxes attached to the existing blocks that home them. These were installed by Lewisham Homes Breyer Group and Lewisham Swifts in 2017 during the last major works. Can you please explain why these were omitted? They should be considered as part of the proposals.

Traffic and parking

1. The [planning statement](#) you have submitted along side the application clearly states throughout that there will be "...provision of 9 active charging points (20%) and Passing Charging (80%) made available at 40 car parking space. However, on further questioning this have been changed to "9 spaces

will have either active or passive charge provision. The remainder will not.” which is a very different offer.

- A key benefit mentioned during the consultation process was the introduction of EV chargers for existing residents. However, at this point only 1 active charger has been confirmed in a disabled space for 1 of the new homes. Can you please confirm how many spaces will have active charging?
 - Currently, you mention passive chargers as if they have a benefit to residents. Can you confirm the process to change passive chargers to active chargers, so they can be used, and how demand for these is monitored so that chargers can be made active?
 - The plans appear to be based on parking permits being introduced within the estate, which is not confirmed. Are the new homes confirmed to be car free? If so, what does this mean in practice and how is it enforced?
2. These proposals were started before COVID-19 impacted our daily lives, and these has since been a significant shift to home working - with many business permanently closing offices. How have the revised proposal taken this in to consideration, both in terms of the design of the new homes but also how construction and noise will be managed to ensure those working from home in existing homes can remain productive?

Scale, massing and density and layout

1. All of the blocks on the south side currently face the same direction, but the orientation of proposed blocks C+D are reversed meaning they will be at odds with the existing buildings, so they will be out of keeping. Why has this decision been made, and how have you considered the impact of this decision on the existing homes?
2. The proposals will increase homes within the estate from 112 flats across 7 blocks to 153 homes across 11 blocks, a 37% increase. How has this been judged as appropriate? Was increasing the height of the existing blocks considered as an alternative to so many new blocks?
3. Document DC_22_127024-DESIGN-1099947.pdf, page 65 has contextual drawings of Block B showing how it fits in with existing housing but there are no contextual drawings of the north face of Block A in relation to houses in Gaynesford Road. This is a serious omission given the scale of development and impact on houses in Gaynesford Road. The document is also misleading when it states the boundary has “a large amount trees and vegetation”. In fact there is very little screening for 6 months of the year, and no screening from walkways and windows of upper floors of Block A which

will overlook all rooms in affected houses. Architects and councillors who have visited our gardens have expressed shock at the scale of the development. Can the planning department confirm it will make public the missing contextual information and drawings so that decision makers have full view of the design impact.

4. The proposed 4 storey mass of Block A will be visually intrusive and and would have an unacceptable overbearing impact on numbers 2-12 Gaynesford Road. Why would this ever be seen as acceptable by Lewisham Homes?

Equalities and Procedure Question

1. How are tenants individual disabilities accounted for when giving planning permission?