

APPENDIX 1

Local Meeting - Tuesday 21 June 2022

DC/22/125927 & DC/22/126038: Planning permission and listed building consent for the repair, restoration and change of use of the listed building at Lewisham Playtower, Ladywell Road SE13, as a multi-screen cinema together with the construction of a part 1/part 3 storey residential block and a part 1/ part 5 storey residential block to provide 33 self-contained flats, with the provision of 3 car and 88 cycle parking, bin storage, associated landscaping, boundary enclosures and plant room.

Participants:

- *Cllr Liz Johnston-Franklin (Chair)*
- *Alfie Williams (Case Officer)*
- *Mark Batchelor (Planning Agent)*
- *Malcolm McGregor (Architect)*

Minutes of the meeting

Cllr Johnston-Franklin (Chair) – Welcomes everybody to the meeting

Alfie Williams (AW) – Provides a brief introduction to the case and the purpose and rules of the meeting

Malcolm McGregor (MM) – Gives a presentation beginning with the history of the site and background to the application. Then provides an overview of the proposed development.

At this stage of the meeting the chair opened the meeting for questions and comments.

Questions and comments from members of the public are detailed below:

Q: Eleanor Keech (EK) – Asked a question regarding the impact to light and privacy to St Peters Gardens and whether the daylight/ sunlight report has regard to the impact to St Peters Gardens. Also raised concerns with the loss of trees.

Q: Ewa Szczepaniak (ES) – requested clarification over whether the Daylight and Sunlight Report considers the impact to the north elevation of St Peters Gardens

A: Mark Batchelor – States that an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Survey have been carried out and that the trees identified for removal are Category B and C trees so less valuable. Confirmed that Category A and some Category B trees would be retained and that a Tree Protection Plan has been submitted to protect those trees. Then noted that the removal of some trees is unavoidable in order to facilitate development and that 20 trees would be planted as mitigation.

MB then confirmed that the light impact was considered through pre-application and consultation stage. Then stated that the Daylight/Sunlight submitted with application finds that overall the impacts would be acceptable. Noted that it is difficult site to development due to site constraints but pointed to the town centre location where there are reduced expectations due to being tightly knit. Stated that the scheme is the best that can be achieved while delivering the quantum of development required to fund the restoration of the Playtower and pointed to the design of the buildings which steps back as the height rises.

Q. Chair – Stated that the boundary is very close and recommended that the applicant undertake a site visit to the neighbouring building.

A: MB – Confirmed that he was happy to undertake a visit site.

Q: ES – Asked why the daylight and sunlight analysis has been carried out without visiting the building?

A: MM – Answered that the plans for St Peters Gardens are publically available and that the report has been carried out in accordance with guidance.

Q: EK –Doubted the conclusions of the report given that no site visit was undertaken.

A: MM – Clarified that the assessment is based on the floor area and size of windows, which could be obtained from the plans.

Q: Stacey Lockyer (SL) – Asked for clarification over how light assessments are carried out.

A: MB – Answered that assessments are carried out using BRE guidance, which has recently been revised to be more in line with GLA guidance on context. The guidance sets out a process for understanding impact and uses 3D modelling and surveying to calculate. Stated that some councils employ specialists to review Daylight and Sunlight reports.

A: AW – Explained that the Council does not employ a specialist but that planning officers are very experienced at assessing Daylight and Sunlight Reports.

Q: SL – Stated that assumptions on the use of rooms may not be accurate due to the increase in working from home.

Q: Mark Upton (MU) – Asked a question regarding the impact to the nursery to the west.

A: MB – Confirmed that the impact has been considered with the flats designed so that the main living space is not orientated towards the nursery.

Q: MU – Responded that the playground would be overlooked which is problematic in winter as the trees would not provide screening.

A MB – Explained that the natural view would be over the playground towards the station and park.

A: MM – Confirmed that the main living spaces would face south.

Q: Ollie Yates (OY) – asked whether the nursery has been consulted

Q: MU – Confirmed that they have been consulted.

Q: ES – Asked a question regarding guidelines for privacy impacts.

A: MB – Confirmed that consideration has been given to the orientation and aspect of the flats. Stated that there is no fixed policy on privacy distances but that landscaping is proposed to help filter views.

Q; ES – Stated that dual aspect is not an option for current residents.

Q: SL – Asked whether the daylight and sunlight analysis will be updated to reflect changes to the layouts of the flats such as use as home offices?

A: MB – The analysis could be update if assumptions are incorrect

Q: SL – Stated that drawings should be produced showing the relationship between the windows of the new buildings and St Peters Gardens.

Q: MU – Asked whether there are balconies on the south side?

A: MM – Confirmed that there are balconies on the southern elevation.

Q: MU – Stated that overlooking to the nursery is a safeguarding issue that would have a negative impact on the business.

Q: ES – Noted that development would also affect house prices.

Q: Matt Shilston (MS) – Expressed support for the restoration of the Playtower but raised concerns with the loss of trees and impact to the light, privacy and outlook of neighbours.

Q: Tony Rich (TR) – Made comments in support of restoring the Playtower and noted that adverse impacts to St Peters Gardens are unavoidable given the proximity of that building to the site boundary.

Chair – Noted that there is a need for a site visit and to consider the safeguarding impact moving forward.

Q: EK – Confirmed that she would be happy to liaise on behalf of residents

A: AW – Agreed to pass on the relevant contact details.

The chair brings to meeting to a close at this stage and thanked everyone for taking the time to attend

End