



The Local Meeting was held virtually on Microsoft Teams. Fifty Residents logged on to the call. Councillor Sophie Davis Chaired the meeting. Senior planning officer Samuel James represented the Planning Service, and the applicant's planning agent Patrick Reedman of DHA, and architect Tom Wainwright represented the applicant.

First Councillor Davis introduced the meeting to discuss planning application DC/22/127431. The purpose of this meeting was to allow residents to ask questions of, and put their views to, the developer and Council officers. The meeting format was explained, including how the questioning process would work, following the Planning Agent's presentation.

The applicant's architect gave an overview of the scheme, and then Councillor Davis started to take questions. The discussion is summarised below:

Resident asked for clarification as to which application was being considered, as it was unclear to them due to the previous refusal, which was currently under appeal. Other questions relating to which of the appeal and the current proposal would take precedence, should both be approved, how many times an applicant can re-apply, and whether councillors had walked the site.

Planning Officer clarified application being discussed was DC/22/127431 received in July 2022. DC/21/123090 was refused in May 2022 and this application is currently being appealed by the Planning Inspectorate. If the appeal were allowed and the current application granted then both permissions would stand, there are no limits on re-submitted applications so long as there are material changes in subsequent submissions. Cllr Davis confirmed she and Cllr Harding had visited the site.

Questions were then taken in themes as follows:

**1. Principle of development and provision of housing, including affordable housing**

- Resident expressed concern at lack of affordable/social housing proposed and viability of the proposal.
- Resident asked why a block of flats is proposed and whether this is a suitable housing for this site.
  - Applicant's agent explained that it was not financially viable to provide affordable housing on the site. Planning officer confirmed viability reviews had been carried out, and the lack of affordable housing proposed was policy compliant in this respect.

**2. Urban design**

- Resident asked how the impact of the proposal on surrounding area and resident's quality of life is assessed, and expressed concern at the impacts.
- Concern raised towards the impact to Locally listed building Taymount Grange.
- Concern that proposal is too close to site edges, impact on openness.
- Resident asked whether the proposal could be made smaller/more sympathetic, or would that make the whole scheme unviable.
  - Planning agent confirmed that in their view a smaller scheme wouldn't be viable, and that planning policy dictates sites need to be optimised.

- Architect explained that building had been designed to respond and respect the Locally listed building and surrounding area and neighbouring residents amenity.

### **3. Impact to amenity**

- Concern raised to loss of daylight to neighbouring windows and increased sense of enclosure and impact to quality of life.
- Concern raised that flats are already experiencing poor light levels due to the vegetation that is on site. Requested applicant/councillors and officers come to the neighbouring flats to see the impacts.
- Concern raised to impacts from the roof terrace, as this would be disruptive and cause overlooking.
- Concerns regarding loss of views due to the new building.
  - Applicant's agent explained how planning policy dictates impacts on neighbours must be reasonable, and this will mean that there are impacts, however impacts must be demonstrated to be acceptable. For example the Small Sites Supplementary Planning Document sets some guidance as to what is considered acceptable impacts when developing on sites such as the application site and BRE Guidance sets out tests for daylight/sunlight impacts.
  - Applicant's agent explained that there was sufficient distance between directly facing windows in line with SPD guidance, and that where there were closer distances, these were not directly facing habitable windows. The terrace has been designed to minimise overlooking, and a management plan would likely be conditioned for this.

### **4. Transport impacts**

- Question of how construction impacts would be managed, as it is already difficult to manage traffic
- Questions RE: impacts to car parking, as there are existing issues.
  - Applicant's agent explained that a detailed construction management plan would be produced and assessed by the council prior to start of works if permission was granted.

### **5. Natural environment**

- How trees to be retained would be protected during construction?
  - Applicant explained that arboricultural assessment had been carried out, and this is included in the submission. Trees to be retained will be protected through a tree protection plan. An extensive landscape plan is proposed to replace those that are lost.

### **6. Process**

- Concern was raised at the lack of pre-application engagement from the developer to local residents, and it was highlighted that residents felt disrespected due to this.

To close the meeting Councillor Davis confirmed all written objections would be considered by officers when making their recommendation, and that residents can write to local councillors, as

well as those on the planning committee, once an agenda is published, to outline their concerns again. Residents were invited to send further comments or questions in writing.

**Meeting closed 21:10.**

**Full Microsoft Teams chat below:**

Can you stop sharing your screen so we can see people?

Have these questions been shared in advance, or am I just unable to see them in the chat?

Please can you stop sharing your screen? Thanks.

Is it impossible to stop sharing the screen? Seeing thumbnail images of people talking doesn't feel optimal.

like 2

Affordable housing not the same as social housing

like 4

Louise Glanville (PSY - Postgraduate Researcher) (External) was invited to the meeting.

Agreed - the building works on Knapdale close were horrific for residents

like 1

constant noise, trespassing on our property, damage to our building from pile driving foundations

We're on the ground floor east corner of FC and this will be dreadful for us after Knapdale!

Agreed, Jess - the mocked-up image shown as a "view from Taymount Grange" was also misleading. It wasn't a view from Taymount Grange; it was a view from halfway down towards the garages behind Taymount Grange. The development will be INCREDIBLY dominant from Taymount Grange (and Forest Croft).

like 3

Also trees are not enough to obscure the impact of a four storey concrete building. 😞

like 3

Completely agree with Chris - that photograph was very misleading as a view from Taymount Grange as residents would experience it

like 2

Davis, Cllr Sophie and James, Samuel I know we need to focus on this application but once questions are asked, it would be useful to provide some guidance to residents on Lewisham's plans to contest the appeal from the first application and how residents can support the council's refusal on this application.

What is SPD? James, Samuel please don't use abbreviations we don't know what they mean

like 1

(In case anyone else was wondering, Small Sites SPD = Supplementary Planning Document )

supplementary planning document

thank you

[Yesterday 20:43] Davis, Cllr Sophie

<https://lewisham.gov.uk/myservices/planning/policy/adopted-local-plan/spds/small-sites-spd>

Small sites SPD

The Small Sites Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) adopted in October 2021 gives detailed design guidance on small sites development within the borough.

Well said Hannah

like 6

Hear hear Hannah!

Absolutely!  
like 1

Yes, Hannah!

Thats ridiculous

so what is the distance to taymount grange then?

The height is as much of a problem as proximity. Particularly given it is set into a hill.

no balconies, just a roof terrace!

Not all the balconies are removed and there is a roof terrace to overlook into the neighbours Patrick Reedman  
like 1

Yes what about the roof terrace?

I have asked for a window to window measurement in writing several times now - this information is never made available.

Mine is a kitchen window

Well said Hannah! We already need to have lights on almost all the time in our ground floor flat because of the overground vegetation blocking light. This development would mean lights on constantly and with the rising energy costs that's unacceptable

The render of the access to light is completely false

The issue is all Forest Croft windows alongside this building are habital windows  
like 2

Please can we clarify the distance to Taymount Grange before this meeting concludes as Jack has asked?  
like 5

Yes what is the actual distance?

Totally agree with Holly!

Yes good point Gwennan!

**Davis, Cllr Sophie**

<https://lewisham.gov.uk/myservices/planning/policy/adopted-local-plan/spds/small-sites-spd>

Councillor Davis, there are some really important questions in the chat - please make sure these are addressed!  
like 1

And the copper beech tree you remove which you could incorporate into the design?  
like 2

No other block on Taymount Rise has a roof terrace  
like 4

What about the lack of parking provision?  
like 1

Parking on Taymount Rise is already extremely difficult and with the latest proposal suggesting a number of 3 bed family units we can assume there will be more cars for family use

I would like responses on the servicing of the development - the road is already very tight there - your scheme doesn't seem to have enough space for delivery vehicles unloading.

Two parking spaces is not enough for a construction this size.

I missed part of the call but don't think the tiny number of parking spaces has been addressed.

If they're primarily designed as family units it's unrealistic to expect the desired residents to not have cars and parking on Taymount Rise is already over capacity and causes major congestion to the street

the point about 10 trucks a day has been ignored. There are so many kids coming up and down this narrow road all day every day. It is a recipe for disaster.  
like 2

Access for emergency vehicles, delivery vans, dustbin lorries etc etc is a huge problem

Sophie - thank you for moderating. The question that was never answered for me is around parking. The hill up to the proposed flats is very steep. It is very likely that many residents will want a car. Taymount Rise is already bumper to bumper filled with cars. This is very hazardous for pedestrians and other cars coming up. The small number of parking spaces does not seem realistic.  
like 1

Hello Sarah here I didn't really get an answer re the logistics of getting construction materials, cement lorries cranes etc up the very narrow very steep Taymount Rise.

We already suffer from dangerous parking and driving at the top of Taymount Rise - the front wall of Forest Croft has been demolished twice in four years by vehicle collisions caused by poor parking - we are concerned that when this development happens it might be a person.  
like 2

Risk to safety of residents, lots of children play in the roundabout and area along with pedestrians and cyclists. Trucks already get stuck coming round the roundabout. What will 1-10 trucks for 5 months then 13 months with 1-8 trucks per week do to the safety of residents.

like 3

Please can you address the parking questions and access for building works vehicles? Davis, Cllr Sophie

like 1

Also the parking survey was done during a less busy time (school holidays). It is not realistic or accurate.

Screening won't stop noise, though!

like 1

and the first one was done in lockdown! 😊

Re. Roof terrace.

Noise carrying is the main concern with regards to the roof terrace. Being set back a meter wont address this problem

like 2

screening won't stop the noise indie its so loud on the hill top sound travels

like 1

Was the removal of the copper beech tree anything to do with this application?

like 3

There will also I assume be light pollution as a roof terrace will have lights on top

Seconding Nick's question.

Agree with Gwennan - noise pollution could also be a huge issue, especially since we all have single glazing at Taymount Grange and cannot change that due its status

Was the tree survey done before the mature coper beech tree on this property was cut down?

We can hear neighbours on Forest Croft balconies, the noise from a communal roof terrace and unit balconies will not be great for the community.

I'm concerned about the impact of noise on Taymount Grange, both due to the proximity and the roof terrace. The windows at Taymount Grange are single glazed and we already suffer unavoidable noise disturbance. Please could you give more information on how the proposed development has been assessed in regards to this?

We already hear people on their balconies on the Forest Estate

Thirthing Nick's question re the copper tree

When the existing property on the site has the occasional garden party late at night it disturbs all of us at the front of Taymount Grange so we already know how noise travels  
like 2

Sophie can i make a final observation?

What assessment has there been on foundational drilling on both of our properties?  
like 2

Can we please ask whether the developers including Patrick were consulted on a mature tree being cut down on that property either verbally with the current resident or via any other communications  
like 2

already high density area, is this not putting us at risk of town cramming. Risk to our building's foundations and stability - already had pipe leaks in that corner.

disappointing that we have less than 60 minutes to meet today when there are so many additional questions that people want to ask.  
like 1

Flats at the front of Taymount Grange are single aspect but also very small - one bed or studio only on the side nearest the development - there is no room you can move into to escape being overlooked.

I think the applicant and the council need to consider that if the development is trying to squeak through by being technically the right size and technically far enough from buildings, then local residents are going to pay a lot of attention to the technicalities of the application which has listed incorrect heights of neighbouring buildings, taken parking surveys on bank holidays, includes images from the highway at favourable angles and no images from neighbouring buildings that will be affected, no account of what the views look like when the leaves fall from the trees, and on and on. Could the council please consider that local residents would be very supportive of a number of lower rise family homes on the site, not a block of flats.  
like 1

Briar (Guest)completely. Noise has a serious impact on health of all and child development

Please can extra time be given to address the parking questions? Davis, Cllr Sophie

Window to window measurement between taymount grange and the new building still not confirmed  
like 1

parking not addresses wither

Attention is seriously disrupted by noise and a large proportion of residents work from home like 1

issues with construction traffic not addresses

Briar (Guest)Flats at the front of Taymount Grange are single aspect but also very small - one bed or studio only on the side nearest the development - there is no room you can move into to escape being overlooked.

Agree - due to the size and single aspect of my flat the proposed plans will have a huge impact.

What about the copper beach tree that was on the original site that was cut down in Jan 2021 during the pre planning stages? I

UNACCEPTABLE not answering Hannah's question!

like 1

The big questions remain unanswered?!!!!!!

We're waiting for answers

NOW

Let's carry on

happy to continue

like 1

yep!

Please do provide written answers. Window to window measurement between Taymount Grange and new development please.

like 1

[Just to reiterate, I am very supportive of creating more homes and getting the balance right between existing homes and development. However I feel like my home and quality of life is collateral damage. I would be very happy for you to come and visit my flat to experience the negative difference the development would make.

well done Hannah!!

left the chat.

Thank you both so much

Thanks Hannah!

I would like to see a proper written document answering all the questions in the chat - emailed or posted to everyone.

Councillors and officers are more than welcome to visit Forest Croft and Forest Croft flats - there is an open invitation - just contact me

Question for the Council: the density of this development seems above the council's density range and it appears to be incredibly high in the context of Taymount Rise. I'm interested to know your view on this since it could be seen as an opportunity for other developers to fill any backyards in the area. Are you concerned about the change in character and the liveability of the place?

like 1