

APPENDIX 1

LOCAL MEETING - 1-3 ASHBY ROAD

TUESDAY 6 JUNE 2023

DC/23/130234 - Construction of part single-storey and part two-storey roof extensions to create 3 self-contained flats, together with the conversion of an existing studio to provided additional living accommodation at 1-3 Ashby Road SE4, with associated cycle storage, refuse storage and a new green roof.

Participants:

- *Cllr Ayesha Lahai-Taylor (Chair)*
- *Alfie Williams (Senior Planning Officer)*
- *Ray Musmar (Applicant)*
- *Ellis Heath (Agent)*
- *Jan Donovan (Agent)*
- *Daniel Morris (Architect)*

Notes of the meeting

Chair – Welcomes everybody to the meeting

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

Ellis Heath (EH) – 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 (Q) from members of the public and the answers (A) given by the application team and Council Officers are detailed below:

Q: AM – Made a statement relating to the impact of the development to existing leaseholders and the lack of transparency from the owners when purchasing the flats. Also emphasised the stressful impact and financial expense of this process. Asked question relating to the disruption from the construction phase.

A: Jan Donovan (JD) – noted that the leaseholders concerns are civil matters and stated that the applicant would accept a condition for a Construction Management Plan (CMP).

A: Ray Musmar (RM) – added that the majority of the build would be off-site to minimise disruption with works on-site restricted to the internal fit out.

Q: SO – Agreed with the Appeal Decision that the impact to light in Flat 2 is a key consideration particularly the impact to the bedroom. Stated that the reduction to the scale of the extension is negligible and asked whether the modelling in the Daylight and Sunlight Report had taken into account the design of the skylight and relationship with the room.

A: EH – answered that the amendments to the design of the extension have been influenced by the light consultant in an effort to reduce the impact.

Q: SO – commented that the modelling has not been undertaken with benefit of a site visit to the flats.

A: JD – stated that the assumptions in the report take into account the design of the room, depth of the skylight.

Q: DD – offered to share internal photographs.

A: JD - advised that the photos can be shared via email and that the application team will prepare a note providing additional details of the impact to Flat 2.

A: AW - agreed that a note would be appropriate and can be published on the website.

Q: DC – Stated that leaseholders were advised that it would not be possible to extend at roof level when purchasing the flat then went onto note that bugs entering the rooflights are an issue in summer and raised concern that this would be made worse by the living roof. Also questioned whether the roof can accommodate the structural impact of the additional weight following advice from a structural surveyor.

A: JD – answered that the conversion of the building was undertaken utilising permitted development rights which would not allow upward extension. Also emphasised that planning policy supports sustainable development and urban greening. Ended by noting that construction and structural matters will be finalised post planning.

A: DM – stated that the living roof is intended to be a lightweight system in order to minimise the structural impact.

A: JD – added that the final details of the living roof system would be secured by a condition.

Q: DC – asked again about bugs entering through the rooflight.

A: JD – stated that they could investigate types of systems that would minimise this impact.

Q: MF – raised a concern with overlooking from the proposed balcony for Flat 9 due to its proximity to an adjoining commercial building and impact to future development that might come forward on that site.

A: AW – confirmed that the impact to neighbouring sites is a material consideration and would be addressed in Officers assessment of the development.

Q: SC – questioned why no site visit has been undertaken at any of the adjoining properties on Manor Avenue and raised concerns with the impact to the Victorian roofline within the Conservation Area and the loss of light to a neighbouring art studio.

A: AW – confirmed that a site visit has been undertaken which included entry to the application site and an assessment from external viewpoints within the vicinity of the site.

A: EH – stated that the appeal decision concluded that the extension would be compatible with the special character of the Conservation Area. Confirmed that the impact to the art studio has been assessed and that no significant impact is anticipated.

Q: SC – asked whether the application team have been inside the studio

A: EH – answered that they had not but were able to obtain details of the design and layout.

Q: GB – stated that a number of residents work from home and expressed concern with the potential disruption from noise and dust.

A: JD – answered that the finalised CMP will address matters such as dust and noise suppression and highlighted that no demolition is proposed, and that construction will mainly be off-site. Also accepted that there would be some impact but would be minimised as far as possible. Confirmed that the applicant intends to engage with residents throughout the construction process.

Q: JJ – questioned whether the harm identified in the appeal decision has been addressed and expressed concern that the CMP submitted with the application has little regard to residents. Also objected to holding the meeting online as it is not democratic.

A: EH – stated that the CMP submitted with the application is a draft version and that a full version would be secured by condition.

A: AW – agreed to feedback residents' preference for in-person meetings to senior colleagues.

Q: DD - highlighted that Flat 10 has been reduced in size due to the reduced size of the extension so would be below the policy requirement for a two-person dwelling.

A: JD – answered that the intention is that the flat would be a single-person studio

Q: DD - stated that this is not reflected on the plans as it shows a double bed.

Q: JM – expressed concern with how the residents have been treated and stated that the Council should consider getting legal advice. Also asked whether the cycle store would be located within the application site?

A: JD – confirmed that the cycle store would be within the site boundary as shown on the red outline on the site plan.

Q: JM – stated that the gates at the entrance to this stretch of Ashby Mews would endanger cyclist and pedestrian safety due to the location of the store.

A: JD – stated that this is management issue that can addressed post planning.

Chair – asked for clarification of where the cycles would be located.

A: EH: answered that the store would be located on the side elevation within the Mews

Q: MS: stated that the gates cannot be locked as there is a right of way.

Q: JM – disagreed and stated that they can be locked.

Q: KF – asked whether the applicant can guarantee that the development would be completed on schedule to minimise disruption.

A: JD – stated that it cannot be guaranteed as could be subject by matters not in the applicant's control.

Q: KF – stated that prolonged disruption would not be acceptable.

Q: MS – asked for an indication of when a decision would be issued

A: AW – answered that it is too early to say at this stage as Officers would need to reflect on the outcome of this meeting but assured residents that they would be invited to committee if there is a recommendation to approve.

Q: VM & PM – questioned the accuracy of the drawings and noted that there is no footpath access to the cycle store due to gates.

A: JD – confirmed that the applicant would investigate whether the location of the cycle store is practical.

Q: S – asked for confirmation that the impact to Royston Court had been modelled correctly as the building is comprised of flats and is not one dwelling.

A: JD – answered that the assessment has been carried out on individual windows and rooms but would check with the consultant that the modelling reflects the layouts. However, does not anticipate any errors.

Q: NJ: raised concerns with construction phase and the proposed loss of external space for bin stores. Added that there are potential impacts to the safety of children and considerable disruption to people who exclusively work from home.

A: JD – highlighted previous answers on the construction impact and reiterated the applicant's commitment to work with residents. Accepted that there would be a loss of external space but noted that there is policy requirement to increase housing delivery.

Q: JM – expressed concern that the impact to long views across the mews have been ignored and questioned whether the site plan is accurate.

A: JD – agreed to check the red line boundary but understand that it is correct.

A: AW – confirmed that the impact on key views is a material consideration and will be considered.

A: JD – stated that the Heritage Statement includes an assessment of the impact to key views.

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

End