

Virtual Local Meeting Minutes (Microsoft Teams Format):

Leegate Shopping Centre SE12: DC/22/126997

Meeting date: 10 January 2023 (7 - 9pm)

Proposal:

Proposed development at Leegate Shopping Centre SE12, bounded by Burnt Ash Road, Eltham Road, Leyland Road and Carston Close, for the demolition of existing buildings, and the construction of buildings up to 15-storeys (including basement level) to provide a comprehensive mixed use development including residential (Use Class C3), flexible commercial floorspace (Use Class E), a community centre (Use Class F2) and a public house (Sui Generis), together with associated public realm, landscaping and highways improvements, vehicular access, car parking and servicing arrangements, cycle parking and stores, and all other ancillary works.

Panel:

Chair: Cllr Rathbone (CllrR)

Applicant team:

Galliard

Jonathan Bloom (JB)

Phillipa Dalton (PD)

Knight Frank

Emma Gill (EG)

Rolfe Judd

Anil Pallan (AP)

Euan MacGillvray (EM)

The Townscape Consultancy

Lewis Eldridge (LE)

Steer

Simon Edwards (SE)

Fourth Street

Tom Agar (TA)

Fabrik

Jane Banks

LBL Planning

Geoff Whittington (GFW)

Residents

47 present

Cllr Rathbone opened the meeting at 7pm and introduced the proposal. The Chair explained the reason for the meeting, and then introduced the panel.

The applicants are invited to give a presentation of the scheme.

The presentation ends at 7:38.

The Chair reads through the key themes, including:

- Scale and height of development;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity: Sunlight/ daylight; microclimate
- Public services;
- Construction issues, including noise and timeframes;
- Highways matters;
- Consultation issues.

Neighbour questions received in advance of the local meeting were then addressed, and attendees were invited to submit text based questions during the meeting.

1) Height and Scale

15 storeys is far too much. This should be a maximum of 11 storeys to match the existing apartment blocks and considering the rest of the road being maximum at 2 to 3 storeys of family houses. How do you address the topic of the tower heights (apart from the profit perspective) to calm the emotions which are apparent in the local community?

(AP) Acknowledged there has been an agreement based on previous masterplan principles, with tests on lower heights. 15-storeys worked the best. Heights have been carefully modelled, creating high quality for new homes – exemplary development in Lee Gate.

(PD) Determination of height is fully justified in terms of impacts – reference to profit is incorrect, and is based on the need for additional affordable housing and to maximise the amount of housing. Well designed taller building, and will enable the scheme to deliver 35% affordable housing.

(EG) Provides further context in regard to history and the former density matrix in the old London Plan, replaced by design led approach. Draft Lewisham Local Plan identifies Lee Green as a place for intensification and suitable for tall buildings. The draft documents have informed the justification and analysis for the 15-storey building.

- 2) *I am writing on behalf of **Lee Fair Share**, a local community group and Time Bank running since 2004, with over 80 local members, the majority of whom are over 65 years. As a Time bank we believe in sharing our time and skills with each other and in helping promote good community spirit and involvement. We have discussed the development plans over a number of years and while we welcome the prospect of Leegate being redeveloped our members have serious concerns about the current plans. We have two main concerns - the height of the proposed buildings; and the need for more detail about the provision of a community centre and other areas where local residents could mix and socialise.*
- 3) *We would like Galliard Homes to explain how the proposed blocks of up to 15 storeys would fit in with existing local buildings. A mock up image above by My London shows how the development could look from the Lee Green Cross Roads and to most people it looks out of keeping both in height and in style. Do Galliard Homes acknowledge that the nearby Leybridge Court buildings which are 11 storeys and set in landscaped areas and are not bunched together should not be taken as a justification for building even higher blocks?*
- 4) *Our members fear that the tall buildings are very close together and will make the pedestrian & shopper experience very unattractive and not sustain shops and businesses nor support community interaction & mixing. They want any new development to provide friendly, green public spaces with good sunlight and which feel safe after dark and are fully accessible for those with mobility issues. Can Galliard Homes explain if their current plans meet these requirements?*

(PD) Places for community to mix and enjoy – detailed thought has gone into making the landscaped spaces attractive for all members of the community.

In response to public consultation, a new community centre will be provided – ground floor space, modern and energy efficient. Will be secured in the s106 Agreement.

(PD) A lot of visualisation and modelling works has been undertaken, with verified images shown in the CGI submissions.

(LE) Townscape – the process included choosing 19 views that were agreed with officers – photographs and a computer model of the buildings were included to allow for an assessment of potential impacts upon townscape and heritage, including locally listed buildings. Addresses characteristics of the

north part of the junction and volumes of existing buildings. Appropriate setbacks proposed.

Questions from the Lee Manor Society

5. The Mayor of London's London Plan of 2021 (Chapter 3 Design Policy D9 Tall Buildings) calls for tall buildings to 'make a positive contribution to the local townscape in terms of legibility, proportions and materiality.'

It also calls for the base of tall buildings to 'have a direct relationship with the street, maintaining the pedestrian scale, character and vitality of the street. Where the edges of the site are adjacent to buildings of significantly lower height, there should be an appropriate transition in scale.'

How does Galliard think its proposals meet these requirements?

(AP) Positive contribution – delivering good design for tall buildings is paramount, and so the scheme has been through a thorough design process, including presentations to DRP. Base of the building is important – design materiality and sense of scale; activation with street; articulated entrances; activate lively public realm – inclusive spaces. Transition in heights to the southern boundary to reflect the domestic heights to the south of Carston Close.

6. Galliard's Design and Access Statement announces the redevelopment will 'respond sensitively to the local historic context and neighbouring heritage assets'.

In what way do the proposals meet these objectives?

(LE) There was a lot of work done in understanding the baseline conditions and how the surrounding context is now - a lot of work was done picking up on the details the character of those buildings but also the wide space of the junction and how to resolve that so that the height of the buildings responds to the scale at that junction and the civic nature of Eltham Road and then steps back towards a more domestic scale further south.

(AP) The Design and Access Statement goes into great detail on the historic influence on the modern designs that we've done - great care taken to ensure that some of the local character has been incorporated into the design proposal. Material choices, detailing and space allocation have all been carefully considered to ensure the development sits well in the local surroundings and brings all the

benefits it does to the local community. Heights have been reduced in certain areas in relation to viewpoints.

7. Galliard's environmental consultants, iceni, state that the redevelopment will represent 'a high quality addition to the local context of the conservation area, enhancing the character of its landscape setting.' Landscape implies a rural setting. It is difficult to see how a solid block of retail outlets and homes rising to 15 and 13 storeys will contribute to the Lee Manor Conservation Area's landscape setting.

How does the redevelopment meet this landscape ambition?

(LE) Considers that IcenI has been misquoted - the consultants have always understood that this is part of a townscape setting, not rural. Townscape is generally understood to be a part of the wider landscape and in this case the building responds to its townscape setting well including the townscape setting of the Lee Manor conservation area to the West - there's a gap between them when you look out of views from Taunton Rd or Hedgley Road, you will see the development. A lot of work was done to ensure that the flank of the building, both A1 and the lower element that steps down would be well detailed. There is a compositional value to the buildings in those views. There is a place there for a tall building.

8. Galliard's consultants, Kanda, conclude that local residents support the proposed scheme because only 59 per cent of respondents raised issues such as the height of corner building.

How can a 59 per cent figure be dismissed as an insignificant minority of respondents?

Has Kanda been sacked for its mathematical incompetence?

(LE) Absolutely not dismissing that number - there were fewer submissions for the second round of neighbour consultation. Understands there will be some concerns regarding height.

9. Neighbour Impact

If the plans are passed there will be much disruption to people's lives with demolition, building works, delivery of building materials etc and our older members are worried about the impact of dust and noise on their health. It's very likely there will be asbestos in the old buildings so how will this be dealt with safely?

(PD) This is a common question. Galliard has a history of delivering complex development in the heart of communities. The application includes information on practical and construction and environmental measures to safeguard against disruption and adverse impacts to the community. Outline CEMP has been submitted - sets out measures including noise, dust and pollution. Planning conditions will be imposed to address these matters. The construction team would be professional and responsible.

10. How are all the negative impacts of redevelopment to be mitigated?

(PD) It will be impossible to regenerate to such extent without a degree of temporary disruption. Will seek to minimise the impacts where they occur – will want to complete the works without unnecessary delays.

11. What is the estimated timetable for demolition and reopening of the new Leegate area? How long would the community be without a Community Centre?

(PD) 53 months – complex build. Will be two-phased development, northern part will be developed first. Completion date of late 2030.

12. How will the developers minimise noise and disruption (during construction)?

(PD) The build will be managed, but there will be opportunities for residents to complain should noise and disturbance be excessive.

13. Highways

What assurance can you give the residents of Leyland Road and nearby streets that those (almost) 600 proposed apartments will not be using Leyland Road for parking due to very few parking places proposed for the property? 60 parking places for 600 apartments is a very risky number.

(SE) The London Plan requires low parking ratios in areas that have good access to public transport. Future residents would be unable to apply for parking permits. The Council is working on extending CPZs in the area.

14. The pavements from Leyland Road side are very narrow - I can imagine car parking there blocking the pavements for pedestrians. Can you guarantee they won't be blocked?

- (SE) Across the site, number of deliveries and servicing have been forecast by surveys. Four loading bays to be provided to accommodate servicing vehicles – sufficient provision. Site management for deliveries – designated areas.

15. Commercial & Community Matters

Will the existing commercial businesses within the Leegate Centre be given the opportunity to move to proposed development commercial spaces for similar rent as now?

- (TA) Cannot guarantee the same rent levels as existing – units are in poor condition, low footfall, poorly sized. Will support existing tenants, identifying premises elsewhere, rent free period for those who return.

16. Why do you propose another supermarket in the development? It will be situated in front of the massive Sainsbury, close to the big Lidl not so far from Lewisham Centre which also will be redeveloped. It's obvious the area doesn't need another big supermarket. I would prefer the space be utilised for a more diverse array of amenities (charity shops, fitness/yoga centres, social spaces, workshop studios, cafes, independent shops etc.)

- (TA) Small basket food store – will meet a local need following public consultation. Area is underserved by food stores. Will assist in addressing the additional demand on shopping in the area from new residents and workers.

17. How will local businesses and services based in Leegate be enabled to continue operating locally during the proposed redevelopment, or are we looking at the loss of up to 1,000 jobs to the local area.*

- (TA) Commercial strategy sets out practical measures – inevitable there will be some disruption during the build process but will be mitigated.
- (PD) Communication with the tenants is important, and will continue going forward. Good package of support put together, and want existing tenants to return following completion. Job losses – Galliard has a good record with apprenticeships and local labour.

18. *The Leegate was built as an ambitious centre for the economy of Lee Green, many of us remember it in happier times. How can the community have confidence that the current development plans will enable the range of businesses and services including independents, small businesses, places of worship and charitable services to thrive.*

(PD) If consented, important that the commercial units thrive. Desire to see the commercial units occupied by characterful, distinctive if possible local businesses – longevity of occupancy, want to avoid a high turnover of tenants. Refers commercial marketing strategy.

19. *Lee Fair Share is a regular user of the existing the Community Centre in Leegate. It has very limited space and facilities for its users and the toilets are upstairs which is not convenient for less mobile users. We welcome the commitment by Galliard to ground floor space for a new Community Centre but we would like more details about its size and facilities. Can Galliard Homes explain what provision is proposed for a new Community Centre and the other public areas where people could mix and relax.*

(PD) Modern purpose built facility, energy efficient and highly accessible, located in a key position. Flexible space for community groups.

ClrR advises the last of the written questions has been addressed, and that the audience may ask questions via the chat room. Questions included:

There are no tall or 15 storey buildings locally or between Lee Green, Hither Green, Blackheath etc these tower buildings do not fit with the traditional local merchant and residential scale.

15 storeys sets a dangerous precedent - if the Sainsbury's site is developed at a later date they could argue for stepping up from 15 to 18 or more.

It's completely incomprehensible why the council decided that 15 floors are better.

(AP) Talks through the DRP process. In terms of massing, it was agreed that 15-storeys appeared more elegant form, compared to 12-storeys.

What is the definition of affordable housing as opposed to affordable rents.

(PD) London Plan defines affordable housing, two tenures (Social Rent and Intermediate). 35% is proposed 70/30 split, has had early discussions with Registered Providers to manage the homes.

(EG) Affordable homes will be tenure blind and secured in perpetuity.

Is going up to 15-storeys required to accommodate affordable housing, and would it reduce if the building was reduced to 12-storeys.

(PD) Not the only reason, there are also good design reasons, but yes it is key – the scheme has to be viable to deliver the affordable housing. Addresses issues with the St Modwen's scheme. The scheme is very finally balanced, particularly with build cost issues.

Were locally listed buildings taken into account in terms of the impacts of the very significant height of the 15-storey corner building.

(LE) All heritage assets, including locally listed buildings were assessed – none in Lewisham. Special Area of Character was also considered.

Will the community centre accommodate a teaching room.

(PD) Too early to advise at this stage.

Will the 15-storey proposed set a precedent for other future developments in the area – Sainsbury's site

(PD) Each site is considered on its own merits – the same rigorous interrogation would be required.

I'm concerned about the lighting as there isn't obvious placements in the cgi-the pedestrianised walk through looks narrow and looks like it could be quite dark unless a bright day; at night how can it be lit well for safety without light pollution for residents

(JB) As the proposals move forward, lighting will be assessed. Measures to ensure no light spillage.

The Council reversed the reference to maximum height of 15 storeys in its Reg 19 version of LP and reverted to 12 storeys.

(EG) The Tall Buildings study published by Lewisham identified the site as being suitable for tall buildings – the Addendum makes reference to 12-storeys, and the draft Lewisham Local Plan refers to 10-15 storeys in Lee Green. Technical evidence against policy requirements has been provided as part of the submission.

Potential for a new Conservation Area within RB Greenwich – why do Galliard consider the development should override their assessment.

(JB) Discussions have been held with Greenwich officers and Cabinet member.

(LE) Doesn't know of the current status of discussions about a new conservation area – advises that the Old Tiger's Head IS in Lewisham.

(EG) No further updates of discussions.

(LE) Has seen RBG's objection to proposal.

Has Galliard considered the impact on the houses right at the end of Taunton Road – reduction in sun/ daylight

(PD) An assessment has been made to all local properties, and no exceedances identified for Taunton Road properties.

I'm concerned about the overload of the sewers in Burnt Ash Road and Eltham Road - has Thames Water done a survey and can we see it?

(EG) TW have been consulted are no objections have been raised in regard to sewage capacity.

SuD's measures addressed.

Has the impact of tall buildings on views from Manor House gardens and other green spaces been taken into account? Blackheath society is also concerned about the 15-storey building viewed from Blackheath village

(LE) Both those views were considered (View 5) – development will be seen from Manor House Gardens. Work was done to ameliorate this in the design of A1.

Views from Blackheath (Views 17 and 18) – A1 Building is just visible in backdrop, small amount of harm, which is in line with Historic England's assessment – low degree of less than substantial harm in that particular view, which requires an assessment of the public benefits.

Is the density not too high for a District Centre in a PTAL 3 location. Claiming a design led approach is not a get-out-of-jail free card.

(EG) Design-led approach on highly sustainable sites as per the London Plan. The proposed density is appropriate.

The design team has referred to the scheme going twice to the Design Review Panel but provide no detail of how or if there was any response to their comments. Please could you release a summary of their comments.

(EG) Planning Statement provides an overview of the responses.

St Modwen advised the development would be conducted in 3 phases – why is the current proposal being done in one go.

(PD) It will be undertaken in two phases, and will seek ways to minimise impacts. There are obvious advantages to building as quickly as possible.

Will you retain the heritage panel on the corner.

(JB) Yes it will remain.

Will you market the homes overseas.

(PD) The private homes will be marketed as widely as possible – vision/ anticipation is locally driven.

(JB) Feedback is that people want to live and work in Lee Green.

The business tenants have been promised a 12month rent free period to return. However, what are they meant to do from the moment construction begins until the completion date? Not many businesses can continue to operate if they do nothing for 4-5 years. Also, many are worried by additional guarantees that will be needed to actually take on new leases making them unviable.

(TA) Applicant team has been working closely with the Traders and are committed to continuing this. Identifying premises for relocation both temporarily and permanently.

How many extra doctors and school places will be funded by the developers' NCIL and other payments.

(EG) Estimated CIL contribution of £4.4m.

CIL plus solution – public services on site, ie medical centre.

GFW sets out next steps

Cllr closes the meeting at 9pm.

Other questions that were raised but insufficient time to address included:

They don't care. They're maximising income. This is an exercise they are going through because they have to

The need for social housing cannot justify the permanent damage to everyone's lives the current proposal will cause.

The architectural design is totally boring why can't they take this opportunity to design something exceptional adding features to the area The Tigers head is not a design feature for future modelling

Please would Galliards show some recognition of the special quality of this part of Lewisham in terms of the built environment.

How high is needed and how many units could be delivered if respectable 25% affordable housing was provided (Lewisham has achieved 23% average over last 10 years)?

- 1. St Modwens 11 stories proposal offered 24% affordable housing, not 10% as claimed;*
- 2. Lewisham's Tall Building Addendum, which has been quoted, recommended 10-12 storeys in Lee Green, not 15*

53 months of construction. Completion backend of 2030? Considering the local flood of recent days is causing increased congestion and associated pollution, how can Galliard plan for this in this area?

pre submitted questions have taken up almost this entire meeting. The opportunity to pre submit questions was not referenced on council correspondence about this meeting. Was it only offered to friends and family?

It's a stitch up between Lewisham Council and Galliards and this is a PR exercise they think they have to go through so they can sell it to 'the community'

Will the art wall not encourage graffiti?

Your timetable suggests building work will not start until mid-2025. Is this so?

Who will maintain the square and greenery?

Existing businesses and services need much more practical detail on proposals to continue trading and offering services- current proposals (and answers today) are inadequate. Not only this with over 13,500 users this is a big dislocation for this very lovely diverse community... Please advise.

Many of the businesses and services are very local businesses, they need to trade in the immediate area. Practically how is this going to happen?

Good points made businesses, local organisations - I would like to ask whether they can carry out the development in phases to allow businesses and organisations currently on site to be able to operate while the area is being developed and built out?

In regard to Rights to Light who has checked the analysis. Affected adjoining owners should be aware that compensation may be available if the new development blocks light of another property under certain criteria

I was quoted £350/400000 for a two bed flat how's that righting people being priced out of the area

please provide the evidence that people can/want/ will be able to afford this development.....not just affordable housing, but all. Please provide the data behind your statement.