

Local Meeting Minutes

17 July 2023

19:30-20:30 pm (via MS Teams)

DC/23/130258 - Apollo Business Centre

Attendees:

Chair: Councillor Will Cooper

Dean Gibson LB Lewisham

Applicant team: Emily Keenan (DP9), Simon Wojtowicz, Clare Callow, Jamie Connors (Transport), Daniel Sumner (Daylight/Sunlight), Lam Yuk Ming (Architect).

Residents: Martin North, Mary-Ann North, Kevin.

Apologies : Councillor Hau-Yu Tam ; Councillor Rudi Schmidt.

1. Chair invited participants to introduce themselves and set out agenda for meeting.

2. Lam did 15 minute presentation of scheme.

Questions from Cllr Cooper and residents:

Q1: How will scheme benefit local area.

Applicant response: Will improve visual amenity of existing site ; will remove HGV movements to site ; will provide significant amount of affordable housing ; will improve public realm – widening footway/cycleway ; will bring retail space and possible community space to site ; will improve junction safety; will improve bus route.

Q2. Will the development connect to a Heat Network.

Applicant response: Will connect to Heat Network if there is one in place and there will be a back-up plan in place in the event no Heat Network connection is possible.

Q3. Concerned about student behaviour – how will students be managed.

Applicant response: A management plan will be put into place to manage behaviours of students; The benefit of PBSA is that it allows for a management plan to be put into effect (whereas ad-hoc student accommodation does not).

Q4. Will the PBSA accommodate students from different educational institutions. What is demand.

Applicant response: Yes, students could come from more than one institution (i.e. Goldsmiths, Greenwich, others. There is student demand for this type of accommodation and policy seeks its provision. It helps to free up conventional housing supply. PBSA will reduce HMO accommodation demand and free up existing buildings/residences.

Q5. Concerned about height and density of development. The density of scheme will put extra pressure on limited infrastructure and the height will overshadow/dominate nearby primary school, and impact on traffic.

Applicant response: Have met with school as developer is keen to ensure they are engaged with school; in the design they have tried to ensure minimal impact, for example in the orientation of the proposed buildings and slender form of the towers ; daylight/sunlight reports also commissioned ; the applicant advises the school are happy that HGV movements to/from the existing site will be removed and that improvements will be made to the junction to improve road safety; the school can appreciate the positive benefits that will arise from the scheme ; the retail element will benefit teachers and parents.

Q6. How much family accommodation is proposed.

Applicant response: High number of 3 bed and 2 bed units in 10 storey block = 14 x 3 beds and 24 x 2 beds.

Q7. What will happen when students are on holiday.

Applicant response: PBSA rooms will be let on short-term basis.

Q8. Will roof-top amenity be used (seems a way of maximising profit for developer by not providing it at ground level).

Applicant response: Yes, it will be used and has been increased in area for the PBSA since the application submission. The site has a quite a limited size due to its physical constraints hence need to provide amenity space at roof levels. However, contribution will also be made through S106 legal agreement for financial contribution to make improvements in Folkestone Gardens.

Q9. Why is height at 26 storeys – it does not take into account the psychological impacts of such a tall building. Why isn't it 22 storeys like the Foundry Building– heights of buildings in area are creeping up.

Applicant response: We have taken into context of area and emerging context. For example near Millwall there are schemes with taller height buildings (32 – 34 storeys) coming forward. Need to acknowledge that area is changing, need to look at wider height context and not just at Foundry Building height. For example, the Surry Canal site has 32 storey building and Deptford Park has tall buildings. So no set amount number of storeys is relevant.

Q10. Question outcomes of lighting/overshadowing.

Applicant response: The scheme has been assessed against a 2 hour sun contour ; results show impacts on residential gardens and primary school either comply with BRE guidance or would have no adverse impacts on shadowing due to slender design of the proposed tower blocks.

Q11. Why towers – for example the towers in the Pepy's Estate were demolished as people did not like them.

Applicant response: The Pepys Estate does not have same context and it should not be used as a comparison.

Q12. How much affordable hsg is provided.

Applicant response: In the conventional housing block - 42 units over 8 floors.

Q13. How long will construction last.

Applicant response: Anticipate 2 year construction period.

Q14. Is there a formally appointed manager for students.

Applicant response: No, there would just be a management plan.

Q15. Is there a Registered Provider in place for the affordable housing.

Applicant response: Not yet, but an RP will be selected.

Q16. Will cycles be routed around Folkestone Gardens.

Applicant response: Ongoing discussions with Lewisham's highway officers and TfL. Want to ensure road safety can be improved as road conditions are terrible. The scheme would reduce HGV movements except during construction works.

General Comments

Residents – would prefer reduced height of building ; agree PBSA would alleviate HMO use within area.

Councillor Cooper thanked all for attending, the applicant for the presentation, and residents for their questions, and the applicant for their responses.

Meeting Ended

