

# APPENDIX 1: LOCAL MEETING MINUTES: DC/23/131277 - LAND TO THE REAR OF 14-48 GEOFFREY ROAD, SE4

---

Main attendees:

- Sian Eiles (Chair and Brockley Ward Councillor)
- Thomas Simnett (Case Officer)
- Richard Quelch (Agent for application)
- Damian Milton (Architect)

**Chair:** Welcomes local residents to the meeting and explains the running order for the meeting

**Thomas Simnett:** introduces the proposal and reason for local meeting

**Richard Quelch:** My name is Richard Quelch the planning consultant on this project. We've also got Damian Milton as well who's the architect on the scheme. So, Damian, if it's ok with you, Thomas, will jump in on any particular questions. Just to maybe elaborate on what I say. You're aware there was a previous application on the site that was refused by the council for nine homes and that's currently at appeal. This new application has been submitted for eight homes which I've had further discussions with officers about and is in the process at the moment of being determined.

**Chair:** questions whether there are any names to questions, Case Officer confirms no names due to GDPR.

**Chair:** So, we're going to start with the previous scheme and reasons for refusal. So, in making the current application, the applicant has stressed that they recognise the shortcomings of the previous scheme and claims to have addressed them. Why then have they not withdrawn their appeal against views of a scheme they themselves recognise as deficient?

**Richard:** In terms of the previous application that was obviously the nine homes, this current scheme is for eight. I think I suppose our view is that the previous scheme does have merit, hence why the applicant has chosen to appeal it. I think that there were five reasons for refusal on that. Where we are at the moment is that there are two of those reasons in relation to transport and also ecology those matters have been resolved with the Council in terms of that appeal process. But obviously there is a difference of opinion between the applicant and the and the Council in terms of the remaining elements particularly the additional unit and whether that results in the suppose essentially the overdevelopment of the site.

So that is where we are with it. We obviously wanted to continue to work with officers as well. The applicant wanted to continue to work with officers, which is why we undertook further pre application discussions to try and address them, I suppose the differences between us is in terms of the quantum of development on the site, hence why this application has also been submitted.

**Chair:** Can I just ask a very brief follow-up to that which I'm sure would help everybody. So you mentioned five reasons for refusal, and then you specified Transport and ecology. Can you just outline what the other three were?

**Richard:** So the other three were trees, heritage impact in terms of design and character and the final one was quality of amenity space for the proposed units in terms of the garden areas.

**Chair:** Gotcha. Right. Brilliant. Thank you. Obviously, you know, I'm sure that's publicly available information, but it will just help everybody in the meeting to get a slightly better picture of what's where we are.

I've now got a number of questions, 4 questions in one section, which is on impact on parking and flow of traffic. I'll do them one at a time because each one, each question is quite lengthy. So rather than sort of doing all four in one go, right.

So, 16 new flats are already consented or under construction along Geoffrey Rd. If the current proposal is approved, we would have 24 new dwellings appearing on the road in the space of a few years. Has a cumulative assessment been made to understand the combined impact on parking resources and flow of traffic, particularly during potentially simultaneous construction of three significant developments? Does the Council have a view on what the ultimate capacity is for Geoffrey Robe to absorb the impact of new dwellings?

**Richard:** so, if I pick up the point about the construction first of all and the three developments being built at the same time. In terms of the impact obviously the redevelopment of this site would be quite well contained as in as in it's not for example on a corner site you have an access Rd and you go into the site. So in terms of in terms of impacts of movement onto the street that would be from construction vehicles and we would be submitting a construction management plan in order to ensure that the timing of delivery of vehicles etcetera

is offset from each other to potentially reduce any impacts. So, we'd be willing to work with the contractors of the other sites should you know to address any to address any concerns. Sorry what was the other part of the question?

**Chair:** it was the cumulative impact from parking.

**Richard:** So this will be a theme answering quite a few of these questions on car parking and I appreciate that not everyone agrees with this position, but it is the planning policy position. So, you know the drive in planning policy terms in these types of locations is for is to reduce car parking in sites. It's national London plan and local policy is to is to reduce parking levels on sites that are close to stations and that is what our scheme is proposing to do. So, we are following the guidance that is provided. In terms of the impacts themselves, we have undertaken a car parking survey, that's been agreed with the council in terms of its methodology and having discussed it with our transport consultant, they've confirmed that the cumulative, impact of those 24 units based on the surveys undertaken there would be sufficient parking capacity on site to absorb any additional parking that might be generated as a result of those developments.

**Chair:** So next question, many residents have expressed concern at the potential for road rage incidents associated with traffic jams on the road. They've provided some links that demonstrate behaviour that was experienced on a daily basis during a period of disruption related to construction on AT159A Upper Brockley Road. And they are asking what reassurance can be offered that this situation does not become permanent following the loss of parking spaces from the new developments and in addition 10 to 15 new cars competing for existing spaces, because I'm not the host of the meeting, I don't think I can play you those clips, but I'm quite happy to forward those on to you at the end of the meeting if that will help.

**Richard:** And in terms of issues caused during construction, obviously I can't. I don't want to sit here and defend other what other contractors have done, what may have happened on sites when people are building things. If that if that is the case that that that the issues have been caused on street because of the way that contractors have been delivering things, that's not right.

Skillcrown are um are a very experienced developer. They deliver quite large schemes and they're they are experienced and so a scheme like this in terms of I suppose what I would say is they have the credentials to be able to deliver a scheme like this. They'll obviously be a construction management plan and as part of that there will be contact details for somebody on site. So, if there are any particular issues people can get in contact with them and my experience of working with developers of this sort of scale contractors is they do have maybe compared to maybe some smaller contractors they do have a they do have a reputation to uphold and you know that's just my view and but the in terms of the road rage point I think it's difficult for me to say, how residents would behave. We can't control residents behaviour I think whether they're existing residents or new residents.

But all I can say is if that was caused by the construction process, that's something that we would, you know, through the construction management plan that we would seek to avoid. So, yeah, it's a difficult question to answer because we can't control people's behaviour from being honest with you.

**Chair:** the next question, CPZ consultation is to take place as part of the development at 1 & 1a Brockley Cross and that is for 7 new dwellings. If a CPZ is implemented along Geoffrey Rd as a car free development will the residents have access to parking on the street or not?

**Richard:** no, they wouldn't have. If the CPZ comes into effect, there'll be something in the in the legal agreement for the planning application which says that that those residents wouldn't be eligible to apply.

**Chair:** That was a quite straightforward answer. The next question is, does the applicant accept the net result of their proposal will be to force current residents to compete with residents of Upper Brockley Road and Manor Ave for parking spaces, further displacing their residents as they are already heavily parked?

**Richard:** I think, I think my answer to this one will probably be quite like the first response in terms of parking impacts. I don't want to sound like repeating myself but they're very I suppose they're quite similar questions. So without labouring the point, I think again I would say that there is an encouragement to have less parking on schemes in these in these types of locations. And again, it you know if the CPZ isn't introduced there may be some additional parking on street. But based on the surveys that were undertaken, there was still sufficient capacity based on the London wide methodology for assessing street parking stress.

**Chair:** Right. So those are that's the end of the parking section and we're now going on to a new section. The applicant state that they will seek to retain high quality trees around the site and only low-quality trees will be removed as they identified. It appears high quality trees are all located on other people's property. Is the applicant suggesting that they cannot guarantee that will not destroy trees on adjacent sites?

**Richard:** I'm sorry, I'm not quite sure I understand that question.

**Damian:** Personally, I can answer it in terms of the impact

on neighbouring sites and yeah, we won't be removing trees on other people's land. Legally you can't do that. Even if people have, for example, there are tree roots that are encroaching onto other other people's land, you still have a you still have an obligation to protect those trees and make sure that they can still survive.

**Local Resident:** I can clarify the question if you like. Sorry for unmuting. Yeah, that'd be great. Yeah, brilliant. It was just a bit confused about the wording there. You're gonna remove every tree on the site with this. You'll seek to retain high quality trees. So it seems an odd bit of wording. It seems like, um, you're seeking to retain trees that are in other people's properties. So it's, um, it's confusing, uh, confusing to us, the wording there. So we're looking for a clarification on that. What do you mean you'll seek to retain them?

**Richard:** Where was this? where was the wording in was it particular document that you?

**Local Resident:** Yeah, I can point to it if you give me a moment.

**Damian:** Richard, I think I can provide some input on this. So I think we mention it is in the design and access statement, uh, essentially what we're saying here is we have taken the tree survey including the root protection areas for all of the existing trees on the site and in neighbouring gardens. And we have positioned the proposed new houses to not encroach onto or into the root protection zones for neighbouring trees. I take your point, Steven, absolutely this, the wording could be a little bit more straightforward, OK. But essentially what we're saying is we've positioned the houses so we're not impacting on neighbouring trees.

**Chair:** I think that's that helped. I think that that clarifies that wording. Thank you. Another question on um, ecology and amenity. Uh, we note the distinction between a high quality tree and a low quality tree seems to be whether it is located on someone else's property or their own. They will in fact be removing all trees on a site which the Council's ecology team have previously recognised as environmentally important. Does the applicant feel the council were wrong in their previous assessments?

**Richard:** from an ecological perspective, I think I mentioned we'd resolved the ecological impacts. So the loss of any trees from an ecological perspective would be I suppose it's considered acceptable by the council and unless Thomas says otherwise and that that's the position we've got to. so if the questions relating to the ecological element then then that I suppose that would be our answer to that particular point.

**Chair:** we might come back to that question at the end if we if we have time. I I suspect, because I think there might be a little bit more digging down into that question #8. How will the applicants ensure that their plans to mitigate biodiversity loss are fully enacted? We note that the replacement trees will be planted along a marginal strip of land with limited space to grow, and heavy reliance is placed on the ongoing viability of proposed tree roots. As green roofs are complex and expensive to maintain Does the applicant accept that they may simply be left to die off by the residents

**Richard:** so in terms of the ecological measures that we put in place, ecology and biodiversity is quite high on the agenda for you know in London wide policy and also the Council's policy. So in in terms of implementing all of those things we would be more than happy for planning conditions to be put on to ensure that that all of those measures are put in place. From a green roof perspective, again, in terms of the detail and the quality and the specification of the green roof, again, we'd be happy for a condition to be to be put on in order for the council to the council and the council ecologists to be able to scrutinise the detail before that that that detail is actually discharged.

**Thomas:** I can just add in terms of procedural points. So I'm not sure whether everybody is viewed the ecologist's comments that are available on our website. She's listed a number of planning conditions which relate to the ecology works which if planning permission is granted on this site, those conditions will be secured, ecology improvements will be secured by condition. And the preliminary ecological assessment report which is submitted alongside has a number of recommendations in that as well. So the report is what we would normally do is secure that report as well with the compliance condition and have a part of that condition that they've got to demonstrate that they've implemented, implemented those ecological improvements.

**Chair:** We are now onto question #9

**Thomas:** Yeah, so sorry. I was going to say, if this is meant to be aimed towards myself, unfortunately I wouldn't be able to comment on that one because I'm only here for procedural points.

**Chair:** So this is to the council. So I'll just let everybody know what the question was. Just to refresh their memories. Does the council recognise the importance of green spaces in providing low carbon mitigation against urban overheating and that this represents a source of local amenity that will be largely lost if the site is developed as proposed? So, Thomas is not able to answer that question.

I can speak to the first part, that I think the council does recognise the importance of green spaces in providing mitigation against urban overheating. I can't personally comment to the second part of that

question. I'm just going to need to make a note of that to myself so that I need to get that question answered for you.

Um, lack of suitable access and impact on 32 and 34 Geoffrey Rd. The boundary wall between 34 Geoffrey Road and the site access has recently been demolished to facilitate HGV access to the site. A shipping container was installed on site within 24 hours of the demolition. Planning consent was required for this action as we are inside the Brockley Conservation Area, but there is no corresponding planning application on the Lewisham planning Portal. Will an application be made for retrospective planning consents and what will the implications be if it's not granted? Since site access for HGV's or emergency vehicles will no longer be possible? We note that the applicant states the width of the road access is 4 metres, which assumes the absence of the boundary wall.

**Richard:** in terms of demolition of that boundary wall. It's not something that the applicant is aware of. It's not any works that we've undertaken, and I don't know I'm not sure who did who undertake the works. In turn it would be useful to in terms of the question does the does the does the wall actually come across is the wall part of the red line boundary or was it historically over the access point I suppose was it on our was it on I suppose the land or the site or is it on the neighbouring property. I think I need to ask.

**Local Resident:** I mean it's a boundary wall of the neighbouring property. So, it's been demolished. And there is clearly coordination between the applicant and the owner of the property because you know massive lorry turned up straight after it was knocked down. It's been removed. So, you know, the widening of the access path to make it viable for heavy vehicles and emergency vehicles to access the site assumes that they can move up directly up against the side walls for #32, #34. So yeah, the demolition of that wall, I mean if there's an arrangement there and some kind of financial transactions taking place that's not for me to say but they needed planning permission to knock the wall down. It's clearly been done in coordination with the applicant. What does that do to your plans for site access?

**Richard:** Well, I can honestly say I have spoken to the applicant and honestly, we do not know. We don't know who's not doing that and that's a genuine response.

**Local Resident:** Not, trying to say you know that that is a genuine response.

**Richard:** We've designed the scheme and considered it in terms of a means of access and the tracking for larger vehicles wouldn't rely on anything outside of our red line access. If you see our red line ownership.

**Local Resident:** I'm not sure that's true. I think if you if you look at where the original boundary wall is, you can't get a fire engine down there, you can't get an ambulance down there. You know it's it was done to because it was a reason for refusal of the previous scheme, and they've struck an arrangement with the owner #34 to make the access viable. I think we'd all like to know that the rules have been followed and the way that they've done that.

**Richard:** Yeah. Well, all I can say is that in in terms of the tracking that we've done that that works within the red line boundary because it has to in terms of our access. If it, if it is within the, if it is within the application boundary which we can, we can check and then then if if the council wanted us to we can we can retrospectively seek approval for the demolition, for the demolition of the wall. that's something I can speak to Thomas about if that is the case, if it is within the red line boundary. So we could, I can take that offline to have a discussion with him if that is the case. But it would be helpful to have the photo in the first instance

**Local Resident:** what's the best way to get that to you?

**Thomas:** If you send it to me, Steven, I can pass it on to Richard. Can I also ask whether anybody has submitted a planning enforcement complaint regarding the demolition of all?

**Local Resident:** Yeah, I can have a look at that. And there was an update on that. Yeah, there was a follow up from one of your colleagues. But when I tried to ring back the planning service, I couldn't leave a message. So I never managed to get back in touch with them.

**Thomas:** Yeah. I'll have a look at the enforcement case on our system, and I'll just flag it with the office involved and see whether he can get back to you. If they can get back to you.

**Chair:** I'm on question 11 when we get there. So there is no separation between the access path and the side wall of #32. The wall contains operable windows which are relied upon for light and ventilation, as well as exposed surfaces including a gas line. Damage to #32 to date includes a passing vehicle shearing off a window sill and badly damaging a gas flue casing. How will the applicant ensure that further damage is not sustained when there is no physical separation between #32 and the access path?

**Richard:** Obviously we've tested arrangement where vehicles, go up and down. We wouldn't expect large to be travelling up there regularly. They'd be smaller delivery vehicles rather than anything larger. Um, I think with existing situation, we would need to rely on people being careful when they're driving down there. Um, that might not be the answer that people want to hear, but I think I think we have tracked these. We have

tracked that route and in terms of the size of the vehicles and it is possible to go through and people may have historically maybe not being particularly careful going down there.

**Local resident:** I think in times gone by when the boundary wall of #34 was there so it was a much more constrained path but it's you know I think your application assumes that it's literally the full width sidewalk to sidewalk from #34 to #32. So you know if that's four metres you can just about get a large truck down there similar fire engine is similar around 3 1/2 metres in width. So it's you know it's right up against the walls of those properties and they have you know operable windows that might be open which would narrow the access path.

**Local Resident:** You know if you've got windows open and both sides um I don't know kind of trucks still get up there. Um, but yeah it does you your plans do assume that they access vehicles can utilise the full width between the side walls of those eyes. There's no, there's no, um, space, uh, between the edges of your access path and on the walls of those properties.

**Richard:** Yeah. Is it worthwhile just explaining a little bit, for example, about the fire strategy?

**Damian:** So it's part of the overall access strategy for vehicles. The site makes an allowance for ambulance and for light delivery vans access to the site. So, fire engines will not be accessing the site, the new houses are going to be installed with sprinklers. A new rising main will be installed in the site. So, the overall distance from a fire engine on Geoffrey Road, there will be some sufficient hose linked to get from the fire engine to the hydrant and then to the houses because it is an extended distance. That's the reason why we've had to install sprinklers into the house as an extra safety measure.

But essentially, fire engines won't be entering the site. The only vehicles that will be are an Amazon van for example, or an ambulance. On the unfortunate occasion that one may have to attend the site, obviously they'll be much larger vehicles during the construction which would be using the path and I think that would have to form part of the construction management plan, um or tracking would potentially be provided at that stage. I mean, so the tracking that we've done at the moment for the vans and for the ambulance and takes account of the existing wall that that has been demolished and there's a 2.8 metre opening in the previous existing condition, it's 2.8 metres wide based on topographical survey from the boundary wall of #32 to the previous existing opening if you like prior to demolition of that wall, it's 2.8 metres and the tracking has taken account of that for both the ambulance and the delivery vans. There is an allowance for 1 metre wide pedestrian strip against the boundary of #3, the remaining width of the street, the 2.83 metres is for the delivery vehicles.

Obviously on a day-to-day and you know you've got the full width to navigate to give yourself enough distance either side. You'd like to think that delivery drivers and, um any driver really would be cognizant enough to see a window when they're driving down a small lane way. And obviously under construction there would be speed controlled also. And so I think a lot of control could be implemented in the construction management plan that would have to be reviewed and agreed with the council as a control mechanism. But you could limit this to the size of construction vehicles. Suspect you'd have to anyway because the reasons we're talking about

**Local Resident:** well, I take your point should I guess our point is that you know the evidence is that damage to #32 has been an ongoing issue with the access as it is and you know best intentions in the world. We feel it's likely that that's going to be an issue for them to manage going forward,

**Chair:** I think, uh, that's all on record now, Um. I think let's move on to the next question for now. And we can sort of mop up any sort of outstanding things at the end. If we don't move on, then we won't have time to sort of do that mop up at the end alright? The applicants plan show the removal of a section of fence and boundary wall which belonged to 32. Additionally, security cameras have recently been installed on the fence without consent. Does the applicant recognise that they do not own the structures on this boundary and a change their design to accommodate their continued presence B. Commit to a time scale for removing the security cameras?

**Richard:** in terms so in terms of any removal of boundaries, um, if they've shown they had, they would have to be, um, done in undertaken in agreement with the property owner. So, we won't be removing anyone's fence or wall and replacing that unless we have an agreement with them. They would remain in place. Um in terms of the actual security cameras, they they've been installed by the current landowner. Um, following, some anti social behaviour And I think what they believe is that they'd they'd installed them onto #34 with agreement with the with the property owner and to obviously keep an eye on the antisocial behaviour if that's not the case, then they can remove them

**Chair:** confirmation that they can be removed. Yeah, well, we suspected that might be the case, so uh, we can probably move on from that.

So 13. The refuse strategy relies on the developer securing a private contract, where the contractor will come to site four times per week to move bins between the new properties and a pickup point near the site

entrance. This will involve up to 16 bins on recycling and food waste collection days. Will the service include visiting at 6:00 AM to return the bins to the collection point after being emptied? Local experience suggests the bins will be left clustered around the access Rd entrance following clearance.

**Richard:** So this type of management arrangement is quite common in schemes like this, I suppose mews developments off main roads. It's not uncommon practise and part of that management will be that someone comes down to the site takes the bins down, obviously collected and then comes back and takes the bins up later on. So that is part of the management service that will be included for future residents.

**Local Resident:** I think our concern here is that they won't be put back in the collection point. They'll be left all over the place because council workers do not have time to do that, and they don't do it for anyone else. I don't see why they would do it here, they will just move on. The bins will be left clustered around the entrance. So unless your contract allows for somebody to wait until they've been and put them back in the collection point, they'll be blocking the pavement potentially, Almost certainly blocking the site access. So anyone wanting to access the site would need to get out of their vehicle and move them out of the way before they could get in. Um. So yeah, you know, notwithstanding that certain times of year holiday periods, it's unpredictable when exactly the bins are going to be picked up in the 1st place. It's going to be hard to manage those being returned to the collection point in a way which doesn't stop people walking up and down the pavement to be quite honest.

**Richard:** Yeah well I suspect that the people that own the new houses will also want their the bins cleared up. I don't think that they won't want that.. They won't want them left near the access for example because you know they have to they have to walk up and down that access and also you know people are delivering to them then you know if what you're saying is that that would cause issues. I mean if the management company which would be put in place in order to collect, take down and collect, if they're not performing and the residents have an issue with that, then then the management company or whoever the the contractor is doing that can be changed.

**Local Resident:** but would it be understood that following collection that the bins must be put back in the collection point, that's not going to happen. So would that be part of the contract that they'd have to time it to the, you know for immediately following collection that they get back there and tidy the bins away or would they be left for you know half a day until they get back and sort it out?

**Richard:** I think that's certainly something we can take away in terms of the precise timing of how quickly that happens. So that that's something we can take away.

**Local Resident:** Can I just clarify with you? It says, a private contract. Is that correct?

**Richard:** Yeah so it'll be paid for but as part of the management fees for the future residents.

**Chair:** So that's the council are aware of Q14 it is similar isn't it?

**Thomas:** Yeah.

**Chair:** So should we go to 15 then How would emergency vehicles access the site when bins are out for collection?

**Richard:** So, so when we've done our tracking, we've obviously looked at where the bins are located on the on the access Rd and an emergency vehicle can still access the site when those bins are out

In terms of the fire strategy, we've explained as well about the fact that for obviously a fire vehicle wouldn't need to enter into the site because there's a sprinkler system.

You're talking about if an ambulance essentially came into the site.

**Local resident:** Yeah. OK Well, I'd returned to our point that if the bins are cleared and the contractors have been back yet, they're not gonna be in the collection point. Um. And also point out quickly while we're at it that where you have the collection point that's right up against the windows in the basement level of #34. So are they going to open the windows and the bins are right there?

I think it just if it feels like it hasn't really been thought through to us.

**Chair:** So I think obviously a few things you're gonna take away there. So would appreciate, yeah, uh, some further thinking on that. So we're on to our final section and our final two questions. Hopefully if we can get through these quickly, we can have a few minutes just to sort of tidy up loose ends and go through comments in the chat.

**Local Resident:** So unsuitability of the site and poor standard of accommodation for future occupiers. So we've got average noise levels to the rear of Jeffrey Rd are generally low, but instantaneous noise levels are intermittently very high due to the passage of freight trains who often apply their brakes on approach to the bridge. From experience, high pitch sound generated is above the pain threshold for an adult and is in

excess of 120 decibels. As this noise level is sufficient to cause immediate hearing damage, how does the applicant propose to keep future residents safe?

**Richard:** mean in terms of the principle of having such sites, you know, residential sites next to railway lines. It's quite a common occurrence. And this is this isn't necessarily a more heavily trafficked railway line than any others. Even coming into central London, you get residential schemes that are,

Go in Central London you'll see various residential schemes that are built very close or closer than our scheme to the to the boundary. And we've obviously undertaken a noise assessment which considers the noise from the railway from the railway lines. You obviously will have intermittent trains running past but that's from a from a noise and immediacy perspective it is quite common and considered acceptable.

**Local Resident:** There's no real issue from the commuter trains. They're not that bad to be honest. But there's a specific issue for this site with the cargo trains which you know whatever way the traffic is managed on the approach to the bridge they often break and pause next to the site and it is ear splitting and that's at the back of our gardens. You're going to be nearly half the distance closer to the noise source. Um, the noise, the, the peak instantaneous noise levels on that site are definitely light enough to give somebody immediate hearing damage. And you know any responsible site manager is going to have in the construction crew ear defenders on to protect them from that. But it feels like a legislative blind spot that's you know the acceptability of the noise levels seem to be based on long term averages which are fine. You know it's quite tranquil out there. Um, but there was instantaneous noise levels are damaging instantaneously damaging to people's hearing. And I don't, I don't see how that's acceptable to have people exposed to that in their gardens.

**Richard:** I'll probably repeat what I previously said in terms of you know the way this has been assessed. Obviously, you know I'm not noise specialists but there are specialists in noise that look at this type of thing and come up with methodologies for technical reports to assess the acceptability of these types of things including the Council's environmental health team and I suppose the point is that they've also assessed this and considered it acceptable as well. acceptable from long term averages which are what they're legislated to look at.

**Local resident:** You know work with these people and I know I know a lot about the subject area but it's you know there is a blind spot here and what they're required to show for the site where nobody needs to talk about instantaneous noise levels here. But I think if you spend any time on the site where when one of those trains is coming past you would you know I think it would surprise you quite highlight the noise is but you know we're set back from the from the noise source it's you know it's very large you can't you have to stop speaking when it happens and that's you know in our kitchens in the back of our gardens they're substantially closer to that noise source. It's going to be a lot louder and I you know if it feels like a real blind spot in the in the noise assessment, but I think you know it's just from a regulatory perspective. the focus is all on longer term average nuisance noise and you know cumulative effects of lower noise levels that it, you know it's not something that the acoustic consultant is required to comment on. So they just don't comment on it.

**Richard:** Yeah I mean I think without going into too much I think we probably in danger of getting into the methodology of noise assessments and the acceptability of them. So in terms of planning, we have to adhere to policy and if there is no policy on it, then we can't adhere to it.

**Chair:** we've have to pop that particular question on one side for the time being. Just in terms of time, I don't want to belittle that issue because it could you know I do take it seriously. I'm just very conscious of time here. Network Rail are currently planning on clearing an 8 metre corridor along the railway line adjacent to the site. As the applicant has referenced the presence of this vegetated border in their application and is relying on it to mitigate noise and create an acceptable outdoor environment. What would be the implications of its removal?

**Richard:** well, I think that that that boundary is going to probably grow and be cut back over the years. That's what normally happens with Network Rail land. It will grow back again and it be cut back from my perspective that that that doesn't make a significant impact in terms of the actual results of the noise assessment.

Steven, I've also seen the comments that are on the website from the environmental health relating to noise. So they've recommended a condition relating to noise protection scheme which will look at, look at details. As you know this is the proof that committee will look at details of final glazing, fabrication and acoustic specifications and those details will be submitted before commencement of development could occur. So Environmental Health will have another opportunity to have a look at the more in depth specifications in terms of rate relating to noise to make sure that it would be adequate.

**Local resident:** if I were to, um, I should have done this before now. But if I were to seek a professional opinion from a colleague about the impact of the instantaneous levels and how that's considered in the

planning process, would, is there still a chance for you to consider that before the committee meeting or as part of the committee meeting? Or is it too late to inject that now

**Thomas:** so we can accept anything up until the point that we make a decision. In terms of timeline for going to committee, I've not drafted my report yet. So there is a process in terms of that and then that goes off to legal officers. And so I think we were looking at potentially a date within August to take this to the planning committee and then reports get made public about five to seven days before planning committee. But notwithstanding that, if we do also receive submissions or any information before we actually have the committee meeting as well, that is something that if we feel necessary, I can address that to Members through an addendum report as well and also get colleagues in environmental health to comment on that if necessary.

So usually, yeah, like I said, we will accept any information before we actually make the final decision. There's never really a hard cut off in terms of comments that even if it goes past the consultation date, we won't consider those comments. So we will always consider everything that's submitted. Until then, we make a decision,

**Local Resident:** OK that that as well. Just in terms of this particular site that you know like I said before, you have many, many schemes in London that are much closer to more traffic to railway lines where I don't think we're talking from my perspective, we're not talking about the principle of what's on there. If you see what I mean, the principle of having a residential unit, it's probably more to do with the specification that's that that's the only that that that's the difference in terms of you know, in in terms of you know, glazing.

**Local Resident:** OK, excuse me, I know we're supposed to get to the end. But I just need to clarify this particular point because I was in a meeting with Network Rail recently trying to save as many mature trees as possible along that four mile wide, 8 metre, 4 mile long, 8 metre wide stretch that they plan to completely clear like they did it on their oak. And you know these freight trains, they are 50 cars long. I film them, you know I'm, I'm quite into trains over 50 cars of trains. So it goes on excessively. So it's not commuter trains we're talking here, they break going to the bridge but worse when they're going down to Loampit Vale they break the entire time. So it's not it's instantaneous, but the noise isn't instant. The noise goes on and on. It's not commuter trains. It's deafening. And another thing, it starts at 3:00 in the morning. But when you do your tracking and your noise assessments and your parking, you don't live on the street. Do you know what this actually is like in the middle of the night?

**Richard:** I think again. I've got to say, I've not, I've not slept. I've never slept in any of the properties along that road. I think particularly if it's night time noise as well the you know a lot of these things that the noise impacts can be mitigated by the sort of the envelope of the building. So some of the properties for example that may be there at the moment are older properties that maybe didn't, maybe weren't at the time built taking into account you know those types of heavier freight trains and you know with more modern you know with the fact that we can now account for these with these new build schemes. You know, that's something that allows us to be able to mitigate that, which I suppose is a good thing.

**Chair:** brings the meeting to a close

**Thomas:** In terms of my meeting notes then they will be online alongside the other planning documents within five working days from this meeting.

**Chair:** Thomas, thank you very much. So again, thank you very much everybody for your very active engagement on with this development and thank you for your very calm and respectful discussions this evening. It's much appreciated. So with that, I think I will draw the meeting to a close and wish everybody a very calm, lovely evening. Thank you very much.

-----**END OF MEETING**-----