

Block D – Hatcham Park Mews Local meeting minutes

The demolition of Block D at Hatcham Mews Business Centre, Hatcham Park Mews SE14, and the construction of a two storey building to create 2, two bedroom and 2, three bedroom maisonettes, together with the landscaping of the existing car parking area to create private amenity space. Application reference DC/15/91333

Date & time: 19 January 2016 – 7pm (started at 7.10pm ended at 8pm)

Location: 11 Hatcham Park Mews

Attendees: Councillor Paul Bell – Chair (Telegraph Hill Ward Councillor and Chair of Planning Committee C)
Councillor Joe Dromey – New Cross Ward Councillor
Monique Wallace – Lewisham Development Management Officer
Barry Neiman – Neiman Associates (applicant team)
Andy Puncher – PH+ Architects (applicant team)
Claire Scerri - PH+ Architects (applicant team)
Tim Gaskell – CMA Planning (applicant team)

Apologies Councillor Brenda Dacres – New Cross Ward Councillor

Approximately 5 occupiers from Hatcham Park Road, Hatcham Park Mews and Nettleton Road attended the meeting.

R – Resident

AR – Applicant representative

Cllr Bell – Councillor Paul Bell

Cllr Dromey – Councillor Joe Dromey

MW – Monique Wallace

AR – Presented the subject proposals and the development which had taken place in the Mews. AR answered questions from residents seeking clarification of the proposals during the presentation.

AR - referred to Officer's numerical error in the committee report and confirmed that the increase in height of Block D would be 2.5m and not 0.7m as referred to in the Officer's report.

MW - confirmed the error in the Officers report and advised that revised drawings showing the increase in height against the existing building were available on the Council's web site since December and that neighbours had been sent letters to that regard.

AR – Advised that Block D would be positioned 2m forward (east, towards the courtyard). Explanation regarding the configuration of the roof terrace, internal layout and bin stores were also provided.

AR – Explained that the proposed car parking for the current application would be assigned to the 4 houses proposed and the two houses within Block B; the flats within the remainder of the Mews were occupied without car parking spaces.

R – The proposed bin store is too small to accommodate the new dwellings; perhaps reduce the size of the meter cupboard to make more space for the refuse.

Cllr Bell – Members (at the committee meeting 24/9/15) requested clarity over the location of the proposed bin stores.

AR – Advised that the bin stores for the proposed development is separate to the bin stores used by the occupiers of the live/work units. We can look into moving the partition wall between the refuse chamber and meter cupboard in order to create a larger bin store.

(The applicant handed out print outs of the proposed development with the existing measurements overlaid).

**R – The proposal would result in obstruction to views from Nettleton Road
R – What will happen to the tree canopies which are close to the boundary where the new building is proposed?**

AR – Tree works can be conditioned if planning permission were to be granted.

Cllr Bell – How close are the trees from the boundary/proposed building?
(unanswered)

R – Would the wall abutting the Nettleton Road properties be retained?

AR – We would like to keep the wall but can't confirm that it would be retained until a structural survey has been carried out; the planning application is for the demolition of the rear boundary wall.

R - Once you demolish the building, would you be re-using any of the bricks?

AR – We would endeavour to re-use the bricks where feasible.

R – Would you use materials to match the existing buildings within the Mews?

AR – Yes.

R – Is Block B drawn on the application drawings as built, or at its pre-development height?

AR – Block B was surveyed in order to create the drawings, so the drawings reflect the height as it is now.

R – Would you increase the height of Block D once approved like you did with Block B?

AR – There may be marginal differences in the measurements shown on the application drawings due to surveys, insulation etc.; Block B was increased in height as the drawings showed the floor levels in the building being lowered which was incorrect. The additional height was created due to the necessity to add insulation to an existing building. Block D would not have the same constraints as it would be a new building.

R – The additional 2.5m increase in height of Block D would result in a loss of sunlight.

AR – The sunlight and daylight report confirms that any impact from the proposed development would be to a level in accordance with BRE guidelines.

R – The houses might be ok, but the gardens would suffer a loss of sunlight.

MW – Advised that the sunlight and daylight report was at parts difficult to comprehend and advised residents to contact her if there were any questions regarding the report. MW agreed that the conclusions in the report are that the impact of the proposed development would be null or negligible.

R – Overlooking from the proposed development would also be a problem for residents.

Councillor Bell requested that the sunlight and daylight report is forwarded to all Members of Committee C. (Development Management Officer to action).

R – The proposed density is high, particularly that family sized houses are being proposed - where would children play? It could be dangerous for children if parking is not appropriately managed.

AR – We originally proposed gardens to the front of Block D, but Development management Officers advised that they should be removed; the space in front of the dwellings although not demarked will be for the use of the new houses.

R – Hatcham Park Mews is a private road, so the parking can not be legally managed.

R - The management company can not legally enforce any parking contraventions, so how can the magement and control of parking be assured?

AR – The management company would have to manage the parking spaces due to the density of the recently occupied flats.

R – As demonstrated with the increase in height of Block B, there would be no recourse if you again fail to build the proposal in accordance with the approved plans.

AR – If we have to make changes, we would have to make a retrospective application for the retention of any changes which would have to go through the planning process and would be subject to public consultation again.

AR – If Block D was not built in accordance with the approved plans, as seen with Block B, the Council's Enforcement Team investigate the matter and could take enforcement action.

Cllr Bell – The application would again have to be brought back to committee

R – Permission was not sought before the felling of trees (in the Conservation Area) in order to carry out the works on the other blocks within the Mews – how can we trust that the same wont happen to the trees next to Block D?

R - Why was the roof of Block B increased in height?

AR – Lewisham Council carried out due process with regard to the increase in height at Block B even though the retrospective planning application was determined unfavourably (from the residents point of view).

R – What was the exact height increase of Block B.

AR – 280mm (28cm).

R – That is not true as there has been an increase of at least 1 meter as I have before and after photographs to prove this showing the views which have been lost as a result.

AR – The building was surveyed.

R – To say that the loss of daylight to 27-30 Hatcham Park Mews can not be right given that a building increased in height by 2.5m is proposed.

AR – vertical daylight, outlook and vertical sky measurements were assessed. The properties facing north were not tested.

MW – The report states that north facing units were not tested but the appendices to the document appear to suggest that north facing windows were tested. After speaking to the sunlight/daylight consultant who explained that in the summer months, north facing windows do not get sunlight during the winter months but that during the summer months, windows may get sunlight as the sun is higher in the sky and travels further around the Hemisphere. Nonetheless, the conclusions of the report are still that any impact from the development would be null or negligible.

R - If the houses are sold, the occupiers do not have to adhere to estate management rules.

AR – The houses will be sold on leases which will include ground rents for the estate management fees.

Cllr Dromey – As the residents said, how enforceable are the management company's powers?

AR – The leases can be terminated for non-compliance.

R – Are the car parking spaces opposite Block A for sale?

(unanswered)

Councillor Bell read out questions from a Nettleton Road resident who gave his apologies:

Question 1: How will the visual amenity of the residents of Nettleton Road be protected given the proposed loss/reduction of the tree canopy?

AR – Any tree branches overhanging the application site will be pruned in a controlled manner.

Question 2: Current levels of light spillage from the new dwellings are compromising neighbour amenity. How will light pollution be controlled?

AR – Windows facing into the Mews courtyard and windows set down would reduce any levels of light pollution.

R – The street lighting on the façade of Block A illuminating the Mews Road is causing a nuisance to residents due to their high level of luminance and intermittent operation.

AR – Sensor lights put up by the management company can have filters to reduce the level of light spillage and directional hoods can also be fitted.

Cllr Bell – Explained the committee process and advised that if any residents have problems getting through to Council officers, please contact your local ward Councillors who are there to help. Please also speak to your ward Councillors if you would like them to speak on your behalf at committee.

Cllr Dromey - advised the audience that he would be free on 4th February to speak at committee.

R – What is the deadline to submit representations to the proposal?

Cllr Bell – explained that representations can be received right up to the night of the committee, but depending on when they are received, may be reported within the report or read out to Members on the night.

R – If permission is granted but the roof is higher than approved, would the Council make the applicant take down the roof and re-build it?

Cllr Bell – Yes.

R – How long would Block D take to build?

AR – Difficult to get a building contract but once on site, no more than 1 year. The proposal is for only 2 storeys so should have shallow foundations making the build process quicker.

Councillor Bell – Planning permission lasts for 3 years, so they would have to commence works within that time.

R – Can you ensure that delivery and construction vehicles travel the right way up and down the Mews and reduce noise and disturbance from the construction process?

AR – Yes there will be disturbance for a while.

Cllr Bell – A construction management plan can be added as a condition should planning permission be granted. You can not however enforce trucks going the wrong way up the Mews.

Meeting ended at 8pm.