

Notes of Local Meeting

Persons Present

Chris Brodie (Chair, LBL)

Brett Henderson (LBL)

Hugh Cave (City and Provincial) Charles Moran (CMA)

Katie Tonkinson (Hawkins Brown) David Bickle (Hawkins Brown) Elliot Page (WSP)

Christina Norton (Soundings) Nia Griffith (Savills)

Local Residents

Marie Dagorn, Ray Woolford, Ernest, Moira Ison, Russell Guthrie, John Hamilton, Catherine Bennett, Lee Heywood, H. Potter, T Glyn, J. Johnson, Derrick Minney, Khiem Ung, Steven P, Dawn s.

Katie Tonkinson (KT) gave a presentation describing the scheme and the recent amendments to it.

The meeting then was thrown open to the floor for a question and answer session.

Marie Dagorn (MD) queried what is the difference between the blue and red brick in the hard landscaping.

KT outlined that the materials will be conditioned, however they are trying to provide as much detail on materials as possible at this stage.

Ray Woolford (RW) stated that this site is large enough for a school, which should be provided. Furthermore, there are not enough jobs provided, the business units should be delivered to the Council in the S106, not enough youth facilities have been provided and there are too many shops.

MD agreed that there aren't enough schools, many local residents have to take their children to schools outside the Borough.

Charles Moran (CM) confirmed that the Council did not consider a school on this site, however other sites are being identified in the schools for the future programme. In terms of shops we agree, but we also have other land uses. It should be noted that the retail units have been designed to be flexible to enable their conversion to other uses. We had a workshop last Thursday with local community groups to discuss future benefits to the local community.

RW believes that a school can be accommodated within a mixed use development. He had issues with the heights proposed and the overbearing impact the development will have on Pepys park. The development has no sense of identity - the area needs great award winning design.

Ernest The developers have not sat down with the residents to inform and gain a perspective of what we want. For example, the petrol station should stay.

CM outlined that the developer has undertaken over 400 hours of pre-application consultation and negotiations over a 2 year period that involved local residents.

RW wanted a meeting with residents and all of the developers of the major sites in north Deptford. Why hasn't the Council done anything?

CB outlined that this was not entirely correct for example in December 2008 there was a consultation exercise with local residents to involve them and for this application we consulted the entire Evelyn Ward.

Moira Ison (MI) agrees with the other issues raised and would like to know who makes the decision on how tall and how dense the development will be. The impact it has will be tremendous, there is concern about how Deptford has changed and there needs to be housing that makes people feel part of the community. Concern that there is too much rental housing.

CB outlined that the Council decides along with the GLA. Discussed the existing employment use and the Council's desire to encourage a mixed use development that brings under used land into use again through higher density.

KT stated that the heights vary from 4 to 18 storeys and that the urban grain that currently exists is quite fragmented. Private family homes and flats are proposed within the scheme as well as affordable rental accommodation.

CM replied that we want social cohesion and have deliberately put open space on the edge of the site to bring in existing local residents.

MD thought that there weren't enough jobs, there were too many flats, and that there should be open space for children to play football in.

Elliot Page (EP) outlined that the scheme was designed not to be car dependent, we want to encourage other modes of transport.

Russell Guthrie (RG) liked the vast majority of the scheme, which will be good and beneficial for the area, but does not understand why an 18 storey tower is proposed. CM replied that there is a demand and need for new homes in the Borough and that the developer was trying to strike a balance between the delivery of these homes and the commercial practicalities of developing such a large site. They have tried to understand the urban grain of the area and assess the impacts of the existing and proposed tall buildings and their impact upon the existing and future residents of the locality.

John Hamilton (JH) re-iterated concerns over the 18 storey height proposed.

CM replied by highlighting how far the developer has come since its pre-application discussions with local residents. Now at this late stage there are only a few residents who are present at this local meeting, which indicates that not as many local residents are concerned at present.

JH stated that could be because they're worn down.

Christina Norton disagreed, there have been extensive pre-application consultations and discussions with local residents that have taken place over an extended period of time. The residents have had valuable input into the scheme.

Ernest (E) wanted all the tall buildings on the Pepys park side.

RG commented that developments such as this are all part of living in a capital city. RW wanted to clarify that he doesn't disagree with the site's redevelopment, but the scale is too much. Also asked whether all issues outlined in the objections will be taken into account.

CB replied by stating that the Council will not set out what objectors can say, however all comments made will be taken into account during the application's assessment. The Council prefers resident input at an early stage of the design process and requests developers to undertake a meaningful dialogue with local residents prior to lodging an application.

MI asked how do you take into account cumulative impact?

CM replied outlining that the Council has done a lot of research in the drafting of its core strategy for development in the Borough to assess cumulative impact. In assessing planning applications the Council takes into account comments from the Greater London Authority, Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment, English Heritage, and the Environment Agency.

CB outlined that the Council was concerned with the overall impact on for example Transport and Healthcare.

MI expressed concern on car parking impacts.

EP reiterated that alternative modes of transport other than private motor vehicles will be encouraged and that most new developments in this location are looking at a 0.3 car parking provision per dwelling.

JH concerned that the Council was not independent enough for joined up thinking and that not enough work was being done on schools. There was a letter to the Council from the developer that said thanks for the assembly site.

CM confirmed that this was probably a letter saying thanks for attending a pre-application meeting.

RW said the cumulative impact on transport and schools including the Canada Water Developments should be taken into account.

Catherine queried the construction impacts on adjoining residents, where would the construction traffic be routed?

HC and WSP confirmed that the advantage net impact compared to existing traffic movements to the site will be minimal. An advantage of the site's size is that most of the activity will be inside it, traffic movements will be co-ordinated.

Catherine concerned about fly tipping and recycling within the completed development. Also didn't want the proposed directional signage to be vandalised.

KT we tried to embed these things from the start, each unit has recycling and waste capacity inside it, space within the scheme for bulky refuse.

BH outlined the likely date of the Strategic Planning Committee meeting as July 15, 2010.

The meeting ended at 20:30