

Appendix A

**159A Upper Brockley Road, SE4 1TF**  
**DC/17/101182**

Local Meeting Minutes

31<sup>st</sup> January 2018



Notes of Local Meeting, 7.30pm, 31<sup>st</sup> January 2018, Committee Room 4, Civic Suite, Lewisham Town Hall

**Application Site: 159 Upper Brockley Road, SE4 Application No DC/17/101182**

**Proposed Development:** Demolition of existing buildings at 159a Upper Brockley Road, SE4 and the construction of a three storey plus basement building comprising 4 two bedroom and 2 one bedroom, self-contained flats/maisonettes and one 89.9sqm Class B1(a) Office Unit at ground and basement level with pedestrian access from Geoffrey Road, together with the provision of bicycle and refuse/recycling storage and front and rear gardens.

**Attendance:**

**Lewisham Council:**

Cllr Adefiranye  
Jan Mondrzejewski (Planning Officer)

**Applicant:**

John Smith of Strutt and Parker  
Malcolm Last and Albert Shih of Chassay and Last Architects  
Steve Selva of Alcomax Investments

**Brockley Society:**

Chris Johnson  
Clare Cowen

**Local Residents:**

Six Residents from Geoffrey Road and 1 from One Resident of Upper Brockley Road

JM welcomed residents to the meeting, gave a brief background to the proposal, and explained the purpose of the local meeting. Local meetings are held where there are 10 or more objections to a proposal or an objection from an Amenity Society, both of which apply in this case. Cllr Adefiranye kindly agreed to chair the meeting which commenced with a presentation of the latest version of the proposal by the applicants team. It was explained that the drawings which residents were re-consulted on in August last year had been specifically revised for the local meeting to incorporate further feedback from residents and Council Officers.

Due to applicant's plans being at A3 scale, it was decided that the meeting should proceed along the lines of an informal discussion centred on the revised drawings so that these could be seen by all present at the meeting and the detailed changes made clear.

The Architect for the proposal explained that the bin and cycle storage had been moved from the front garden on Upper Brockley Road to the rear of the site adjoining Geoffrey Road. This change had been made in response to resident's comments during the most recent consultation on the application.

Residents raised the issue of whether bins would be allocated to individual flats, as shown on the revised plan, or be communal. JM stated that although either could be appropriate, a scheme for 7 flats would generate a lot of individual bins while communal bins for refuse and

recycling would make more efficient use of the space available while being accessible to all residents of the proposed development.

A Geoffrey Road resident made the point that the street is often left on refuse collection day with bins lettering the pavement. JM stated that this would be less likely to happen with refuse/recycling paladins which would be collected from and returned to the storage area subject to this being (as shown on the revised plans) within 10m of the highway.

The applicant stated that another change incorporated into the scheme was the redesign of the lightwells to the basements of the 2 two maisonettes fronting Upper Brockley Road. Previously, these had been of limited size and due to their depth would have needed to be covered by grilles or protected by 1.1m high railings to ensure the safety of residents using the garden. These light well have now been enlarged and incorporated into the garden, considerably improving natural light and outlook for occupiers of the proposed maisonettes. This was regarded as a positive change by the Brockley Society.

On the boundary treatment to upper Brockley Road, JM stated that front gardens in the Brockley Conservation Area generally have low garden walls, which were sometimes surmounted by railings. The later were generally removed during WW1 to assist the war effort. The proposed garden walls to Upper Brockley Road, which will become the main amenity space for two of the proposed maisonettes, should therefore be of a traditional form for the Conservation Area, with privacy dealt with by panting within the garden.

On the detailed design of the elevations, discussion focussed on the parapet height and the design of the corner of the building with Geoffrey Road. The re-introduction of a glazed link adjacent to the end of terrace property now created a visual break between the parapet of the new building and the eaves height of the existing terrace. The architect explained that lowering the height of the parapet had been explored but would detract from the appearance of the façade of the new building by diminishing the gap between the tops of the second floor windows and the parapet coping. JM stated that officers welcomed the re-introduction of the glazed link but felt that it could be a little wider than shown of the revised proposals.

On the design of the corner, there was a general feeling by residents and the Brockley Society that having the junction of two bay windows meeting at this point resulted in a visually awkward juxtaposition which would need to be addressed. CJ suggested that the re-introduction of a curvilinear feature at this point (as used in an earlier proposal for this site) might work. He also said that the Brockley Society were willing to engage with developers and their architects to resolve design issues such as this.

On parking and traffic, the architect stated that the scheme had been designed to be car free, hence no on-site parking was intended. JM explained that in areas such as this, which are reasonably well served by public transport, such scheme were acceptable subject to the provision of covered and secure cycle storage for residents in accordance with London Plan standards and a 3 year car club subscription (secured by a Section 106 Agreement) for all initial residents of the proposed development. As the site was not within a CPZ, JM stated that it would not be possible to place any restrictions on future residents of the development with respect to parking should a CPZ be introduced. Cllr JA advised residents that formal consultation on a CPZ for Brockley has taken place in the past but has previously been rejected by the majority of residents.

On the subject of pollution and on-street parking, residents considered that this had improved since the vehicle repair use which formerly occupied the site had closed. On the removal of the small commercial office from the proposal, this was in response to previous feedback from residents that this was an inappropriate location for such a use and the proposal would be unviable in this location. In any event the need to move the building further away from the

Geoffrey Road boundary (also in accordance with the views of residents and officers) has significantly reduced the footprint of the building and the floorspace available for development.

Many residents were concerned about the amount of traffic using Geoffrey Road, the speed of the traffic (despite the presence of a width restriction) and the localized pollution generated. JM explained that this was a matter concerning the local highway network which residents would need to raise with Highway Officers. On the subject of pollution, JM stated that the life expectancy of the building would mean that it will be in place long after the transition to non-polluting vehicles, indicating the pollution is best tackled by government legislation rather than building design.

The issue of daylight and sunlight was also raised by one resident of Upper Brockley Road and one resident of Geoffrey Road whose property contained basement accommodation. The architect stated that the orientation of the site meant that loss of sunlight as a result of the proposed building would be negligible. It was agreed that the architect would produce a shadow path analysis to demonstrate this and that this would be made available to residents. The resident of the Upper Brockley Road property which was located opposite the site felt that his position would be improved by the corner of the building being reduced to two storeys

One resident was concerned that, given the former use of the site, the application had been submitted without a site contamination report. The applicant stated that he expected this to be a requirement of a planning condition should the proposal be granted planning permission. He also considered that the size of the scheme and the need to demolish buildings in a conservation area in order to undertake the investigation meant that this was best done prior to commencement of development, once such development had been agreed by the Council. JM stated that this was also the case with a commercial garage site in Brandram Road Blackheath where a proposal for redevelopment to provide 4 flats would be considered by the Planning Committee on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2018.

JM explained that following this meeting the applicant would produce a revised scheme taking into account the comments raised at tonight's meeting and that this would include a shadow path analysis. Residents would be consulted on these proposals prior to the scheme proceeding to the Planning Committee for determination.

The meeting ended at 8.30pm.