

Local Meeting minutes 22nd November 2018

Tidemill School, Giffin Square



Chaired by Councillor Paul Maslin – New Cross Ward

Council Officer - Michael Forrester / Jeremy Ward (LBL)

Applicant Team Richard Parkin-Mason – Bluecroft Creekside
 Tim Thompson – Bear Dynamics
 Nick Philips / Jack Hughes – Metropolitan Workshop
 Tim Gaskell – CMA Planning

Resident (RES) – 16 residents were in attendance.

The meeting was introduced by Councillor Paul Maslin, followed by a brief scheme introduction by Metropolitan Workshop Architects.

RES – The development is misleading when the model shows a 12 storey building. (Double height ground and double height roof)

CMA – The link element is 4 storeys, taller part to the north 6 storeys, and to the south at 8 storeys. The roofs include accommodation but are not storeys, so the description is correct.

Resident - what is the Council's view of description?

LBL – Clarified description as correct.

Res - why is green public space being built on? Why is the most polluted area with small public land been given away? The Council needs to think about the future needs of those residents in the future who will open their windows on the busy road and very poor standard.

App – The land deal was completed and was not free. It is neither public open land, but was vacant since 1976 when the terraced housing was cleared for a road widening scheme which did not take place. So vacant for 40 or so years and with no open access. The Council completed a commercial deal under best consideration deal to Bluecroft, the premium i.e. the price is for Bluecroft to build commercial space to generate commercial income for the council to assist in delivery services. Part of the wider Council portfolio. The Council retains a long term interest in the site, would generate jobs and homes.

Res – Land is not dormant, the trees are mature and a shield from pollution in the local area. The council is already cutting down trees. More trees should be planted, because there will be a large health bill.

Res – Land approved as disposal in 2015, and the same night the Council at Mayor and Cabinet announced their biodiversity and ecology plan - planning street trees. The plan is contrary to the wider ecology strategy and environmental need.

Res – There is a lot of commercial space empty in Deptford, not used and empty. This is a risk rather than benefit, it should be good employment - young people or a training centre, rather than empty space.

App – We have been working with advisors to the council as to the layout and nature of commercial space, has been designed to be flexible over time. Could have larger floor plate or smaller units. Unsure of why other units are empty (could be because of rent or internal fit out).

Res – Commercial space will be a terrible risk to the Council. The site also had homeless people sleeping there. This was a safe space for them. Do Bluecroft own the land.

App – The site has a conditional sale. So it is Council land still.

Res – The fact that they space has been vacant since the 1970s is totally untrue, it has had open public access. It was being used as a bike run, it was used by rag and bone men for their horses. Used the site for composting etc, apparently with blessing from the Council.

Res – The scheme is contrary to the local plan, employment and conservation so why is this even being considered?

LBL – This is advertised as a departure from the local plan and would be considered on its own merits

Res – The existing buildings are good quality and nice attractive industrial buildings. Why are these being demolished? There was a Deptford Charette, informed with residents, and since there are now hundreds of flat of both sides, but no infrastructure.

Res – Blocks are also very close to Cremer House, overshadowing. It's 15m away the new block. Why does it have to be so close?

App – There is a need for residential and commercial like Faircharm, although recognise it is an employment zone. Working with specialist advisors. But need the flats above to fund the development. Always been aware that there are residential to the north and impacts on sunlight and daylight.

Res – There should be no tall buildings are permitted, this is very inappropriate. Faircharm already broke this with a tower. This is a tall building.

App – It is not the case that there is a restriction on tall buildings, it is about high quality design. The scheme was presented to the Councils Design Review Panel which they considered to be high quality. We have appraised the site and do not consider the existing buildings to be high quality and we are working with heritage advisors.

Res – Continuing surviving of the Birds Nest. Government said they would strengthen planning rules to protect music venues. So many sites are closing down at the moment. Birds Nest has already been assessed to protect Frankham St and Crossfields. This scheme is already so much closer. A petition of 2130 people signed that. Will the applicant team work or protect the Bird Nest or not?

App – Yes we will, policy has already done this via Agent of Change. We have had to factor this in. We commissioned an extra noise study and ran monitors during the night. That report made recommendations about glazing specification and sound proofing which we will adopt. We will equally be soundproofing against the pub.

Res – Are details on the application available online?

App – Yes

Res – So in the future will the birds nest be protected? What about in summer with doors open.

App - it is about reasonableness in law, on both sides.

Res - the Birds Nest will always act reasonably, because they have guidelines to work to.

App - people won't be able to open their windows anyway, because of applicant's own air pollution, which is 6 x national limit and 2 x EU limits.

Res – What is the impact of daylight and sunlight to allotments? No light calculation for all of Wilshaw House

App – Tested Wilshaw house as far as the impact was felt. I.e. not tested beyond when found to be acceptable.

Res - Windows are at different angles on the building - so proximity is not necessarily the only test.

App – We will re-look at daylight and sunlight.

Res – What material is the roof?

App – Bricks and materials have been assessed. So it would be a darker brick to match those along Creekside. Roof is a standing seam actual metal. Ground floor includes crittal type windows.

Res – The pavement looks very narrow, yet there are trees. Misleading? We need trees.

App – Generally speaking the pavement is twice as wide and more in places. It is the intention to plant as mature trees as possible, but do not know the specific details.

Res – Lots of trees in surrounding sites are being lost (Tidemill/ TTT) are sites considered cumulatively. Visual/ air quality/ impact.

LBL – sites are considered cumulatively. Visually yes in streetscape, yes traffic for CEMP and then potential CPZ.

Res - Construction impact with TTT, lack of access into the site. The number of lorries is huge.

APP – A fully detailed construction management plan would be secured by planning condition.

Res – Affordable Housing, how much is there?

App – It is 35% mixture of affordable rent and intermediate. Prices are set by the Council.

Meeting End 20:30