

## SILWOOD STREET VIRTUAL LOCAL MEETING

<b>Application</b>	Construction of mixed-use development comprising four blocks with building heights of five to nine storeys to provide 1,616 sqm of flexible commercial, business and service floorspace (Uses Class E) at ground and first floors with 61 x residential units on the upper floors together with car and cycle parking, service facilities, hard and soft landscaping, and other. [REVISED DESCRIPTION]
<b>Site</b>	Land and property comprising Silwood Street, London, SE16
<b>Application no</b>	DC/20/116783

**Lewisham Planning attendees -** Patrycja Ploch (Senior Planning Officer)

**Applicant’s attendees –**  
 James Thompson (Northport Property)  
 Chloe Saunter (Montagu Evans)  
 James Ainsworth (Montagu Evans)  
 Peter Smith (Davy Smith Architects)  
 Harry Leung (Davy Smith Architects)  
 Craig Robinson (Robinsons Surveyors)  
 Aaron Hand (Ardent)

**Public attendees -** Approximately 17

### 1. WELCOME AT 7PM

Planning Officer introduced a meeting and explained the procedures for the meeting.

The introduction was followed by a presentation prepared by the application introducing the scheme.

### 2. BRIEF PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT’S TEAM

Peter Smith (the Architect) introduced the scheme and what is being proposed on the application side.

### 3. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

**This development will tower over our development and the prospect of overlooking concerns us.**

**Local plan Policy DM 32 states flats should be 21m from living room windows. We have found rooms less than this distance which is against planning policy?**

**Privacy isn’t kept throughout the site, such as stairwells with large windows. How does the design mitigate this? There are various examples throughout Lewisham where living room spaces are facing towards viaducts.**

## **Why is such a high block being built right opposite 49 Silwood Street?**

**In looking at the design I can't identify any serious efforts to try minimise privacy impact. There are no similar height buildings in the immediate area. Please explain the gap between A and b.**

PP- The policy tries to achieve a distance of 21m, however, it has been found to not always be possible. Therefore, through design the requirement is that you have to show how you have tried to prevent habitable rooms overlooking each other. Separation as a general rule is applied flexibly and depends on local circumstances. Looking at the local area it is not uncommon for distances to be similar to that of the proposal.

PS – in the context of the Silwood Street estate. We did look at having apartments overlooking the railway, however, distances of 2 or 3m would not be desirable. The proposal is similar to the context of the area. We have staggered the building back and forth to try create more distances. However, the site is highly constrained and given the narrowness we believe that these distances are appropriate. We have put bathrooms and kitchens towards the railway.

PS - The Gap between A and B is to allow movement through to the arches beyond, bringing the arches into use in the future. This provides open space and parking also. At the Design Review Panel, it was felt that the elevation should be broken up and that is how it developed.

## **Daylight and Sunlight**

**We are concerned by the daylight and Sunlight, overshadowing impact on the rooms of the existing building. You are depriving some of the new residents of direct sunlight from the north side units.**

**The height of the blocks is an issue and you are only referring to the building to building distances. The height will make a serious impact – the general surrounding designs are of lower heights.**

CR - The problem with D&S is that the sun path only goes round half a hemisphere. Therefore windows outside of 90 degrees due south aren't properly considered and the situation is made to look worse than it is. Likewise, due to the dual aspect nature of rooms, if you're getting sunlight through 2 windows you tend to notice reductions in sunlight less. The amount of windows in a room and the direction they face also make a big difference. We look at both the impact on a window and then in the context of the room to make a more informed decision about the realities of the impact.

## **Transport**

**The loading bay area is another concern – there is parking on both sides of the road. If there is going to be a development here, how will you deal with the impact on the local residents. If there is no parking on the scheme how will you stop residents parking on our spaces. How will you manage the areas? How will we secure a CPZ?**

**There's talk that there will be CPZ but you also say we need to apply ourselves. We are not sure the percentage of residents to get a CPZ. How are you going to cope**

**with Millwall parking on match days? The idea that business owners and residents will come without cars isn't realistic.**

**The design should incorporate new bays just as this development does rather than suggesting that existing parking bays will be available for use which is very unrealistic in practice.**

**To clarify, will the new block residents have access to the parking bays already in existence?**

PP – if the development goes ahead. The developer will have to pay a sum of money towards a CPZ. We are aware that there is a high parking stress. You should be submitting information to the highways team so they are aware and with the potential money that comes forward, we should be able to designate these roads as CPZ. CPZ's, they are designated as a result of an identified need in the local area. It is surprising one has not been done already given the proximity to Millwall, however, it should help the case. If the permission were to be approved a legal agreement would be signed which prevents future residents from obtaining a permit. To clarify, if a CPZ were introduced, new residents would not have access to the parking space. We can also discuss with the applicant whether family units get access to car membership such as Zipcar.

AH – we are proposing Car free development due to the Sites accessibility, which is demonstrated by its PTAL rating. The primary mitigation we've put forward is the CPZ – we have committed to securing this through a legal agreement. It would be made clear to future occupiers of the Site that they couldn't apply for those permits. To further offset any potential harm, we are also providing 10 disabled bays, which is the full 10% requirement of TfL. With regards to the servicing and loading bays, for the daytime operation they are just for loading and then during the evening they would become open for parking – the terms of this would be down to Lewisham. The typical peak time for parking demand is the evening and therefore loading during the day shouldn't have too much impact. The Travel Plan has been secured against the site which will be used to encourage people not to drive, which combined with the CPZ should provide positive modal shifts, alongside good levels of cycle parking.

AH - we would like to see the CPZ introduced. The funding will be in place and the council will required to consult the residents on this. In terms of Millwall – this application shouldn't make the situation worse.

**The Transport Report was a good read – some of the assumptions I don't agree with. The Bolina Road is not considered as safe. The bus services have declined from the period I have lived here. Don't agree with PTAL rating.**

AH - When we look at the PTAL rating – this is all defined by TfL. They derive these values from a number of factors, such as walking distances. We work from the TfL assessment of routes of the area and also look at future conditions. The rationale for a manual assessment came from Lewisham Highways and also where there isn't a consistent PTAL rating. Everything we have done with PTAL has been reviewed by Lewisham and TfL. Likewise, we have worked to identify routes that are in need of improving and are trying to improve these certain routes.

**Can underground parking be provided?**

PS - Underground parking would be completely unviable given its location and the Sites shape.

### **Affordable House**

#### **What does 42% affordable housing mean?**

CS - Affordable housing is 42% on habitable room basis or 34% on a unit basis meaning 21 units, which is split between London Affordable rent and intermediate units.

### **Green Spaces**

#### **You propose green areas, but there is not enough considering this urban environment. Who will manage these green areas?**

CS - Maintenance of green spaces will be run by the owner of the site which would be funded by the service charges paid by future residents.

### **Closing - The meeting ended at 20.05 pm**

PP – We have ran out of time and we note that there are various unanswered questions. Please send us an email to: [planning@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:planning@lewisham.gov.uk) and we will do our best to get back to you.

### **Post Meeting Questions**

#### **What is the timeline for the completion of this development?**

The anticipated programme for construction is 18 months. Further details on this are contained in the draft Construction Logistics Plan document submitted with the application. There will also be a condition which requires a finalised Construction Logistics Management Plan to be approved prior to the development commencing.

#### **There are concerns with local crime and anti-social behaviour. How are you proposing to address this?**

The applicant met with the Secure by Design Officer to discuss the proposed scheme and how design measures can improve security and safety around the site. The feedback from the meeting and the measures that have been introduced are outlined in the Design and Access Statement. The improved public realm around the site and increased activity to the corner of Silwood Street and Bolina Road will help to create a better environment to minimise anti-social behaviour in this area of Silwood Street.