

BLACKHEATH BUSINESS ESTATE VIRTUAL LOCAL MEETING

Application	The construction of a part seven/part nine storey building on the site of Blackheath Business Estate, Blackheath Hill SE10 to provide 31, one bed 24, two bed and 8, three bedroom self-contained flats and a four storey building to provide 2288 sqm ² commercial space, together with disabled parking, cycle parking, play space, refuse storage and plant.
Site	Blackheath Business Estate, Blackheath Hill, London, SE10 8BA
Application no	DC/20/117309
Date	5 October 2020 between 19.00-20.00

Lewisham Planning attendees - Patrycja Ploch (Senior Planning Officer)

Ward Councillors - Cllr Bonavia (Ward Councillor for Blackheath)
Cllr Campbell (Ward Councillor for Blackheath)

Applicant's attendees – Ben Spender (GS8)
Nick Evans (Vabel)
Louise Welham (DP9)
Sam Hine (DP9)

Public attendees - Approximately 16

1. WELCOME AT 7PM

Planning Officer introduced a meeting and briefly explained the programme for the meeting.

Cllr Bonavia officially opened the meeting and explained the procedures.

2. BRIEF PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT'S TEAM

The introduction was followed by a presentation prepared by the application and the team. The presentation run through the proposed development.

3. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

After the presentation was over the floor was opened to questions and answers. The following questions were asked by participants (bold). The responses are provided and marked with word 'Answer' following each question.

Are you using MBHR systems? Surprised you didn't mention in sustainability section.

Answer: Yes, this is standard practice.

Will you be using cavity wall or ecobeads?

Answer: Not decided yet, but neither of them.

How tall is the building?

Answer: 33m at the highest.

Statement from a Clarkhill resident was read out. The statement claimed there was no consultation. It went on to say the DLSL situation is very bad and making it worse will badly affect their child who has some special needs.

Answer: The applicant commissioned Daylight & Sunlight Assessment, prepared by Tuffin Ferraby Taylor (TFT), dated 16 June 2020.

The effect of daylight and sunlight has been tested against BRE guidance. It is noted that the original design of Block D, Beechwood Place results in lower light levels on the elevation facing the development site. This is because several habitable rooms are located under recessed external walkways that hinder the windows/room ability to see visible sky and this is indicated by the poor light level currently experienced.

Daylight is measured using Vertical Sky Component (VSC). In urban locations such as this one, the case law established that if VSC value is 15% or more then the flat would receive good level of daylight

Out of the 185 windows tested, only 65 currently benefit from a VSC of at least 15%, even though the windows in question currently face single storey buildings. This will reduce to 57 windows post development, that's 8 windows that would be below 15%. Whilst the scheme is not BRE compliant the impact to those properties would not be significantly different to the existing situation caused by the original design of the building.

The flats have access to the elevation at the frontage of the building where the levels of daylight and sunlight are better, therefore all residents would have access to well-lit areas of the flats and only a one habitable room would be affected looking at the approved floor plans for the development.

The existing ward in the hospital site do not have much light, this might affect patients.

Answer: The southern elevation of the hospital building would experience daylight and sunlight impact. The rooms that would be affected are not permanently occupied by one person. Given the nature of the use of the hospital and the room the impact is assessed in a different to if the building was used a house.

Construction would result in creation of dust and other disturbances.

Answer: It is recognised that during implementation of the development there would be a significant amount of noise and disturbance from construction related activity. Construction related noise and activity cannot be avoided when implementing a development of this nature and scale. This is a relatively short-term impact that can be managed as much as practically possible through measures such as a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and control of construction hours.

An Outline Construction Logistics Plan, prepared by Ardent, dated May 2020, have been submitted in support of application. Officers will be requesting that an update Construction Management Plan including Logistic Plan should be secured through planning condition.

Lastly, it should be noted that it is not uncommon for mid-scale to large scale development to be constructed next a hospital, for example Shard was being constructed near Guy's Hospital in London Bridge.

Fears there will be illegal parking overspill.

Answer: The proposed development would be car free with the exception of three (3) disabled parking spaces. All prospective residents and commercial occupiers would be prevented from obtaining on-street parking permit in order to avoid parking street in the surrounding area. To reduce the need to car ownership from that indicated by applicant date, a membership to a car-club should be provided to each potential residents. This would be secured through appropriately worded section 106 obligation.

However, if there is any illegal car parking happening in the local area now or when the development is completed and occupied. You should in the first instance always try and resolve the issue peacefully yourself. If you can't find the driver to speak to them, try leaving a polite note on their windscreen. Failing this, please contact the council at lewishamparkingenforcement@nslservices.co.uk. The traffic enforcement team will attempt to trace the owner and can arrange for the vehicle to be removed if necessary.

Statement was about parking and that the Holly Mount residents end up paying for damage to grounds by cars from outside the estate.

Answer: As mentioned above, prospective residents and commercial occupiers would be prevented from obtaining on-street parking permit in order to avoid parking street in the surrounding area.

However, if there is any illegal car parking happening in the local area now or when the development is completed and occupied. You should in the first instance always try and resolve the issue peacefully yourself. If you can't find the driver to speak to them, try leaving a polite note on their windscreen. Failing this, please contact the council at lewishamparkingenforcement@nslservices.co.uk. The traffic enforcement team will attempt to trace the owner and can arrange for the vehicle to be removed if necessary.

Planning officer was requested to "walk the site".

Answer: Since the local meeting the planning case officer has visited the site alone as requested.

Blackheath Hill Residents Group which has in excess of 106 co-signatories to our letter of objection. We recognise that GS8/Vabel made some effort to engage with the local community, but there were major inadequacies within the consultation process at the pre-planning stage.

Answer: The National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) states that pre-application engagement with the community is encouraged where it will add value to the process and the outcome.

The applicant has organised community workshops which have been attended by a few residents. This shows that the applicant has tried to engage with the local community as it was stated in the submitted Statement of Community Involvement.

Tenants had not been consulted. New tenants still coming in because the units are great - no need to improve. Wanted compensation and asked how much they'd all get, etc.

Answer: The applicant encouraged the tenants to continue to contact him directly to discuss the relocation and/or compensation.

Confined his comments to biodiversity. Did not believe the biodiversity situation could be improved via this development.

Answer: The development would result in a removal of 38 trees. These trees are in poor health. The proposed development includes the planting of 50 new semi-mature and established trees across the site, giving a positive net gain of 12 new trees. In addition to this the applicant is also proposing to improve public realm through soft landscaping on the ground and roof level. The proposal would therefore result in biodiversity gain.

We feel that this is an overlay ambitious, dense and overbearing scheme of very high residential and business buildings whose scale is not commensurate with the immediate surrounding building which include the hospital, Block D Parkside and the properties (including those that are listed) on Blackheath Hill, none of which exceed 5 storeys as viewed from Blackheath Hill kerbside.

Do you accept that this development will have a massive impact on the amenity, (in planning terms), of the immediate community with respect of loss of privacy, overshadowing, overbearing/oversized, increase noise, increase pollution, loss of mature tree canopy.

Answer: The development would optimise the use of brownfield site and create positive addition for the local area, through bring this site forward with housing and employment space. The impact of the development has been robustly assessed through a number of technical documents, all of which consider that impact of proposed development to be acceptable in terms its impact on neighbour amenity, urban context and highway and transport.

What actual number (not percentage) of the proposed residential accommodation will actually be designated for social housing (not affordable housing)?

Answer: The application would deliver 20 affordable housing units. Out of the 20 units, 14 would be social rented and they would be mainly 3-bedroom flats and 6 would be intermediate/shared ownership.

Post Meeting Questions

The submission includes a report on air quality carried out shortly after Lockdown began, when traffic on the A2 was virtually non-existent.

Answer: Council's Environmental Protection Office (Air Quality) reviewed the submitted information and advised that the assessment demonstrated that the changes in traffic flows brought about by the proposed development will be below published screening thresholds, and thus the impact on local roadside air quality will be insignificant. Overall,

the construction and operational air quality effects of the proposed development are judged 'not significant'. The proposed development has also been shown to meet both the current, and intend to Publish, London Plan's requirement that new developments are at least 'air quality neutral'.

Your department granted a two-week extension for objections to be submitted. This in itself appears to acknowledge that insufficient time had been allowed for those objections.

Answer: The formal consultation period last for 21 days. The period of time was extended as officers knew that the application will not be determined after that period and a reasonable request was made by the member of the public.

Other

Officer note that any further comments, letters of support and objection would be counted and taken into account as long as the application is live