



### **Hesper House Local Meeting**

**Monday 14<sup>th</sup> October 2021 – 19:00 – 20:00 @ Virtually held on Zoom**

#### **Meeting Opened at 19:00**

8 Local residents, and Councillor Sophie Davis attended the meeting.

Councillor Leo Gibbons introduced themselves, James Hughes (Planning South Area Team Leader) and Sam James, the lead planning officer; and on behalf of the applicant, the planning agents John Smart and Jonas Brayz of Craftworks.

The reason for the virtual meeting was outlined: to discuss planning application DC/21/120262. The purpose of this meeting was to allow residents to ask questions of, and put their views to, the developer and Council officers. The meeting format was explained, including how the questioning process would work, following the Planning Agent's presentation.

The planning agent gave a short opening statement and presentation of the proposal, and summarised the design intent of the amended scheme.

Following the presentation, the meeting proceeded in 'themes' which broadly covered each of the main material planning considerations, main concerns raised during the consultation period were read out the planning officer, followed up by comments or questions in the text chat function.

Concern was raised by a resident regarding the standard of amenity that would be provided. Planning officer explained that officers considered the standard of accommodation to be acceptable, as all dwellings would exceed the minimum floorspace requirements.

Concern was raised regarding the design and whether this was appropriate for the area. It was stated by one resident that there is nothing that matches the proposal in the surrounding area and that reconstituted stone and timber are not used in this area. Concern was raised that the large window that would emit light, which wildlife will fly into. Planning officer explained that officers considered the design to be acceptable and policy compliant, as a result of its high quality and appropriate scale and massing. It was also noted that the building proposed is very similar to that approved previously.

Concern was raised regarding overlooking from the proposed balconies to Longton Avenue. Planning officer explained that the distances were considered to be acceptable, and the balconies would not result in a harmful loss of privacy to Longton Avenue properties as a result.

Concern was raised that Wells Park Road is dangerous. Planning officer noted the access arrangement are similar to others along the street, and that highway officers did not object to the proposal.

A resident asked whether the proposed density was still considered acceptable, as the permission was at the upper end of acceptable density. Planning officer explained that the density was considered acceptable, and would optimise the site in line with new London Plan Policies.

APPENDIX A – DC/21/120262

A question regarding the type of heating that would be used was raised. The applicant advised that they were proposing to use electric boilers, rather than gas. Further they were proposing other methods to reduce energy usage, and using renewables, as set out in the energy report that was submitted.

Concern was raised that the landscaping scheme did not appear to include native planting. The applicant showed their ecology and landscaping strategy, and confirmed they were proposing native landscaping, as well as other ecological enhancement. Planning officer confirmed the landscaping and ecological enhancements would be secured by condition if approved and that the ecology officer raises no objections subject to this. It was also noted that Section 106 financial contributions would be sought for enhancement to local nature reserves.

Concern was raised regarding the amount of parking that could be generated by the proposal, and questioned where residents not allocated a parking space would park. Planning officer advised that the provision of parking was in line with adopted London Plan policies, and that a parking survey had been submitted, demonstrating sufficient capacity on surrounding streets for any overspill parking that might be generated.

A question regarding affordable housing viability was raised. Planning officers confirmed the applicants financial viability review had been reviewed independently, and the Council's consultants concluded that the proposal could not viably contribute affordable housing. However there would be provision for early and late stage viability reviews in any future 106 agreement if permission was granted.

Concern was raised that there is a lot of new development in the surrounding area, and that there was not capacity in local schools or doctor surgeries. Planning officer explained the development would be CIL liable, meaning financial contributions were payable for local infrastructure support, which is expected to cover the costs of additional residential units using these services etc.

Councillor Gibbons gave a brief summary of the points that had been covered, and thanked all for their attendance. He explained that further questions and comments could be submitted in writing, and residents can write to councillors, the planning team and the applicant. He confirmed residents who have commented on the application will be notified of the date any future planning committee meeting relating to the proposal, thanked everyone for attending and for participating in the meeting.

**Meeting Closed 20:05.**