

Appendix 1

Local Meeting Thursday 23rd January 2020

DC/19/114244: The demolition of existing social club at 240-242 Brockley Road, and the construction of a part four/part five storey building including basement comprising new social club with 9 residential units above (7 x 2 & 2 x 3), together with the provision of bicycle and refuse stores, landscaping and amenity space, terraces and a pergola in the rear garden

Participants:

Cllr Stephen Penfold (Chair)

Alfie Williams (Case Officer)

Marc Stennett from Ravensgate Developments (Applicant)

Anna Madej from Robert Davies John West Architects

Minutes of the meeting

Cllr Penfold (KB) – Introduction to the meeting

Alfie Williams (AW) – Introduction to the case and the purpose of the meeting

Anna Madej (AM) and Marc Stennett (MS) – Provide a presentation detailing the history of the scheme and the current proposals.

At this stage of the meeting the chair opened the floor to the public to ask both parties questions and make comments. It is reiterated that questions relating to process should be directed towards Alfie Williams and those relating directly to the application should be directed to the application team.

Questions and comments from members of the public are detailed below:

Q: Austin Musto – Are the flank window facing No.238 obscure glazed.

A: AM – Yes at first floor level and above.

Q: Mrs Hibbert - The building would be too high and would result in overlooking

A: AM - There are higher buildings on the opposite side of Brockley Road and there is existing overlooking from Foxberry Court.

Q: Mrs Hibbert - In response disagrees

A: AM – The balconies have been designed to prevent overlooking.

Q: Lionel Lewis – The architecture is good, however the height is required due to the retention of the social club.

A: MS – Foxberry Court is four storeys.

Q: Tony Green – The social club is good for the local community.

Q: Danny – Will there be an increase to deliveries and parking pressures in the area.

A: MS – There were three pre-application meetings and we were advised to be car free.

A: AM – The site has a high PTAL due to the proximity to the station and bus routes. We are also promoting car club membership.

Q: Danny – There will also be parking pressures caused by increased use of the social club.

A: AM – A parking study was submitted with the application.

Q: Tony Green – The parking pressure is caused by parking for the train stations and schools. We need residents parking permits.

Q: Imogen – There will be noise and disturbance from the use of the social club due to the late nights. Will the opening hours increase?

A: AM – A management strategy for the social club and a noise impacts assessment have been submitted. Music events would be restricted to the basement to ensure that noise is limited and doors will be kept closed.

A: Louise Hagen (Social Club Secretary) – The aim is to expand our offer wider to include a more diverse range of groups and create relationships with the community. The club can be used for community groups, yoga and children/baby groups. There will also be improved disabled access.

Q: Derek Griggs – Concern with the height of the building due to impact on light.

A: AM – A report was submitted with the application which demonstrates that the impact would be restricted to two small windows at No.238.

Q: Jane Dickinson – It is impossible it wouldn't block light. It is overly dominant.

A: MS – We were encouraged to design a feature corner building.

Q: Imogen – There is always a pressure from the Council to increase housing.

Q: Gordon – Would the housing be affordable?

A: M – The cost of re-providing the social club mean that it is not viable to provide affordable housing.

Q: Gordon – You have saved money from not having to purchase the site.

A: MS – The cost of re-providing the social club is the equivalent of purchasing the site.

A: AW – The proposed development does not meet the policy threshold for an affordable housing contribution.

A: MS – The original proposal was for 11 one bedroom flats but this evolved with the design.

A: AM – Two and three bedroom flats are considered more desirable.

Q: Angela – Was the height of the building and number of flats encouraged by the Council?

A: Mark – The original proposal was for a smaller building with a higher number of flats. Viability and comments on the design dictated changes to the scheme.

Q: Jane Dickinson – Other developments have reduced the height in subsequent proposals.

A: AM – There is precedent for larger buildings on corner plots on Brockley Road.

Q: Jane Dickinson – It's out of keeping.

Q: Question relating to overlooking from the top floor to the gardens on Foxberry Road?

A: AM – The terrace faces Brockley Road and the petrol garage, and is stepped backed. We can also obscure the windows facing Foxberry Road as they are secondary windows.

Q: There is potential for overlooking from the green roof?

A: MS – The green roof would will be fenced off.

A: AW – The use of the green roof as an amenity space could be restricted by condition were planning permission to be granted.

Q: Austin Musto – Question relating to the boundary with No.238 and security?

A: AM – It would have a 1.8m high close-board timber fence with a side alley for maintenance.

A: MS – The alley can be gated.

Q: Imogen - Question regarding the opening hours of the club

A: Louise Hagen (Social Club Secretary) – The opening hours would remain the same midnight Monday – Thursday, 1am Friday and Saturday and 11pm Sunday.

Q: Derek Griggs – Problem with people leaving the club late at night due to talking, smoking, slamming car doors etc.

A: Louise Hagen (Social Club Secretary) – The aim is to maximise revenue during the day through community groups and other uses so we are not so reliant on late nights. This would allow the club to revert to a members club during the evenings

and promote games and other activities. Parties and discos will be restricted to the basement and kept to Fridays and Saturdays.

A: SP – Some of these issues are more relevant to licencing.

Q: Ken – Where will bins and deliveries be collected?

A: MS – Maintaining the existing arrangement from Foxberry Road.

Q: Jen Parker – The previous scheme was smaller, is there a possibility of reverting to a smaller building?

A: AW – We are required to assess the scheme that has been submitted.

A: MS – This scheme is considered to be the best proposal for the site and reports have been carried out based on the current scheme.

Q: Lionel Lewis – There appears to be a contradiction between the requirements of the Council and the requirements of the developer.

A: M – There are different parameters when working across different boroughs. The initial advice was to look at the wider area and assess what has been done well and let that inform the next proposal. We were not told a specific design or height.

Q: Lionel Lewis – What happens if the club does not succeed.

A: M – The club has been here for 100 years and the aim is that this development will allow the club to thrive. However, the club could be converted to residential.

Q: Jen Parker – So it would become residential by the backdoor?

A: AW – The retention of the social club would be secured by condition and any change of use would require planning permission.

Q: Question relating to flooding and high water table.

A: AW – A drainage report has been submitted with the application and is being reviewed by Council Officers.

A: AM – A structural engineer would review the water table after the planning stage.

The chair brings to meeting to a close at this stage and thanks everyone for taking the time to come and informs the attendees that the minutes of this meeting will be made public to view.