

Aylesham Centre LB Southwark Meeting Note

Purpose of Meeting:	Project Kick-Off – Introductory Meeting		
Location of Meeting:	Virtual - Zoom		
Date:	14 th December 2021 – 9:00am	Meeting No:	1

Details:**Attendees present**

Yvonne Lewis	YL	LB Southwark	LBS
Pete Davidson	PD	Berkeley Homes	BH
Chloe Young	CY	Berkeley Homes	BH
Jacob Dunn	JD	Berkeley Homes	BH
Tom Anthony	TA	Berkeley Homes	BH
Alan Shingler	AS	Sheppard Robson Architects	SR
Claire Haywood	CH	Sheppard Robson Architects	SR
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young (Planning)	AY
Greg Smith	GS	Avison Young (Planning)	AY
Gardiner Hanson	GH	Avison Young (Planning)	AY

Meeting Items	
1.0	Public Consultation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> YL highlighted the importance of reaching a wider audience and capturing the younger voices (local schools) and cautioned against focussing too heavily on the more dominant local voices (Eileen Conn). This is a matter which the previous owners did not get right. Very diverse community – ‘what is Peckhamness??’ Hard to define as the area is evolving. Challenge is to complement and reflect the unique character of Peckham and not compete with it. The intention of BH to have a presence on-site to facilitate continuous community engagement was welcomed.
2.0	TfL Land / Bus Route <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disappointment voiced over intention to exclude the TfL land from the application (no aspirations to bring the site forward in the short term). YL acknowledged the current issues with TfL and suggested that this is an issue they may need to come back to and that we may need to help TfL. LBS would be really disappointed if we were not able to ‘help’ resolve the problem that LBS considers exists in terms of bus circulation and repairing the Peckham High St frontage. Future proofing required. Important to create a frontage and not ending up with the development treating the bus depot as ‘back of site’. BH intend to respond appropriately to site edges and not prejudice bus operation or potential for future redevelopment. Bus route through the site was discussed over many years and seen as a positive benefit of the scheme which would address ‘long-standing issues in the town centre’. BH reiterated that we are looking at the site afresh and not ruling anything out at this stage. ARUP appointed early to provide technical input and inform design principles.

Meeting Items

3.0

Key LBS Planning Issues

- Scale and Massing – Impact upon local views from Peckham Levels and Bussey Building well documented. Intimated that number of homes was creating a scale that had brought challenges. YL noted that there was a long battle to manipulate the form necessary to achieve the number of homes promoted by Tiger.
- Opportunity for more workspace/workshops to be explored in order to create employment and generate more footfall as a business location.
- Mix of retail – opposing schools of thought which some preferring bigger high street brands to complement existing retail offer and others insisting on the need for smaller retail space to reflect the character of Peckham. Interesting challenge to overcome. Integration of scheme into Peckham TC will be important.
- Architectural response to Peckham Rye frontage important and the need to create pedestrian routes through. Distinctive Rye Lane frontage was welcomed in Tiger scheme.
- Idea of having different architectural hands to avoid creating a large development with a homogenous architectural style. YL queried whether the use of different architects could be explored and stated that a local BME firm would be well received by Members. BH/SR to consider.
- Mix of non-residential uses; could include community/cultural space to support place-making.
- Inclusion of leisure space would contribute to the night-time economy but needs to be carefully located to avoid impacts on residential amenity, particularly any affordable homes.
- Cycling provision – important.
- Sustainability and carbon reduction strategies – an innovative approach would be welcomed.
- Quantum of affordable housing – deemed to be 'non-negotiable'.
- Community Land Trust – noted that this can be difficult and does not have universal support within the Council. LBS Officers expected the Inspector to remove it from the policy but didn't. Likely will require a standalone block. Need to work through in more detail.
- Quality of housing in terms of unit sizes, aspect, amenity space etc
- Children's playspace – key issue for members. Needs to be meaningful. The development should not just be an adult orientated place and must be suitable for kids.
- Public realm and connectivity. Needs to be a liveable place as well as a lively town centre environment.
- Need to create positive frontages on all sides of the site.
- Big challenge to resolve parking and servicing issues.

4.0

Type of Application (Full or Hybrid)

- Acknowledged that a hybrid approach could work provided that the parameters of the outline components were supported by strong design principles/codes.

Meeting Items

5.0

Next Steps

- YL to liaise with GS to diarise a pre-app in January and will feedback on the suggested PPA meetings/topics and programme.
- Positive that we are allowing sufficient time between meetings for the design work to take place.
- YL commented that they would prefer that we are honest about what we need to achieve - don't be disingenuous.

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre - LBS Pre-App 1		
Location of Meeting:	Zoom		
Date:	26 January 2022	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	1

Details:			
Attendees Present			
Victoria Lewis	VL	LBS - Team Leader, Strategic Applications	LBS
Colin Wilson	CW	LBS – Head of Strategic Development	LBS
Yvonne Lewis	YL	LBS – Group Manager, Strategic Applications	LBS
Tom Weaver	TW	LBS – Case Officer, Strategic Applications	LBS
Catherine Jeater	CJ	LBS – Team Leader, Design & Conservation	LBS
Pete Davidson	PD	Berkeley Homes – Divisional Land and Planning Director	BH
Chloe Young	CY	Berkeley Homes – Development Director	BH
Jacob Dunn	JD	Berkeley Homes – Senior Development Manager	BH
Tom Anthony	TA	Berkeley Homes – Planning and Development Manager	BH
Alan Shingler	AS	Sheppard Robson – Partner	SR
Claire Haywood	CH	Sheppard Robson – Partner	SR
Tom Kyle	TK	Sheppard Robson – Associate Director	SR
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young – Partner	AY
Greg Smith	GS	Avison Young – Associate Director	AY
Gardiner Hanson	GH	Avison Young – Associate	AY

Next Meeting			
Date of Next Meeting:	TBD	Place of Meeting:	TBD
Purpose of Meeting:	Transport and Design Workshops		

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Planning Specification	
1.1	<p>VL – Requested clarification on specification of planning application.</p> <p>NA – Noted that it is likely to be hybrid application, but this is still under review as to what parts of the site would come forward under detailed and outline permission.</p> <p>LBS were comfortable with this approach.</p>	Note
2.0	Community Engagement	
2.1	<p>VL – Requested clarification on the project team intentions for community engagement moving forward.</p> <p>NA – First priority is to engage in meaningful consultation with local community as design progresses.</p> <p>JD – Provided more detail on engagement strategy – three stage process to be led by BH and Kanda. Seeking widest range of views to inform proposals as possible. There is a strategy for continuous engagement in place whereby BH will go directly to the community, traders and businesses rather than wait for them to come to us (consultation hub/door knocking/pop-ups/digital/social media).</p> <p>CY – Early engagement has already been undertaken with local stakeholder groups (4 x meetings already held with Aylesham Community Action Group (ACA) and Mountview for example, and produced an agreed stakeholder map).</p> <p>PD – This being said, we recognise that the ACA are not wholly representative of the locale and we'll be seeking broader engagement across all parts of the community, particularly those that are harder to reach as the project progresses.</p> <p>LBS were supportive of this approach.</p>	Note
2.2	<p>TW – Queried consultation timelines – when is the project team intending on sharing more detailed information to the broader community.</p> <p>JD – The first stage will run until spring 22 and will be a listening exercise, following which we will report back on the initial findings and progress to sharing plans with the broader community, where we will again be seeking feedback.</p> <p>LBS raised no concerns with the proposed consultation programme.</p>	Note
3.0	Local Design Input	
3.1	<p>VL – Sought clarification on whether there is any intention to include local architects/designers.</p> <p>CH – Project team is currently reviewing opportunities to include local architects that are present in Peckham or represent the diversity of Peckham.</p> <p>AS – Clarified the project team would need to have the masterplan/layout principles set prior to bringing in design partners. The hybrid approach offers a greater opportunity for different architectural expression.</p> <p>VL – LBS would welcome discussion and assist in identifying local architects/practices as needed.</p>	Note

Meeting Items		Action
3.2	<p>PD – BH also recognise importance and support including local design knowledge as scheme progresses.</p> <p>YL – Would suggest that early engagement with local firms on developing masterplan would be welcomed and can add value/credibility to the designs and enable creativity.</p> <p>VL – Suggested that reaching out to the local Camberwell College of Arts (University of Arts London) may be welcome and beneficial.</p>	BH/SR
4.0	Retail/Non-Residential Strategy	
4.1	<p>VL – Notes there are business relocation strategy policies within NSP and LBS would expect that appropriate strategies are implemented for existing on-site businesses that want to relocate.</p> <p>VL – Noted possible equalities implications and that an Equalities Impact Assessment would be required.</p> <p>PD – BH are aware of the policy requirements, are supporting existing businesses and will engage with tenants moving forward.</p>	Note
4.2	<p>VL – Queried what the retail strategy is – what types of businesses are envisioned (chains/independent businesses) and what size of units are being considered.</p> <p>NA – Noted the project team are preparing an evidence base to ensure policy requirements and BH commercial interests are met.</p> <p>JD – Confirmed BH have instructed consultants to undertake a comprehensive retail study to understand the current retail offer in Peckham and what further requirements there are, in order to inform our masterplan.</p> <p>GS – Stated that the strategy would also be informed by the views of the local community, received through the consultation process, in terms of what they would like to see.</p> <p>YL – LBS were supportive of the approach to the retail strategy/study but would like to see a variety of non-residential uses proposed to bring vibrancy. Notes consideration of creative, cultural and workspace uses should be undertaken.</p> <p>CJ – Reiterates there is likely to be different segments of community wanting different uses and character of spaces. The project team should consider how best to achieve diversity of offering that meets community expectations.</p>	Note
5.0	Bus Route	
5.1	<p>YL – LBS consider Bus Route through previous scheme was seen as a major public benefit of previous scheme. Notes LBS consider one of the best ways to improve Rye Lane public realm is to remove buses. Considers exclusion to be major issue with this masterplan concept. Also considers incorporating bus station land and improving frontage along Peckham High Street would be considered key public benefit and would be in accordance with site allocation policy.</p>	

Meeting Items	Action
<p>5.2</p> <p>AS/NA – By setting back development from Rye Lane, giving space back to the area, the proposals will improve the pedestrian experience, reduce congestion whilst providing significant public realm within the scheme that would benefit the wider community. Relocating bus routing through site would replicate the same issues currently on Rye Lane and potentially reduce footfall and vibrancy along the main high street along Rye Lane.</p> <p>CY – Based on recent public engagement the project team understand main priorities for residents are creating successful spaces, public realm and greening – rather than the prospect of hard landscaping associated with rerouting buses away from Rye Lane.</p>	
<p>5.3</p> <p>YL – LBS would recommend looking beyond site boundaries for ways the scheme can deliver public benefits – considers strategic bus provision/routing as a significant public benefit which can be successfully integrated as a positive part of public realm.</p> <p>AS – Queried who had primarily pushed for bus route through site – TfL/LBS/or local residents.</p> <p>YL – Thought it was largely driven by TfL, but recalled it may also have been supported by local residents.</p> <p>ACTION: AY to set up workshop with TfL/LBS to discuss bus routing and investigate the pros and cons.</p>	AY/BH
<p>6.0</p> <p>Design</p>	
<p>6.1</p> <p>YL – Would like to understand what the project team brief is in terms of quantum of development - resi/retail and heights of building.</p> <p>NA – Project team very much seeking to optimise development – baseline is the indicative site allocation capacity of 850 dwellings.</p> <p>CJ – Scheme currently looks like 3 x large blocks with leftover spaces provided in between. Desire lines not well provided for – results in longer blocks. Suggests that variety of fronts and backs of buildings will create more interest and more meaningful plan.</p> <p>AS – Agreed that this is the intention of the masterplan to respond to pedestrian desire lines across the site, and for the blocks to be broken down into a more granular plan that will allow a variety of spaces to be created with different uses in the buildings that define them. It may not have come across as such in the presentation, and this level of detail will further emerge as the design progresses.</p> <p>ACTION: NA – Suggests LBS and project team set-up a design workshop to discuss design principles and masterplan options following the workshop with TfL/LBS.</p> <p>YL/CJ – LBS officers agree design workshop would be welcome at early stage.</p>	AY/BH

Meeting Items	Action
<p>6.2</p> <p>CH – Design seeks to create residential environments at ground floor fronting onto McKerrell Road and part of Hanover Park to integrate the scheme with the surroundings, reiterating that it is a ground floor- led masterplan</p> <p>YL – Raised concern that this may result in single aspect large sized units. Also raised concern about the outlook of ground floor units along Hanover Park, which would front onto Primark –suggested employment/active frontage should be explored for this location.</p> <p>TW – Also notes potential N facing units at ground floor looking over bus depot may be problematic and may be more suitable for main town centre uses.</p> <p>YL – Notes the floor to ceiling heights in Morrison’s block may be difficult to provide good quality homes at ground floor.</p> <p>CH – Agreed that project team will review residential at ground floor along active edges of site.</p>	
<p>6.3</p> <p>CJ – Notes that greater consideration of how the development backs onto adjoining sites should be considered in masterplan – rear yards are considered prevailing quality and character of Peckham that could be integrated into masterplan.</p>	
<p>6.4</p> <p>CW – Suggestion that additional consideration should be undertaken on how to really reflect the character of Peckham – suggesting we look into how this development would be different from others and include some ‘Peckham-ness’.</p> <p>ACTION: CW – Stated LBS would be able to provide some feedback from officers who have been involved in Peckham Square scheme regarding challenges and feedback.</p>	LBS/AY
<p>6.5</p> <p>YL – Queried potential for creating opening/routes onto Peckham High Street to the north of the scheme.</p> <p>PD – Stated that this was considered but clarified that the buildings within BH ownership on this frontage have long leases in place which restricts opportunities. However, BH and SR will review and consider any available options moving forward.</p>	BH/SR
<p>7.0</p> <p>Community Land Trust</p>	
<p>7.1</p> <p>YL – Queried what BH’s position is on Community Land Trusts.</p> <p>NA – Noted that the Project team are exploring potential options and trying to better understand the implications and the feasibility of delivery.</p>	Note
<p>8.0</p> <p>Delivery & Servicing</p>	
<p>8.1</p> <p>YL – LBS would like to understand delivery and servicing strategy – routes, frequency, service areas</p> <p>ACTION: VL – LBS would appreciate if D&S strategy could be issued prior to discussions with TfL.</p> <p>ACTION: NA – Noted that Arup have been looking into this and agreed the project team would prepare a pack and arrange follow-up session with officers.</p>	BH/AY/ ARUP

Meeting Items	Action
<p>8.2</p> <p>CH – Noted one of the criticisms of previous scheme was D&S from McKerrrell Road – Instead project team are pursuing ground level D&S yard for Morrisons from Hanover Park. Still at early stages and under review with ARUP.</p> <p>CW – References that Fitzroy Place benefits from a basement servicing strategy and is all well managed – queried whether or not this would be a feasible solution.</p> <p>CW – Could be an opportunity to reflect the ‘messy’/organic character of Peckham in terms of servicing within the scheme on-street. BH to consider.</p>	
<p>8.3</p> <p>CH – Car parking is proposed within basement below Morrison’s (140 spaces) – plus 3% blue badge for residential. LBS were aware of the need to balance the desire to reduce traffic congestions and pollution in the town centre with a viable level of car parking to serve the centre and the supermarket.</p> <p>YL – Applicants should also consider how supermarket users will access/leave site – taxi pick-ups, cycle parking, home delivery.</p>	
<p>9.0</p> <p>PPA/Next Steps</p>	
<p>9.1</p> <p>GS – Outlined high-level PPA timescales – likely next pre-app project team would like to start discussing design in more detail.</p> <p>ACTION: VL/YL – LBS still reviewing and will respond on PPA.</p>	LBS
<p>9.2</p> <p>YL – Prior to moving to the next formal design pre-app, LBS notes an interim design workshop is required to focus on bus route inclusion/exclusion – needs to include TfL.</p> <p>YL – Andrew Hiley was previous main contact at TfL – would typically include TfL representatives as needed from Commercial/Property teams.</p> <p>ACTION: AY to touch base with TfL and begin arranging transport/bus workshop.</p>	AY/BH
<p>9.3</p> <p>ACTION: AY to issue minutes post-meeting for review and formal agreement with LBS.</p>	AY

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre – Transport Workshop		
Location of Meeting:	Southwark Offices, 160 Tooley Street		
Date:	04 March 2022	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	2

Details:			
Attendees Present			
Yvonne Lewis	YL	LBS – Group Manager, Strategic Applications	LBS
Tom Weaver	TW	LBS – Case Officer, Strategic Applications	LBS
Alex Oyebade	AO	LBS – Team Leader, Transport	LBS
Anne Crane	AC	TfL Spatial Planning - Area Manager	TfL
Andrew Hiley	AH	TfL Spatial Planning – Transport Case Officer	TfL
Tim Gould	TG	TfL Spatial Planning – Associate Transport Officer	TfL
Peter Davidson	PD	Berkeley Homes – Divisional Land and Planning Director	BH
Chloe Young	CY	Berkeley Homes – Development Director	BH
Jacob Dunn	JD	Berkeley Homes – Senior Development Manager	BH
Alan Shingler	AS	Sheppard Robson – Partner	SR
Brendan Weaver	BW	Arup – Associate Director	
Greg Smith	GS	Avison Young – Associate Director	AY

Next Meeting			
Date of Next Meeting:	08 March 2022	Place of Meeting:	Southwark Offices, 160 Tooley Street
Purpose of Meeting:	Design Workshop		

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Presentation	
1.1	<p>For the purposes of the meeting with TfL, AS shared a presentation outlining our initial first thoughts on a new masterplan for the site.</p> <p>The initial layout had offered the widening of Rye Lane to facilitate an improved urban environment, enhanced setting of heritage assets, cycle lane and bus lane improvements. The primary east-west pedestrian route was positioned to the north within the site to offer improved connectivity between the bus station and the bus stops on Rye Lane.</p> <p>BW presented the transport context with opportunities for widening the cycle route, bus route and pedestrian footway on Rye Lane.</p>	Note
2.0	Masterplan Feedback	
2.1	<p>AC raised queries on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the site and Morrisons would be serviced, how the retail uses within the site would be serviced and how deliveries would be managed. Additional servicing along the northern boundary was discouraged. • Quantum and location of car parking. AC/YL stated that every space would need to be justified. • Cycle routes – stated that Peckham High Street (PHS) was challenging for cyclists and pedestrians. • Need to think about how the site can be accessed by cycles. Opportunities for more cycling along Hanover Park would be preferred to reduce dependency on PHS. Would want to discourage east-west cycling through the site itself to avoid potential conflicts within the ‘bus station’ <p>Type of non-residential uses at ground floor – AS stated that uses are indicative at this stage and will be informed by the ongoing retail study.</p> <p>AO asked whether the masterplan layout had considered mobility impaired users (lots of trees etc). CY – high level masterplan at this stage but will take on board as detailed design progresses.</p> <p>TfL prefer the proposed revised service arrangements for Morrison's via Hanover Park, rather than via the bus station as is currently the case, subject to further details. did not raise any issues with the proposed principles for access and servicing arrangements for Morrisons.</p>	Note
2.2	<p>The opportunity for enhanced cycle lane provision and widening of the bus route along Rye Lane was discussed and was welcomed in principle.</p> <p>AC stated that there was potential for a new bus stop on PHS to the north-west of Rye Lane for east-west services (conversion of existing loading bay).</p> <p>AC raised a potential issue with the ‘pinch point’ at the southern end of Rye Lane where cyclists would need to move from the highway onto the cycle lane, highlighting that not the full extent of Rye Lane would be widened. BW explained that this was a short distance and not uncommon, and that the proposal would offer a significant betterment from the current position.</p>	Note

Meeting Items	Action
<p>2.3</p> <p>AC asked about BH landholdings and whether there was any opportunity to create a new pedestrian link at the north of the site onto PHS to help avoid a potential conflict with bus movement.</p> <p>TfL raised the opportunity of improving pedestrian connections via Bull Yard which currently has some steps and some planning or enforcement issues, particularly at its southern end.</p> <p>AH stated that there could be potential to reduce the width of the existing vehicular access onto PHS if there is no longer a requirement for articulated lorries accessing via this route in the future.</p> <p>AC suggested that the scheme would need to find a balance with the operational requirements of the bus stand and the potential safety issues if it was to remain as it is.</p>	
<p>2.4</p> <p>When the question was asked about TfL's plans for the bus station, AC stated that there was not currently funding for any improvements.</p> <p>TG acknowledged that the redevelopment of the site would not achieve everything that everyone wanted.</p>	Note
<p>3.0</p> <p>New N/S Bus Route</p>	
<p>3.1</p> <p>YL advised that the opportunity for a north/south bus route should still be explored and made reference to the long period of time this was discussed with Tiger.</p> <p>YL acknowledged that working with TfL on a joint application would add complications but stated that this is what their Councillors want to see come forward, stating that betterment of the bus services and a repaired frontage onto PHS is the aspiration.</p> <p>AC confirmed this is TfL's preferred approach but highlighted that they were here speaking as transport planners rather than TfL commercial. Rye Lane 'would be something' but would not address all of the bus issues. Hanover Park also needs improvement.</p> <p>TG stated that he had understood there would be more 'marriage value' for the site by bringing the sites together, it would create a nicer environment for the new residential development (and the town centre), currently very ugly to look at, lots of noise from the station with bus reversing so there would be an Agent of Change issue to consider if the bus stand was not included within the redevelopment plans.</p>	Note
<p>3.2</p> <p>When asked about what the existing issues were with the bus movement, AC/TG referred to the current inefficiencies of N/S buses and the operational costs for TfL associated with that, as well as increased passenger journey times because of 'detour' down Clayton Road and poor transport interchange with passengers needing to walk long distances to connect to different bus services.</p> <p>TG – TfL have made the best with what they have and made it work as well as it can. Would need to liaise with London Buses on operational requirements.</p> <p>TG could not recall final Tiger scheme bus routing or movements but key priority was bringing the southbound buses through the site.</p>	Note

Meeting Items		Action
	AC/TG stated that a central hub and interchange for the buses is TfL's main priority.	
3.3	AH asked about the possibility of including third party land to the east and bringing the N/S route down onto McKerrell Road. Discounted by LBS, no option to include the neighbouring estate land owned by LBS.	Note
3.4	<p>When asked about the Tiger scheme, TfL confirmed that some bus services would continue on Rye Lane in all scenarios, and with the ongoing requirement for servicing and deliveries for existing retail occupiers, Rye Lane would never be fully pedestrianised.</p> <p>TG understood that the previously proposed bus route would accommodate circa 60 buses per hour. BW stated that from the draft TA we had seen that this number was 250 buses per hour – which would create a very different character. BH - this could result in two public routes which are dominated by buses and create a compromised area of public realm. Acknowledged that proposals may have moved on. Clarity to be provided by LBS/TfL.</p>	LBS/TfL
3.5	It was queried whether the Tiger scheme was supported. YL stated that they were getting there but there were still issues around servicing, height of the development and impact on views from the Bussey Building, officers deemed there to be a lack of ambition for the town centre aspects of the scheme, i.e. pure retail and wanted to see more dynamic uses.	Note
3.6	<p>AS highlighted that an important driver of the new scheme was to offer something different and new green space/public realm could respond to requests from the local community.</p> <p>YL stated that a good public realm could still be created with the bus route and be pedestrian friendly.</p> <p>AC stated that new bus route through the site would benefit the Morrisons store but acknowledged impacts on residential uses – could be partially mitigated (covered stands could avoid noise breakout). This would be encouraging a sustainable mode of transport, not cars.</p> <p>AC questioned need for all of the new ground floor uses and public realm – ‘is there room for this in Peckham?’ Should not sanitise Peckham with the idea of creating quiet residential streets and spaces – it's a town centre.</p> <p>YL echoed this comment in reference to ‘what is Peckham-ness?’ – busy environment – lots of buses. Stated that buses are important to Peckham.</p>	Note
3.7	<p>GS queried if there was any option for scheme to be futureproofed to make provision for the bus route should TfL ever decide to bring forward their site for development. AC stated this was not an option as it is not viable to redevelop the TfL site in isolation in the current market.</p> <p>TW – intention for Tiger was to have bus stands submitted in detail with residential above in outline.</p> <p>PD questioned this approach given the residential requirements that would need to be accommodated – servicing, cores, residential entrances, etc. BH consider</p>	Note

Meeting Items		Action
	<p>that the scheme as previously proposed would not have been a viable development.</p> <p>AH acknowledged the design complexity and subsequent viability challenges associated with development above a bus station, referencing a proposed facility in Bromley North which three developers have walked away from.</p>	
4.0	Summary	
4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TfL recognised the proposals to enhance Rye Lane could bring improvements to the existing environment and bus operations. TfL have no current plans to redevelop the bus station and currently have no funding for any bus improvements or future redevelopment. It was recognised that redevelopment of the bus station in isolation is unlikely to be viable and consider that this would lead to a sub-optimal development for both parties. Opportunities to improve pedestrian connectivity to Peckham High Street and ensure pedestrian and cyclist safety through the bus station should be explored. It was noted that a new bus route through the site would not have pedestrianised Rye Lane but would have reduced bus numbers on Rye Lane. TfL's main objective is to create a better passenger interchange from bus to bus. LBS main objective is to improve the surrounding urban environment including Rye Lane and Peckham High Street. 	Note
4.2	TfL advised that the minutes should not be taken as TfL's formal view on matters and that can only come from a TfL pre-application letter, following a TfL pre-application meeting.	Note

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre – Design Workshop			
Location of Meeting:	Southwark Offices, 160 Tooley Street			
Date:	08 March 2022	Ref:	02C102578	Meeting No: 3

Details:			
Attendees Present			
Victoria Lewis	VL	LBS – Team Leader, Development Management	LBS
Tom Weaver	TW	LBS – Case Officer, Strategic Applications	LBS
Catherine Jeater	CJ	LBS – Design and Conservation	LBS
Chloe Young	CY	Berkeley Homes – Development Director	BH
Jacob Dunn	JD	Berkeley Homes – Senior Development Manager	BH
Alan Shingler	AS	Sheppard Robson	SR
Tom Kyle	TK	Sheppard Robson	SR
Mark Bell	MB	Fabrik	F
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young	AY

Next Meeting			
Date of Next Meeting:	TBC	Place of Meeting:	TBC
Purpose of Meeting:	TBC		

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Introduction/Context	
1.1	<p>NA confirmed the purpose of the meeting is to workshop the masterplan layout (buildings, routes, spaces).</p> <p>NA summarised the key points from the meeting with TfL workshop 04/03/22 (refer to minutes of that meeting)</p>	Note
2.0	Masterplan Workshop	
2.1	<p>AS/TK led a presentation which evolved into an interactive 'workshop' (tracing paper, plans etc).</p> <p>The following bullets set out key points made during the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - VL stated that when LBS met with TFL, TFL's primary concerns were with the reliance of servicing via their land. - The approach to improve Rye Lane seemed supported by the room, including the setback of new buildings. - VL – requested existing and proposed sections of Rye Lane. - VL – concerned that if the N-S 'route' is laid out as greenspace there could be public opposition if this was lost to a bus route in the future. - VL – supportive of the proposed servicing arrangements in principle. Aspiration is to serve from BH-owned land. Concerned about the principle of servicing from the north. It was noted that PHS buildings service from the northern service road already and that this will continue. - BH team clarified that that there is no intention to service directly off Hanover Park, however there could be taxi pull-ins (VL – advised that this should be accommodated on BH land, not the highway). - CJ – Supportive of the potential for rainwater attenuation and Biodiversity Net Gain benefits of greening/planting in the public realm, and integrating play space into public realm. - VL – Highlighted the children's playspace policy requirements and that on-site provision is expected. - TK advised that 3 local architects have been approached for proposals. Felix and Merlin (CJ has worked with), Karl Turner (VL – seemed supportive), and Downen Farmer. VL asked if they would be involved at the masterplanning stage? AS clarified that SR would be the lead masterplanner but they would provide input if selected. - CJ – asked about the opportunity to involve local artists (materiality, artwork, sculptures etc), noting the potential opportunity to get the local community involved. - CJ – Raised the need to consider how to heal the edge of the 2 historic buildings. CJ noted that she would like to discuss the proposals for Rye Lane with LBS colleagues. - CJ – There is 'a lot going on' with the public realm, incorporating several different squares and spaces. CJ suggested that there are too many character areas and that these may be better limited to 3 or 4. - CJ – How legible will the layout be? Desire line from station to bus station should be a key consideration that should drive the layout. Could it be more legible? VL – Could there be a diagonal linear park? 	Note

Meeting Items	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits of improving Rye Lane were discussed. CJ/VL – noted that they want to discuss the option of improving Rye Lane and retaining it as the bus route with TFL/colleagues. CJ/VL to provide feedback of discussions. - All agreed that Space Syntax analysis to determine footfall patterns across the site would be helpful to determine desire lines and origin/destination pedestrian trips. - CJ – Support for a mix of non-residential uses and the inclusion of an anchor use to bring people to the site. - CJ – Long façade south of Morrisons entrance needs an active frontage. - VL – Requested details of indicative quantum of all uses. BH confirmed that they hope to share indicative quantum for the next pre-app – noting that this would be a product of the massing. - CJ/VL – Suggested we reconsider the SW corner (fronting onto Hanover Park) and questioned whether it needed to be another square. - Next step is pre-app where we will evolve the layout and start to consider massing. Pack to be issued to Officers one week in advance. - 	<p>CJ/VL to provide feedback on Rye Lane discussion</p>

11th March 2022.

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre - LBS Pre-App 2		
Location of Meeting:	Sheppard Robson / MS Teams		
Date:	12 th April 2022	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	2

Details:

Attendees Present

Yvonne Lewis	YL	LBS – Group Manager, Strategic Applications	LBS
Tom Weaver	TW	LBS – Case Officer, Strategic Applications	LBS
Catherine Jeater	CJ	LBS – Team Leader, Design & Conservation	LBS
Pete Davidson	PD	Berkeley Homes – Divisional Land and Planning Director	BH
Chloe Young	CY	Berkeley Homes – Development Director	BH
Jacob Dunn	JD	Berkeley Homes – Senior Development Manager	BH
Tom Anthony	TA	Berkeley Homes – Planning and Development Manager	BH
Alan Shingler	AS	Sheppard Robson – Partner	SR
Claire Haywood	CH	Sheppard Robson – Partner	SR
Greg Smith	GS	Avison Young – Associate Director	AY
Gardiner Hanson	GH	Avison Young – Associate	AY

Sending Apologies

Colin Wilson	CW	LBS – Head of Strategic Development	LBS
Victoria Lewis	VL	LBS – Team Leader, Strategic Applications	LBS
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young – Principal	AY
Tom Kyle	TK	Sheppard Robson – Associate Partner	SR
Mark Bell	MB	Fabrik – Technical Director	FBK

Next Meeting

Date of Next Meeting:	TBD	Place of Meeting:	TBD
Purpose of Meeting:	Workshop: Masterplan Update, Scale and Massing		

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Masterplan/Massing/Model Presentation	
1.1	SR – Introductions and slide-deck/3D model presentation.	
1.2	GS – Provided an overview of planning policy context, which has informed the high-quality, design-led approach that the project team are undertaking to optimise housing delivery.	
2.0	Meeting Objective 1 – Fix Masterplan Principles	
2.1	<p>CJ – acknowledged the findings of the original Space Syntax report but queried whether the location of the proposed servicing off Hanover Place, to the SW of the site, would conflict with the pedestrian flows from the new mews space and the SW-NE diagonal route through the site.</p> <p>AS – agreed that this relationship would require more detailed assessment, but the benefit is that there is no longer a reliance on servicing the scheme from the north, in response to TfL's concerns, and that the widening of Rye Lane and the creation of the new retail route to the north of the site would encourage the main pedestrian flows north and then east, with the route through the site being an alternative secondary route.</p>	SR & ARUP
2.2	<p>YL – queried where the servicing for Morrisons was proposed.</p> <p>AS – confirmed from Hanover Place alongside the car park entrance. No servicing for the Morrisons store will be required along Mckerrell Road.</p>	
2.3	CJ – Stated that the masterplan was now providing good legible routes through and into the site, however would like to see more detail on the Morrison's entrance/bus stand interface.	
2.4	<p>YL – Queried what the non-residential land-use strategy is. Members would like to see Peckham as an emerging creative/cultural destination alongside a 'working destination'.</p> <p>CJ – Suggested that the main square where the taller buildings are situated might be a better location for a cultural use rather than within yard space or on periphery.</p> <p>JD – Noted that any community/cultural uses and their locations will be partially informed by perspective tenants and community feedback. Two-follow-up mini-surveys currently being progressed.</p>	
2.5	<p>YL/CJ – Queried what level of detail would be provided within the application for the Rye Lane frontage and the second taller building, highlighting that the preference would be for both elements of the scheme to be submitted in full detail as part of a hybrid application.</p> <p>AS – confirmed that the current intention is for Phase 3 and the second taller building to be submitted in outline, but more detail could be provided within the design code to ensure greater design certainty on the appearance of these parts of the masterplan.</p>	
2.6	YL – Noted that the Rye Lane buildings/scale was mostly well received from the Tiger Scheme. If buildings along Rye Lane are proposed to be in outline, the parameter plans/design codes will need to be fairly detailed and informed by public consultation.	

Meeting Items	Action
3.0	Meeting Objective 2 – Fix Building Footprints
3.1	
3.2	
3.3	
4.0	Meeting Objective 3 – Agree Massing Strategy
4.1	
4.2	
4.3	SR

Meeting Items	Action
4.4	YL – Feels buildings in excess of 20-storeys goes against previous discussions with community, noting that she expects members and the local community will likely be opposed to this approach.
4.5	YL – Unsure of appropriateness of framing the two taller buildings within the masterplan as townscape markers. Questioned what the taller buildings would be marking and how this could be justified from a townscape perspective; noting that they currently mark an area of open space and the intersection of two key routes within the development adjacent to the bus stand and therefore the scale is not considered to be warranted, relative to the importance of the space.
4.6	YL - Stated that there appeared to be additional height on the perimeter of the site compared to the Tiger scheme as well as additional height on the taller buildings – which exceed the 20-storey maximum identified by the site allocation. Considers that there are actually 4 buildings which LBS would consider 'tall' as they are taller than their surroundings.
4.7	YL – questioned what was driving the number of homes (1,045), which is much higher than the indicative site allocation of 850 homes that was set across the whole of the site allocation (including the TfL bus stand land). Need to understand the rationale of seeking to significantly exceed the quantum of homes compared to the site allocation policy.
4.8	GS – reiterated that the quantum of homes on the site has been driven by a design-led approach and seeks to optimise housing delivery, as set out in policy.
4.9	YL – Expressed concern regarding building heights within Phases 2 and 3 that impact on key views.
4.10	CJ – Supports the set-back on Rye Lane but considers 9-storeys to be too imposing and in competition with the J&H and HSBC buildings that bookmark the street.
4.11	CJ – Highlighted that the taller buildings behind the Peckham High Street frontage were quite visible from Peckham Hill Street, although further articulation of the buildings could help reduce the impact.
4.12	CJ – In the view looking towards the Jones and Higgins clock tower, CJ stated that whilst a change is expected and for new buildings to be visible, the current proposal is felt to be too dominant.
4.13	<div>CJ - Stated that the height of the 14-storey building created quite an awkward and tight relationship with the two taller buildings, being quite squat proportionally and neither relating well to the taller buildings or the medium rise buildings – needs looking at.</div> <div>CJ – 14 storey needs to be more elegant and doesn't appear to relate with adjacent heights/massing. SR to consider.</div> <div>CJ – Noted that the building heights are generally ok along site edges. However, the transition in height to the taller buildings within the centre of the site will need to be carefully considered, with the potential for more 'stepping up', although recognised the challenges with the views towards the city & St Pauls.</div>

Meeting Items	Action
<p>4.14</p> <p>YL – Considers a single building a more appropriate marker rather than a cluster of tall buildings.</p> <p>GS – General approach of the masterplan was to create a cluster of height and massing towards centre of site, which is aligned with the policy approach to townscape, and has been supported by Peter Stewart (Townscape Consultancy)</p> <p>AS – Doesn't feel a singular tall building would be appropriate in townscape terms. Two tall buildings would be more balanced in townscape/design terms.</p>	
<p>5.0</p> <p>Meeting Objective 4 – Agree Townscape Views</p>	
<p>5.1</p> <p>AS – Queried LBS on what are the most important views from Bussey Building.</p> <p>YL – Will not provide LBS view on what are the most protected views because the quantum of development has yet to be justified. Considers that the broader panorama from the Bussey Building needs to be considered.</p> <p>CY – Noted that the OKR Opportunity Area is not currently plotted on the models and project team will integrate cumulative development of OKR area into next stage.</p>	
<p>5.2</p> <p>ACTION: YL - would like to understand impacts of views from Peckham Levels.</p> <p>TA – clarified that the site allocation only references the views from the Bussey Building, which is why the views in the presentation focused on this point.</p>	SR
<p>6.0</p> <p>Other Matters – Design Quality</p>	
<p>6.1</p> <p>TW – Noted that it was suggested that avg. 8 units per core. If in excess of 8 this would not meet exemplary design standards.</p> <p>CH – Noted the majority of blocks wouldn't exceed 8 units/core. But some may have 9 units/core. This will be worked through further as the proposals progress.</p>	
<p>6.2</p> <p>YL – Queried the number of single aspect/dual aspect units.</p> <p>AS/CH – Stated that the majority of the units would be dual aspect (between 50% – 60%) on the basis that more than 50% would meet the 'predominantly dual aspect' policy requirement.</p> <p>YL – Referred to recent appeal cases on what was defined by the 'predominant' and that this is interpreted to be the significant majority, i.e. 70%+. 50% considered to be too low to demonstrate exceptional quality.</p>	
<p>6.3</p> <p>YL – Regarding separation distances, YL stated that the scheme should be achieving a minimum of 21 metres rather than 18 metres.</p> <p>AS – Stated that in town centre urban environments that shorter distances are common and part of that character but the N/S route provides 21 metres.</p> <p>YL – Noted that single aspect units with 18m separation distances would draw concern from officers.</p>	
<p>6.4</p> <p>AS – In terms of sun on ground hours for the open spaces within the scheme, AS confirmed that in the majority of cases, the spaces are meeting and exceeding the BRE 2-hour test. More work needs to be done to the central courtyard, which falls short by 1% point.</p> <p>YL – Stated that the BRE standards for sun on ground hours should be treated as a minimum rather than a target.</p>	

Meeting Items	Action
<p>6.5 YL – Would like more detail on the quality of residential amenity/play space areas as we move forward, noting a specific requirement for information on DLSL quality of spaces.</p> <p>YL – Further details on DLSL results (on neighbouring properties) would need to inform site proposals. Tiger scheme had difficulties of achieving BRE compliance with lower edge heights than currently shown by BH.</p>	
<p>6.6 GS – In terms of playspace, confirmed that the scheme was comfortably able to achieve all of the playspace requirements for 0 – 12yo on site within the podiums and ground level public realm. Opportunities are being looked at to distribute some of this area to rooftops.</p> <p>GS - Opportunities for older children's play (12+) are still being explored and expect to achieve some of this on-site, but the team recognises there is a need to look at potential betterment of spaces off-site.</p> <p>YL – All playspace should be provided on site, or analysis of where closest play space 12yo + is suitably close to site.</p> <p>TW – Noted the LBS Design policy states playspace 'should' be located at GF or podium level.</p>	
<p>6.7 YL – Queried how the blocks without podium gardens would have direct access to playspace.</p> <p>GS – Stated that this could potentially be accommodated at roof level but this has yet to be explored. YL stated that Members do not support this approach and TW highlighted that policy resists this due to fire risk reasons.</p> <p>AS – Stated that rooftop play is quite common across London with lots of good examples where this works well. Agreed to provide scheme precedent examples.</p>	SR & Fabrik
<p>6.8 YL – Noted there had been a significant challenge at Canada Water for providing acceptable basement car-park ventilation solution that does not interfere with residential uses above from a noise/odour perspective. Natural ventilation is proving extremely difficult and if this is proposed at the Aylesham Centre it will need to be discussed with officers from an early stage, as LBS have concerns over the approach.</p>	
<p>6.9 YL – Footprints should be achieving 21m hab room to hab room separation with 12m across highways.</p> <p>CJ – Narrow gaps between buildings would need to demonstrate that amenity impacts would be mitigated.</p> <p>ACTION: SR will provide detailed plans to demonstrate high-quality accommodation could be achieved.</p>	SR
<p>6.10 CJ – Queried how single aspect duplexes along McKerrell Road could be provided with amenity.</p> <p>AS – Noted units would have access to either private amenity of scheme wide amenity areas but this will be looked at in greater detail at the next stage of design.</p>	
<p>6.11 ACTION: For the next pre-app meeting, YL requested more information on unit mix and affordable tenure mix including where these units are proposed to be located.</p>	SR / BH

Meeting Items		Action
7.0	Next Steps	
7.1	ACTION: AY/TW to agree next meeting date (target w/c 2 nd May) ASAP.	AY/LBS
7.2	ACTION: TW to provide Feedback on the PPA this week. TW - Initial view is that LBS are uncomfortable with the programme target submission date and to that end would not be able to sign the PPA in its current format. CY – BH need feedback urgently in order to progress the scheme.	LBS

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre - LBS Pre-App 3		
Location of Meeting:	LB Southwark Council Offices		
Date:	7 September 2022	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	3

Details:			
Attendees Present			
Colin Wilson	CW	LBS – Head of Strategic Development	LBS
Dipesh Patel	DP	LBS – Head of Strategic Applications	LBS
Victoria Lewis	VL	LBS – Group Manager, Strategic Applications	LBS
Catherine Jeater	CJ	LBS – Team Leader, Design & Conservation	LBS
Tom Weaver	TW	LBS – Case Officer, Strategic Applications	LBS
Ciara Lester	CL	LBS – Planning Officer, Strategic Applications	LBS
Neil Sams	NS	Berkeley Homes – Land and Planning Director	BH
Jacob Dunn	JD	Berkeley Homes – Senior Development Manager	BH
Tom Anthony	TA	Berkeley Homes – Planning and Development Manager	BH
Claire Haywood	CH	Sheppard Robson – Partner	SR
Tom Kyle	TK	Sheppard Robson – Associate Partner	SR
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young – Principal	AY
Mark Knibbs	MK	Avison Young – Associate Director	AY

Next Meeting			
Date of Next Meeting:	27 September 2022	Place of Meeting:	LB Southwark Council Offices
Purpose of Meeting:	Townscape, Landscape, Transport, Daylight and Sunlight Workshop		

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Project Update	
1.1	NS – provided a brief update to officers on the viability work that has been undertaken over the summer. He explained that BH is keen to develop and agree the principles of development that have been worked up with SR over this period.	
1.2	NA – explained the focus of the meeting is to discuss the direction of travel the masterplan is taking, the location of buildings, the massing strategy, townscape views and the PPA refresh, including pre-application meeting programme.	
2.0	Masterplan Approach	
<i>General</i>		
2.1	JD – we discussed the southern square and the conflict with pedestrians and servicing. The commercial offer on Rye Lane has been supported by CF Commercial. Using the success of Rye Lane to pull people into the site is crucial. There is a proposed leisure anchor within the with looking to draw footfall into the site. The idea is to introduce a different use which supports the retail uses. The purpose of the square is to provide viability of Morrisons from Rye Lane.	
2.2	TW – the diagonal route looks a lot less direct than previous arrangements, querying the relationship with the bus stand.	
2.3	CH – the space syntax shows that the route from the bus depot to Rye Lane isn't that well used. The massively important desire line is the proposed east west connection from Rye Lane to the bus depot. The diagonal route is the secondary route. It's a discovered route.	
2.4	CJ – that diagonal route is a smaller, less direct route, a 'found route' so you will need to consider security, but it appears to work well.	
<i>Public Squares</i>		
2.5	CJ – queried how the team ended up at the size and location of spaces within the site, specifically referencing the space to the north-west. LBS requested examples of the squares to get a feel for the spaces.	
2.6	CJ – requested further justification that the arrival square in the north-west of the site is in the right location, noting that there are no examples of public squares off Rye Lane currently.	
2.7	TK – noted that the team sees the square in the north west corner as the gateway to the site, connecting into library square and providing views into the site from Rye Lane.	
2.8	CH – the square in front of Morrisons is similar to Fitzroy Place is a good example of the type of space.	
<i>Rye Lane</i>		
2.9	CJ - LBS have been supportive of the setback from Rye Lane but why the setback in the northwest corner? LBS have been supportive of the north/south, east/west routes through the site.	
2.10	NA – Rye Lane is the primary shopping street and the masterplan looks to strengthen and improve the street experience. We can put a bit more narrative around this.	

Meeting Items		Action
2.11	CJ: Junction with Rye Lane and Peckham High Street needs its own study and understanding of character to inform the design of the space and buildings to extend south along Rye Lane. This is the most sensitive and detailed part of the conservation area and the design needs to reflect this	
2.12	CW – requested further justification that stepping back the building line on Rye Lane, is this the right approach, querying the team’s approach to the design of the shop fronts. He also requested further justification on leaving the flank wall of the clock tower open, noting that you see example of this in Hackney but asked whether it was the right approach here.	
2.13	CH - regarding the placement of the square and the set-back along Rye Lane, we were keen to bring in views of the clock tower down Rye Lane. We have mapped out the character of the surrounding buildings and how the proposals knit it with the surrounding area, which can be presented at the next pre-app meeting.	
<i>Bus Route & Bus Stand</i>		
2.14	CW – noted that conversations are ongoing regarding the bus route through with Cabinet Leads and key stakeholders and it is not known when a decision will be made on the bus lane. However, made clear that LBS are not asking BH to submit a joint application with TfL regarding the bus depot land but providing a passive provision for the north south bus route through the site be required is advised should the bus route be required.	
2.15	VL – what are the implications if the linear park is removed in a few years if the bus route is required - likely to be unpopular with the local community, so BH should consult with them on the proposals.	
2.16	TA – we have been consulting on this during our Stage 2 consultation and overwhelmingly locals want to see the linear park on site and widening of Rye Lane as opposed to a bus route through the site and a pedestrianised Rye Lane.	
<i>Non-Residential Offer</i>		
2.17	TW – the current proposals do not replace the existing retail which deviates from the site allocation.	
2.18	NA – we are embracing the E use class which provides flexibility. This is on the back of advice of commercial agents, CF Commercial. We will pick this up in further pre-app meetings but it’s to ensure that there’s not an over provision of one type of use.	
3.0	Massing Strategy	
<i>General</i>		
3.1	TW - in the options that were tested with the massing – was the 1,050 target always tested, noting that this significantly exceeds the site allocation indicative capacity?	
3.2	NA – the current proposals have been developed through a design-led process. The brief of 1,050 wasn’t the brief that was originally given to the team, however it was what has come out of the ongoing discussions around deliverability and viability between BH & senior LBS officers.	

Meeting Items		Action
3.3	CJ – recognised that 26 storey building cannot be located anywhere else. However, stated that the 19 storey block is starting to impact on Rye Lane and bulk of the taller buildings with the existing residential dwellings and conservation area to the north of the site needs further justification. The buildings need to be read separately from the clock tower, specifically the 19 storey building. Advised the site allocation capacity of 850 homes could be accommodated on the same masterplanning and massing strategy principles.	
3.4	CJ – LBS are generally comfortable with the location of taller buildings however officers are still yet to be convinced regarding the overall height of the tallest building, given that the Site Allocation specifically references 20 storeys.	
3.5	NA – we have gone into more detail, challenging the Local Plan evidence base with regards to building heights appropriate on site. There are separate meetings that we will have with you to show you how we have arrived at the height, scale and massing.	
3.6	DP – stated that LBS Officer and Member expectations are clear on building heights (max 20 storeys), suggesting that SR look at options that accord with the site allocation building heights – redistributing height from the taller buildings to the lower buildings.	
3.7	CJ – reiterated that the approach to materplanning and massing proposed, including in being informed by neighbour daylight and sunlight and providing a varied townscape could be achieved with building heights reduced across the site same.	
<i>Edge Conditions & Grounding of Taller Buildings</i>		
3.8	CJ – happy to do a walkabout with the team to understand the finer grain. Hannover Park is 2 storeys – how does this ‘bulk’ feel against those 2 storey residential developments.	
3.9	CJ – the Morrisons building can be articulated to break up the massing. We understand that this needs to be a large building to accommodate a supermarket.	
3.10	CJ – Elephant Park is an example of a development with big blocks but have been designed to feel smaller, this was done through a combination of articulation of the buildings in terms of active frontages, height, scale and bulk.	
3.11	CW - the Rye Lane edge needs consideration. If you can get the important edges right, it takes some of the heat off around height.	
4.0	Townscape Views	
4.1	CJ – noted she considered there to be crowding around St Pauls from the Bussey Building view. CJ recognised that the view is not designated but is important to locals, so needs some improvement. Impact of height and scale in view from Peckham Hill Street over 101 Peckham High Street was noted and requirement to interrogate One Tree Hill view which was not able to be addressed in this meeting.	
5.0	Next Steps/AOB	
5.1	VL - getting buy in locally will be key to the success of the development. Getting a local architect on board should be considered.	

Meeting Items		Action
5.2	JD – noted that since the previous meeting Downen Farmer and Feix & Merlin, both local architects, have been instructed.	
5.3	VL – noted that it would be good to engage in viability discussions early in the progress and is going to speak to the LBS property team about whether they need to go external for an assessor. NS agreed, noting that BH would be keen to adopt this approach quickly to progress conversations as soon as possible.	
5.4	NS – noted that the team remain keen to be involved in the creation of a Steering Group and are happy to assist LBS to ensure that this progresses quickly, given the current programme.	
5.5	MK/NA to liaise separately with TW regarding PPA / pre-app programme but noted the intention is to arrange fortnightly meetings with officers alternating between a design and technical meeting. TW noted that this approach was taken with Tiger previously, so is likely to be acceptable.	
5.6	CW – noted LBS's involvement with the Model Design Code pilot projects at Elephant and Castle and Old Kent Road which can inform approach to outline/hybrid planning application and proposed architecture.	

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre - LBS Pre-App Workshop		
Location of Meeting:	LB Southwark Council Offices		
Date:	27 September 2022	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	

Details:			
Attendees Present			
Colin Wilson	CW	LBS – Head of Strategic Development	LBS
Dipesh Patel	DP	LBS – Head of Strategic Applications	LBS
Victoria Lewis	VL	LBS – Group Manager, Strategic Applications	LBS
Catherine Jeater	CJ	LBS – Team Leader, Design & Conservation	LBS
Tom Weaver	TW	LBS – Case Officer, Strategic Applications	LBS
Michael Tsoukaris	MT	LBS – Design and Conservation	LBS
Alex Oyebade	AO	LBS – Transport	LBS
Chloe Young	CY	Berkeley Homes – Development Director	BH
Jacob Dunn	JD	Berkeley Homes – Senior Development Manager	BH
Claire Haywood	CH	Sheppard Robson (Architects)	SR
Tom Kyle	TK	Sheppard Robson (Architects)	SR
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young (Planning)	AY
Mark Bell	MB	Fabrik (Landscape)	F
Katie Bone	KB	Point2 (Daylight/Sunlight)	P2
Lewis Eldridge	LE	The Townscape Consultancy (Heritage/Townscape)	TC
Brendan Weaver	BW	Arup (Transport)	A

Next Meeting			
Date of Next Meeting:	TBC	Place of Meeting:	TBC
Purpose of Meeting:	TBC		

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Purpose of Meeting	
1.1	Workshop to explore the key considerations that are driving the emerging masterplan (layout of buildings/spaces and massing).	
2.0	Planning Application Specification	
2.1	NA briefed attendees on intended specification of the planning application (as per AY note dated September 2022). Phases 2 (central part) and 3 (western part) to be in outline in reflection of the anticipated phasing and deferred vacant possession dates of these parts of the site (2028 for the properties fronting Rye Lane). Intention would be to discuss and agree with Officers the appropriate level of detail that the outline component should go to in different parts of the site. No objections raised to the principle by LBS Officers – CJ agreed to consider post-meeting and to discuss further with the BH team in due course.	LBS/AY
3.0	Layout/Massing Strategy	
<i>Heritage/Townscape</i>		
3.1	TK briefed attendees on the key considerations that have shaped the masterplan in terms of the layout and massing of buildings. Pointed out earlier massing options that have now been superseded.	
3.2	LE briefed attendees on the key heritage/townscape considerations and how these have shaped the masterplan.	
3.3	CJ advised that the principle of the set-back on Rye Lane and the location of the square were supported.	
3.4	CJ questioned the relationship of building massing with the H+J Building and conservation area. The visual 'experience' of this building should preferably be that associated with the lower buildings as opposed to the tall buildings. MT noted that the Conservation Area Appraisal anticipated 8-storey development immediately behind the H+J building.	TK/LE
3.5	CJ queried how best to treat the space to the rear of Peckham High Street including the alley way. TK noted that not all of this land was under BH's control. BH team. BH team to consider.	TK/LE
3.6	CJ/CW CW noted that reduction in heights of tall buildings to 20 storeys was welcomed, but that shouldn't mean that the perimeter blocks should increase in height as a consequence as shown in the meeting. CW noted that the heights of the perimeter blocks shown in the presentation would need to be reduced. CW stated that the consequence of reducing the height of the tallest buildings and not increasing the height of the perimeter blocks would be that the overall numbers of homes on site would need to reduce – CY noted that this was required for viability reasons.	TK
3.7	CJ/MT considered the perimeter block heights to be acceptable subject to being softened through architectural detailing.	
3.8	CJ/CW questioned opening up the flank of the H+J building. BH team to consider.	TK/LE

Meeting Items		Action
3.9	CJ/MT noted that a key consideration should be the principle of 'layering' building heights/massing – particularly along the edge of the site (where architectural detail will be a key means to ensuring appropriate integration with the surrounding existing context. The purpose being to screen the taller elements. Reference made to Elephant and Castle (Walworth Road/Romsey Street) where mansion block typologies around the edge have ensured successful integration with the surrounding existing context (relationship with the ground is particularly successful). BH team to consider.	TK/LE
3.10	CJ/DP queried the difference between the tallest and lower buildings, suggesting that there may be an opportunity for a mid-scale. BH team to consider.	TK/LE
3.11	MT noted that the existing views from the top of the Bussey Building do not warrant protection in policy terms. Recommended that the BH team consider views from the roof of the car park (noting that this is more publicly accessible than the Bussey Building).	TK/LE
3.12	CJ noted that the 4 'little buildings' on Peckham High Street are the oldest buildings in the CA and that the Council had invested funds into them. BH team to ensure due consideration is given to them.	TK/LE
3.13	MT noted that the north view up Cerise Road requires consideration (visual relationship and pedestrian permeability).	TK/LE
<i>Daylight/Sunlight</i>		
3.14	TK explained that the team has tested the daylight/sunlight performance of numerous 'base case' options. This included a blanket 10-storey height across all buildings which performed less well when compared to scenarios that include tall buildings	
3.15	KB explained that existing receptors that surround the site currently benefit from a very open outlook that provides unusually high levels of light compared to what would typically be expected in a town centre in inner London. As a consequence, a noticeable reduction in light should be an expected consequence of any meaningful form of development is to come forward on the site. This principle was accepted by Officers.	
3.16	KB went on to explain that the scheme objective was to ensure that retained values would be at an acceptable level. 'Acceptable' would be a judgement having regard to what has been found acceptable on recently consented schemes and the existing context. This has been benchmarked against 15% retained VSC. DP confirmed that 15% was reasonable – noting the site's town centre context – however noted an aspiration for higher retained levels for the homes to the south of the site on Hanover Park on the grounds that these were more suburban in character.	
4.0	Play	
4.1	MT – preference is for playspace for all ages to be met on site.	
4.2	VL confirmed that the height of the podium was appropriate to accommodate playspace. MT added that the Council's Building Control department would not be comfortable with children's playspace on rooftops for fire escape reasons (general amenity spaces on roofs are acceptable just not dedicated play).	

Meeting Items		Action
4.3	MT supported the provision of playspace within the public realm (especially 12-17 year olds), noting that this was a public benefit.	
4.4	VL queried what the implications would be if the Linear Park became a bus route. NA advised that loss of playspace would need to be mitigated via off-site provision (enhancement to existing facilities). VL suggested that this should be explained in the future application submission.	MB
4.5	MT advised that consideration should be given to the phasing of playspace to ensure adequate provision.	
4.6	MT supported the principle of the proposed landscape works to Rye Lane. Queried how successful the central courtyard would be re. light levels and ability to 'find' it (while recognising that the design intent is that it should be a 'discovered' space'). MT queried the width of the linear park and noted that it would need to perform numerous functions (including N-S pedestrian connectivity), while noting that it would be well sunlit and likely be a successful space.	MB
4.7	CJ added that the Linear Park space needed to work 'hard'. Noted the importance of the interaction of ground floor uses/active frontages with the linear park in ensuring its potential is optimised – e.g. coffee shop with spill out space.	MB
5.0	Access and Movement	
5.1	BW explained the aspiration for reuse vehicles to have the ability to access the housing area to the north from McKerrell Road. This was in order to avoid refuse trucks having to turn around on McKerrell Road (and noting that the trucks would service the development on the same 'route' as the flats to the north therefore this would be more efficient). TK added that there were clear urban design and social integration benefits of removing the boundary barriers between the site and the housing area. AO confirmed the acceptability of refuse servicing from McKerrell Road but expressed concern over the principle of allowing refuse trucks access to the north (on pedestrian amenity/safety grounds). TW explained that he recognised the benefits in planning terms, however that the land is owned by LBS Housing who may not support this (noting that they had been asked before) therefore it may not be deliverable. BH team agreed to prepare a pack setting out the proposal and TW agreed to raise the matter with LBS Housing department.	BW/TK
5.2	AO advised that allowing servicing along McKerrell Road was not preferred in order to optimise conditions for pedestrians. However, attendees noted that servicing would be principally limited to taxis and delivery vans/bikes accessing the residential cores accessed from this road and that in practice these vehicles would use this road whether controlled or not. Accordingly, it would be logical to design this in from the outset (as this would ensure pedestrian safety was maintained). BW to prepare a pack and discuss further with AO.	BW

Meeting Items		Action
5.3	AO queried the need to have a separate crossover to access the Morrisons service yard to the basement carpark – i.e. could these be consolidated into a single shared access. BW explained the reasons why this was not feasible (tracking, levels, Morrisons operator requirements, highway/pedestrian safety). BW agreed to prepare a pack setting out the options that had been previously considered and discounted to inform further discussions with AO.	BW
5.4	AO requested 3% on-site provision of blue badge parking on the grounds of London Plan policy. BW explained that the scheme was proposing slightly less than this, noting that the GLA/Mayor (the planning authority responsible for the London Plan policy) now apply their policy more flexibly and consider less than 3% to be appropriate in town centres and other highly accessible locations. AO confirmed that remaining blue badge requirements (i.e. up to 10%) can be provided for on-street. All agreed to have joint discussions with GLA/TFL/LBS to reach agreement on on-site requirements.	BW
5.5	TW queried the provision of blue badge spaces for on-site workers. Also queried whether non-Morrisons shoppers would be able to use the car park. BH team to confirm in due course.	BW
5.6	All agreed that 6% blue badge provision in the car park was appropriate.	
5.7	AO advised that as a starting point all blocks should meet Southwark Plan standards for cycle parking. If there were sound reasons to justify a shortfall then mitigation measures should be proposed to compensate. BW to provide further details in due course.	BW
5.8	AO confirmed the acceptability of first floor cycle stores including the use of a cycle lift to gain access. 20% Sheffield and 80% 2-tier system is acceptable.	
5.9	AO encouraged the provision of EV points including in the Morrisons car park and to the Blue Badge bays	
6.0	Next Steps	
6.1	TW to liaise with AY re. PPA and dates for next meetings (noting the preference for a regular fortnightly slot).	TW

Avison Young

14 October 2022

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre - LBS Pre-App 4			
Location of Meeting:	Avison Young Offices – 65 Gresham Street, London			
Date:	2 November 2022	Ref:	02C102578	Meeting No: 4

Details:			
Attendees Present			
Colin Wilson	CW	LBS – Head of Services, Strategic Applications	LBS
Dipesh Patel	DP	LBS – Strategic Applications Manager	LBS
Catherine Jeater	CJ	LBS – Design and Conservation Team Leader	LBS
Ciara Lester	CL	LBS – Planning Officer, Strategic Applications	LBS
Michael Tsoukaris	MT	LBS – Design and Conservation Manager	LBS
Oliver Stutter	OS	LBS – Urban Forester	LBS
Chloe Young	CY	Berkeley Homes – Development Director	BH
Jacob Dunn	JD	Berkeley Homes – Senior Development Manager	BH
Tom Anthony	TA	Berkeley Homes – Planning and Development Manager	BH
Alan Shingler	AS	Sheppard Robson (Architects)	SR
Claire Haywood	CH	Sheppard Robson (Architects)	SR
Tom Kyle	TK	Sheppard Robson (Architects)	SR
Thomas Farmer	TF	Dowen Farmer (Architects)	DF
Freyja Clarke	FC	Dowen Farmer (Architects)	DF
Tarek Merlin	TM	Feix & Merlin (Architects)	F&M
Harry Cowley	HC	Feix & Merlin (Architects)	F&M
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young (Planning)	AY
Mark Knibbs	MK	Avison Young (Planning)	AY
Mark Bell	MB	Fabrik (Landscape)	F
Katie Bone	KB	Point2 (Daylight/Sunlight)	P2
Lewis Eldridge	LE	The Townscape Consultancy (Heritage/Townscape)	TC

Next Meeting

Date of Next Meeting:	16 November 2023	Place of Meeting:	LBS Council Offices
Purpose of Meeting:	Viability		

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Purpose of Meeting	
1.1	NA – set out the purpose of the meeting noting the pre-app meeting is design focused, looking at layout, massing and scale. NA noted the design team is seeking officer support on the proposals in order to move forward with further detailed discussions.	
2.0	Proposed Masterplan	

Introductions

2.1	CH – provided an overview of the summary of changes since the previous pre-application meeting and workshop with LBS.	
2.2	CH – noted that DF and F&M are working collaboratively with SR and aren't just responsible for certain buildings within the masterplan but have also been engaging in discussions around the wider masterplan.	
2.3	TM – noted that both local architects have looked at the emerging SR masterplan, particularly the ground floor. TM – summarised that F&M are focusing on the building to the south of the masterplan which has a leisure anchor, which can provide flexible SME, mixed use commercial floorspace within Peckham Town Centre, creating a sense of energy within the emerging proposals that provide activity throughout the day.	
2.4	TF – summarised various masterplan ideas that DF have looked at. The scheme looks to address the east/west access. Looking at addressing facades along Hanover Park which might be considered secondary facades.	

Discussion

2.5	MT noted that the generous pieces of public realm, offered as part of the Pre-App 3 proposals, have been replaced with narrow lanes and passageways between tall buildings, which was felt to be a step back and an unwelcome change	SR
2.6	NA – suggested that the design team set out the dimensions of the key pedestrian routes through the site and compare the open/public spaces with comparables within LBS/London. MB – noted that the east/west shopping street is between 20-25 m wide. The public square outside Morrisons is ca 45 m wide. and the north/south is ca 20-25 m wide.	
2.7	AS – requested clarification on what public realm areas MT considered to be diminished. MT clarified the loss of the Central Courtyard adjacent to the leisure building, the loss of the square on Rye Lane and the square adjacent to Morrisons.	SR

Meeting Items		Action
2.8	TK – noted that narrowness does not have to be dark and there are good examples of where narrow streets can work by creating excitement and activity, which can be shared at later meetings.	
2.9	LE – noted that the square on Rye Lane was not lost, it was reduced as result of comments from CJ at previous pre-apps as a result of the flank wall of the J&H Dept. store being exposed.	
2.10	CJ – clarified that the exposed flank of the clock tower building doesn't necessarily need to be removed from the proposals, but greater consideration needs to be given to how it is treated. It was reiterated that the design team should identify comparisons, ideally within Peckham, for the open spaces proposed within the scheme.	
2.11	MT – highlighted that Rye Lane currently experiences a lot of pressure and the public realm within the Site needs generosity within the public realm to relieve the pressure.	SR
2.12	MT – noted the route through the site from the Bus Stand to Peckham Rye Station could have been enhanced as a result of the Proposed Development, as per pre-app 2.	SR
2.13	KB presented the DLSL results within the scheme. MT – stated that the retail street, from Rye Lane to the new Morrisons entrance, will be overshadowed for half the year and suggested that the massing needs to be adjusted in order for this to work.	
2.14	MT & CW both reiterated that the scheme is 200 units over a site allocation within a Local Plan that was approved in February 2022. CW – suggested that further work is required but noted that a reduced total may be more appropriate for instance 950 home rather than 1050, or indeed 850 homes tbc following response to LBS comments on height mass and bulk and open space.	SR/DF/F&M
2.15	CW – noted that whilst LBS have concerns with the density of development there are elements of the proposals that officers are happy with, for instance the stand alone commercial use offer and commitment to at least 35% affordable housing.	

Meeting Items	Action
<p>2.16</p> <p>However CW stated that having been presented with an introductory presentation form F&M and DF on Peckham character, that character was not reflected in the building typologies of the scheme. For instance the Bussey Building has a relatively narrow floor plan, something captured in the Option 1 commercial block but now lost. If this scheme is to make a claim that it is genuinely reflecting some elements of local character it needs to do that with overt reference to nearby building and space typologies. This would be a far clearer message with which to engage local communities.</p> <p>CW noted with reference to the masterplan blocking models, that the current scheme is dominated by standard residential block types which could be anywhere. CW noted that there is of course a place for a more standard block type within the scheme, but that the perimeter of the scheme and the commercial uses offer the opportunity to express a more Peckham character. As a for instance CW suggested that the design of the Rye Lane block, could be divided up between a number of local architects, for each to design one of the historic plots, CW referenced the Knight Dragon Pavillions in Greenwich Peninsula as an example. This should be an exercise that would be more than just wallpapering the exterior of the Rye Lane frontage with “interesting” architecture. It should involve the design of the plan of the block not just its elevation. In that way it could more meaningfully reflect the variety and dynamism of the other side of the street.</p>	
<p>2.17</p> <p>MT – summarised that his main issues with current masterplan proposals are the impact on the Conservation Area, daylight/sunlight and that ultimately it comes down to density</p>	
<p>2.18</p> <p>CY – highlighted that BH is seeking to deliver a viable scheme and if it is going to come forward there will need to be a compromise. CY further noted that the viability discussions are important to see what else can come out of this in order to agree with officers the key deliverables of the scheme.</p>	
<p>2.19</p> <p>MT – noted that whilst LBS are happy to see a re-provision of retail he queried if any other uses have been explored (i.e. cultural uses) to deliver additional public benefits.</p>	
<p>2.20</p> <p>NA – noted that there is 10,500 sqm of flexible commercial uses – some of which is required to replace the food store and retail, but BH are building flexibility into the proposals in order to have the option of introducing complementary, flexible town centre uses such as cultural, office and leisure floorspace.</p>	
<p>3.0</p> <p>Proposed Massing and Building Character</p>	
<p><i>Massing /Massing</i></p>	
<p>3.1</p> <p>TK - noted that the design team have worked closely with P2 and the Townscape Consultancy in developing the proposed massing and looked at how the proposed buildings address existing residential buildings adjacent to the Site.</p>	

Meeting Items	Action
3.2 MT – noted that from Views 4/5 the buildings will be viewed from the Conservation Area, and that the Rye Lane Peckham Conservation Area Appraisal sets a maximum of 8 storeys to the rear of the existing buildings. MT- noted that 8 storeys is where the scheme needs to start then work back from there. [Post meeting note: it is noted within the Rye Lane Peckham Conservation Area Appraisal that opportunities for buildings of eight to ten storeys to the east of Rye Lane maybe appropriate].	SR
3.3 MT – noted that within View 17 the buildings could start to coalesce.	SR/TC
3.4 AS – noted that in Option 1, the taller buildings gave greater variation and that there are merits with View 17, so queried whether LBS consider 20 storeys an absolute maximum or whether there is scope for Officers to support increased height where justified.	
3.5 CW – noted that he attended a meeting with the Leader of the Council and Ward Councillor who suggested that there is an expectation that buildings within the development should be no more than 20 storeys.	
3.6 MT and CW agreed that there is a narrative around 2 towers where one might be above 20 storeys and the other drops below 20 is something that he would be willing to explore, as long as the edge buildings are reduced in height to reflect their adjacency with the Conservation Area. CW emphasised (with reference to point 3.5 above) that there would need to be a very strong justification/public benefit for a building over 20 storeys, to justify a departure from the adopted plan policy position, and officers would need in the first instance to get a steer from members in respect of this approach. It may be that this would not receive any support, but it's something officers are willing to explore.	SR
3.7 MT – noted that within View 11, more work needs to be done to ensure the clock tower is not crowded by the development.	SR/TC
3.8 MT – noted that the Bussey Building is not a protect view, it is a local view which is considered to be important and there was an expectation with the previous proposals that this acted as a bookend to The Shard.	SR/TC
3.9 LE – noted that the pavilion building has the ability to replace this view with a publicly accessible roof terrace, whilst also giving the public the ability to be closer to the Conservation Area and view this from a different perspective.	
3.10 MT – suggested that from View 35 the buildings in the foreground should be lowered with taller buildings behind, creating a layer of buildings.	
3.11 MT – queried the separation distance between buildings. TK – confirmed that they range from 18m – 21m. where there is a separation distance of 18 m between buildings, the dwellings are all dual aspects.	
3.12 MT – noted that there appear to be a lot of enhanced single aspect flats, which the team should further justify, noting that the Planning Committee will pay greater attention to schemes with height where the number of Dual Aspect units fall below 70/75%	SR

Meeting Items		Action
3.13	MT – suggested larger gaps between the blocks to the north of the site, given the buildings relationship to the Conservation Area – noting that the NPPF requires “great weight” to be given to the conservation of heritage assets, which has not been reflected in the design at this point.	SR
<i>Daylight/Sunlight</i>		
3.14	KB – noted that 15% retained VSC along Rye Lane and to the north and higher threshold 18% retained VSC to the east and Hanover Park to the south which was agreed at the 27 Sept Technical Pre-app Meeting and are being targeted with the revised massing proposals.	
3.15	MT – queried if sunlight to adjacent residential buildings has been tested. KB – confirmed that it will be tested and the results would be presented at a future pre-app meeting. KB noted there will be a change in sunlight levels currently received and what there will be change but we would seek to agree a similar benchmarking with officers as the daylight.	P2
4.0	Proposed Landscape and Play	
4.1	MB – summarised the scheme is currently able to accommodate c.10,000 sqm of public realm of which 7,000 sqm is publicly accessible with generous walking routes, tree planting and play space.	
4.2	MT – queried whether cycle routes, servicing routes and spill out spaces for non-residential uses have been overlaid on the landscape plans.	
4.3	MB – noted that the public realm is primarily within the outline element of the planning application, so the spaces are proposed to be flexible and adaptable. However, they can currently accommodate all of the above.	
4.4	MT – noted the east/west route would achieve little DLSL during the winter and that the servicing space to the rear of the northern blocks needs to be further considered, to see how this can be integrated into the public realm. MT suggested that the planning permissions granted to the properties along Peckham High Street are reviewed to understand how spaces to the north of the site can relate positively to the buildings.	SR/F/AY
4.5	MT & CW – both reiterated that the Rye Lane improvements have always been considered a positive move and would considerably improve the environment along Rye Lane.	
4.6	OS – noted that for him Peckham is about more incidental open spaces (Station Square), which are opposite narrow alleyways. OS recommended going back to the central square proposed at Pre-App 3 opposed to the podium building with narrow lane to provide short alleyways which open up into found spaces.	SR/F
4.7	OS noted that BNG and UGF should be considered minimums, rather than a target. MB confirmed that the biodiversity net gain will be significant and UGF will be calculated in due course.	
4.8	MT – queried whether playspace for all ages is incorporated on site.	
4.9	MB – noted the entire requirement for 0-17 y/o play can be accommodated on site through play led landscaping; noting that 0-17 y/o playspace will be incorporated at ground/podium level and that any roof level playspace has been removed.	

Meeting Items		Action
4.10	AS – queried if the scheme moves back towards more generous public squares, would Officer's be willing to accept playspace at roof level. MT – noted that Building Control often will not sign off on roof playspace and therefore suggested finding other areas for the playspace, not at roof level. MT – noted space to the north west of the site, in the area currently earmarked as 'yard space' could potentially accommodate landscaping/play space if it is not required for parking/servicing.	
4.11	OS – queried if incidental playspace will be provided. MB – noted that playspace isn't precluded elsewhere on site but noted that he does not consider it to be appropriate on a retail street, however the scheme will seek to enhance the experience on the retail street from a child's perspective.	
5.0	Next Steps	
5.1	NA/CY – highlighted the need for detailed viability discussions between BH's viability consultant DS2, LBS officers and their appointed viability consultant. CL – confirmed quotes will be issued to BH for agreement this week.	LBS
5.2	CY – noted a viability pre-app will be arranged as soon as the Council's viability consultant is appointed and up to speed on proposals. Target 16 th November.	AY/LBS
5.3	MT – stated officers would provide a summary of LBS' comments from the meeting as a line in the sand to guide revised proposals.	LBS

Avison Young

4 November 2022

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre Design Workshop		
Location of Meeting:	Sheppard Robson, Camden		
Date:	21 December 2022	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	

Details:			
Attendees present			
Michael Tsoukaris	MT	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Catherine Jeater	CJ	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Philip Freeman-Bentley	PFB	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Colin Wilson	CW	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Ciara Lester	CL	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Lewis Eldridge	LE	Townscape Consultancy	TS
Mark Bell	MB	Fabrik UK	FU
Katie Bone	KB	Point2	P2
Tom Anthony	TA	Berkley Group	BG
Neil Sams	NS	Berkley Group	BG
Chloe Young	CY	Berkley Group	BG
Tom Kyle	TK	Sheppard Robson	SR
Claire Haywood	CH	Sheppard Robson	SR
Alan Shingler	AS	Sheppard Robson	SR
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young	AY

Note: Read meeting notes in conjunction with Sheppard Robson Masterplan Workshop 02 Presentation Pack (dated 21st December 2022).

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Introduction	
1.1	CH introduced by setting out the team's updated brief following various meetings with LBS in November, which can be summarised as follows: Detailed application rather than hybrid; approximately 950 homes; and submission July 2023. MT welcomed the change in unit numbers, confirmed he was supportive of move to a detailed planning application and that he was happy to aim for a submission in July 2023.	
2.0	Masterplan Updates	
2.1	CH presented the updates to the masterplan.	
2.2	MB ran through landscape context findings slides providing an overview of character types and possibilities for connective improvements into/across the site.	
2.3	MT noted that plans have been approved to make the station step-free. 'Glass-box' being added to the rear of the existing station building to facilitate this. Explained that through co-design and public consultation he feels the landscape design to the front of the station feels very 'Peckham' like.	
2.4	MS keen for the BH team to explore opportunities with TFL to improve the quality of the bus station (particularly with regards to the quality of the pedestrian environment and improving connectivity to north). CY confirmed that BH have been speaking to TFL and they will continue. MS encouraged the BH team to prepare an illustrative enhancement scheme to include both planning and bus operational matters. CJ noted that any improvement works to the bus station would be a public benefit and queried whether a contribution could be made towards these improvements. NA noted that this would not meet the S106 tests as it would not be required to make the development acceptable, but BH can pick this up with TFL.	CY
2.5	CW welcomed the proposed edge boundary treatments (lowering of the levels), to the north and north east of the site (adjacent to the Bus Station) as it will ensure the development connects in with the neighbouring properties.	
2.6	MT agreed that a pragmatic approach should be taken to the retention of existing trees, including those with TPOs. Consideration of retention versus loss should be driven by sound arboricultural principles – any losses should be mitigated appropriately (i.e similar size/maturing as existing).	MB
2.7	MT suggested that consideration is given to how the exposed flank wall on the HSBC building is treated. Queried whether the treatment could relate to the flank of the clock tower building.	TK
2.8	MT queried whether play space could be provided within the Yards.	MB
2.9	CY confirmed that while BH own the freeholds of some of the units fronting Peckham High Street and the J&H Clock Tower, they are subject to long term leases and therefore BH does not have control over them.	

Meeting Items	Action
<p>2.10 MT enthusiastic about principle of tidying up the rear boundaries of properties fronting Peckham High Street and activating the Yards area with small scale maker spaces etc. Recognition that BH can only deliver change within its land ownership, but that this may encourage neighbouring landowners to bring forward similar complementary development. MT noted planning permissions for development at rears. CJ noted some of these existing properties have rights of access to rear and queried whether the proposals were deliverable. TA noted these were initial ideas around how this area could be improved which required further thought, recognising that the ownerships and access rights position was very complicated. NA noted that one way this could be done would be to seek approval as part of the planning application for works/development within the red-line (BH ownership) that is deliverable but could also include illustrative material of what could be achievable on the land/adjacent land. CW stressed that whatever is proposed here should be deliverable.</p>	
<p>2.11 CJ noted that the Rye Lane sections require updating to tally the most up to date masterplan.</p>	TK
<p>3.0 Streets and Spaces</p>	
<p>3.1 No comments made.</p>	
<p>4.0 Townscape and Heritage</p>	
<p>4.1 MT noted the changes in height, particularly around the clock tower, were positive and it was moving in the right direction, but reiterated that the scheme still 'fills the sky space' around the clock tower (still seen as his key view) – CW suggested a three storey reduction on the 'shoulder' of the 27-storey building. MS added that this would help present these buildings as a suite of layered buildings.</p>	
<p>4.2 MT and CW both supported the changes from Peckham Hill Street and Library Square, particularly the layering of height.</p>	
<p>4.3 MT would reflect on whether he is comfortable with the height of the towers including how they relate to one another. CW noted height needed further justification 'in the context of Peckham' – Why here? Why are they needed?</p>	
<p>4.4 MT supportive of the viewing cone methodology that SR have undertaken.</p>	
<p>4.5 MT noted that there was historically a taller structure to the 'rear' of the clock tower (a water tower or similar). Queried whether this should be used as a precedent.</p>	
<p>4.6 PFB queried whether any further micro-climate analysis has been undertaken on the streets and spaces. TK noted that we have had some wind studies undertaken but will test fully once the massing is better understood but initial feedback does not throw up anything out of the ordinary.</p>	TK

Meeting Items		Action
5.0	Daylight and Sunlight	
5.1	MS – The Linear Park is the main dwell space (where levels of sunlight are important). The E-W street is an ‘active’ space that people will pass through therefore levels of sunlight here are less important. MT asked Point 2 to look at what date the 50% figure is achieved, indicating that a more granular assessment would also be helpful. Noted that there are pockets of well-lit spaces as you pass along the street which is helpful as this mitigates the low levels of sunlight along the rest of the E-W street. KB suggested that this would be around May time, but will be looking at this over the coming weeks.	KB
5.2	NA noted that if active ground floor retail frontages along both sides of the E-W street are to be provided, this is going to preclude high sunlight levels to the E-W street.	
5.3	MT recognised that there were ‘stepping stones’ of spaces that were achieving the BRE Target, so the scheme was moving in the right direction. MT would expect to see improvements to the Morrison’s square.	
5.4	MT – asked whether there were any opportunities to articulate the façade on McKerrell Road to reduce impact on light levels to properties to the east. KB confirmed that the without balconies test would be submitted as a supplementary assessment to the actual assessment, noting that BRE recommends that this exercise is done to determine whether it is the proposed development or the existing obstruction that is causing the impact. Noted that the Planning Committee would likely be sensitive to this point. MS suggested that we test what would happen if the building height was reduced – an options appraisal. KB noted that in order for all windows to pass there would be very low levels of height on the site and the current proposals represent the best solution. AS noted a number of options have been tested and these can be shared in advance/at the next pre-app.	TK
5.5	MT queried the DLSL impact on the rear windows of properties fronting Peckham High Street. KB to prepare pack of information that shows the results of assessments to be shared with LBS.	KB
6.0	Housing Quality	
6.1	MT noted the updated stats regarding dual aspect and is going to consider.	
6.2	CL queried the internal light levels of the single aspect units. KB confirmed that this is going to be tested as part of ensuring good housing quality.	KB
6.3	MT queried the separation distances between blocks, linked to residential privacy/amenity matters. Details to be provided.	TK
6.4	MT requested façade analysis of proposed.	
7.0	Building Character	
7.1	MT noted that there is a challenge that needs to be tackled to design a façade that attaches successfully to the retained bank building. Queried whether an arcade to north of bank building would be successful – could a chamfer be more successful?	

Meeting Items		Action
7.2	CJ queried whether there was any benefit of rebuilding the elements of the bank building that had been taken away. CH & AS noted it would be very difficult to make it work with a residential building, but would look at this over the coming weeks.	TK
7.3	CJ supportive of general approach being taken to Rye Lane frontage. Suggested that a brief is prepared for the entire Rye Lane frontage with sub-briefs for each part. Consideration should be given to avoiding competing with the clock tower.	TK
7.4	MT encouraged the direction of travel for the Pavilion Building. Eye-catching, playful etc.	
7.5	MT – could the shoulders of the tallest buildings be presented as being part of the mansion block character/typology in order for the taller buildings to appear more slender? Keen to explore modern version of mansion block typologies.	TK
7.6	MT encouraged the team to break the site into character areas and to prepare design guidance for each character area to guide architectural design (noting that the direction that the masterplan is going would tally with this).	TK
7.7	MT noted prevalence of art deco architecture in Peckham that wasn't picked up in the character section, which should be considered moving forward (suggested an Art-Deco Tower).	
7.8	CW encouraged the team to draw more on Peckham examples for inspiration for the design of the Pavilion building. Same point applies to the rest of the scheme – recommended repeatedly referring to Peckham examples as being part of the design inspiration for the scheme.	TK
7.9	CW requested some imagery/plans from the SR Bart's scheme in Little Britain to understand how this would work in practice with fixed layouts behind.	TK
7.10	CJ recommended that consideration is given to the security of the yards.	TK
7.11	MT noted Benny O'Looney is looking at introducing residential to the J&H Clock Tower – worth discussing with them again – CJ confirmed they have been in for a formal pre-app with LBS (2 x flat per floor added to the back of the building).	
8.0	Next workshop/meeting to be arranged for January.	

Minutes of Meeting - DRAFT

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre Design Workshop		
Location of Meeting:	Sheppard Robson, Camden		
Date:	11 January 2023	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	

Details:			
Attendees present			
Colin Wilson	CW	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Dipesh Patel	DP	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Catherine Jeater	CJ	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Philip Freeman-Bentley	PFB	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Ciara Lester	CL	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Katie Bone	KB	Point2	P2
Jacob Dunn	JD	Berkeley Group	BG
Leo Scarfe	LS	Berkeley Group	BG
Tom Kyle	TK	Sheppard Robson	SR
Claire Haywood	CH	Sheppard Robson	SR
Alan Shingler	AS	Sheppard Robson	SR
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young	AY
Mark Knibbs	MK	Avison Young	AY

Note: Read meeting notes in conjunction with Sheppard Robson Masterplan Workshop 03 Presentation Pack (dated 11 January 2022).

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Masterplan Updates	
1.1	CH explained that the presentation seeks to address comments made by officers in the meeting on 21 st December (workshop 2).	
	<u>Massing Updates</u>	
1.2	TK – summarised the changes in the height scale and massing between workshop 2 and workshop 3 and presented townscape views. Key changes: reduction in height to the shoulder of block M1 by 3 stories; addition of a full storey to block M3; increased the shoulder height of block C2 by 1 storey; and created a 2 storey set back on the south corner of block R2 fronting Rye Lane adjacent to the bank building.	
1.3	CJ – noted that the proposals are starting to feel a bit like there are a cluster of tall buildings again, which officers would like to move away from, noting that previously it felt that there were 2 towers. CJ – indicated that it would be helpful to see the townscape views in relation to increase in building heights on Hanover Park. With that being said, CJ noted that changes made are positive, particularly in relation to block M1. CJ – requested the VuCity model.	SR
1.4	CW – noted that he had a meeting with Councillors on 10.11.23 and that during this meeting, Councillors queried why officers are promoting a 950 unit scheme when the site allocation suggests 850. CW clarified that officers are not promoting 950 but exploring options with the applicant. With reference to the Marmont Road view, CW suggested that Block M4 would benefit from a 3-storey reduction in height to align it to the new shoulder height of M1. CW acknowledged that this would reduce the number of homes and referred to a reduction of approx. 12.	
1.5	JD – noted that the Marmont Road view is one of the more challenging views, however it is one of the least sensitive views. JD – noted that a reduction in number of homes will have an impact on viability and emphasised how stark the viability position is. JD confirmed that BH will get viability details across to officers ASAP but stressed BH cannot reduce residential units any further.	
1.6	NA – suggested SR look at reducing M4 height and adding height elsewhere that doesn't impact townscape views. NA – noted that 950 is a round number but there is a viability discussion to be had, however the Marmont view will be viewed by the project team as part of further refinement of the scheme.	SR
1.7	CW – noted that slightly reducing numbers down from 950 would have a beneficial perception with Councillors.	
1.8	DP – noting the domestic character of the street, it was suggested leaving Hanover Park as presented at the 21.12.22 workshop and not include additional height in this location due to impacts on adjacent residents.	
1.9	CH – noted the project team will further review the townscape views and present to officers. CH noted that the lower option on Hanover Park in townscape terms does not feel as comfortable as the proposals that include the additional storey.	SR
1.10	CJ – suggested a staggering down of block H1 so that it is more respectful of the transition to the rear of the bank building. CJ – noted that she considers this a more sensitive transition in height than on Rye Lane.	

Meeting Items		Action
1.11	CJ – noted that the plant should not increase the heights of tallets buildings. TK – noted that this will be clarified at further pre-app meetings but not all buildings will require plant on roof.	SR

Meeting Items		Action
2.0	Daylight and Sunlight	
2.1	<p>KB - summarised the feedback provided at workshop 2 and noted that there were four main queries raised in that previous meeting.</p> <p>KB confirmed that Point 2 are undertaking additional overshadowing assessments in line with the BRE 2 hours sun on ground methodology. One test to check the exact date on which the 'Morrisons Square' amenity area is adequately sunlit. A further test to establish the minutes of direct sun which the different spaces of the E-W retail street achieve on 21st March, which will provide a more informative picture of the sunlight in this space than the binary 2 hours test.</p>	
2.2	<p>KB – in response to officer comments earlier in this session, KB noted that the daylight impacts to residential accommodation situated above retail units on Rye Lane, whilst beyond the BRE guidance, should be considered acceptable as the retained levels either meet or exceed the agreed alternative daylight target value of 15% VSC%.</p>	
2.3	<p>KB – noted that one of the concerns raised at workshop 2 was the impact to daylight and sunlight on properties to the east, on McKerrell Road. Noted that there would be percentage changes between the existing and proposed situations that are potentially noticeable and beyond a strict application of the BRE threshold of 20% change. KB noted that the neighbouring windows have access to excellent daylight levels in the existing situation, uncharacteristic of an urban environment due to the partially clear and under-developed nature of the existing site condition. As such, it was noted that larger relative daylight and sunlight changes would occur as a result of meaningful massing erected on the site.</p> <p>Regarding impacts to the key worker accommodation at 81 Hanover Park, the results show that the single aspect rooms in the centre of the site facing facades experience non-BRE complaint impacts. However, the retained levels to windows at the upper floor levels were in line with the alternative target of 15% VSC. Some windows at lower floor levels fall below this threshold.</p> <p>Windows at lower levels will experience larger relative impacts due to their good existing levels and the tight space to height ratio/obstruction angle with the site and position on/near their boundary line.</p> <p>summarised the McKerrell Road VSC results and given the low density nature of the site, there will be some change to VSC at lower levels. where there are changes this is due to the lower levels of the development and not the height.</p>	
2.4	<p>DP – queried if detailed NSL analysis has been undertaken and requested analysis of the adjacent McKerrell Road, Hanover Park and Rye Lane residential properties. KB – confirmed that an NSL assessment has been undertaken for all properties and can be provided</p>	
2.5	<p>MK/KB – suggested a dedicated daylight/sunlight workshop be held with officers. DP – suggested a meeting held at point 2 offices CL – requested any details are provided to officers a week in advance of the workshop.</p>	AY/KB

Meeting Items		Action
2.6	KB – noted that a no balcony assessment for the surrounding properties has been undertaken where appropriate. KB used Purdon House analysis as an example of where the removal of the existing balcony results in good, retained daylight (VSC) levels. Demonstrating that it is the presence of the balcony that is the predominant factor in larger impacts, rather than the scale of the scheme.	KB
2.7	KB – queried whether there was anything specific officers would like to see at the workshop – DP – noted he is keen to understand the impacts and see the floorplans of the adjacent properties. CJ – suggested looking at a comparison of where massing has been changed and impacts on daylight/sunlight. KB – noted floorplans of adjacent properties will be provided as part of the information pack issued to officers 1 week in advance of the agreed daylight/sunlight pre-app meeting.	KB
3.0	Housing Quality	
3.1	CH – summarised the dual aspect provision, highlighting Block M3 which MT did not consider dual aspect, and has now been amended.	
3.2	CH/TK – provided further clarification and examples on how the apartments with 3m corner aspect deliver dual aspects. PFB – queried whether the units have been tested in terms of overheating and daylight. TK – noted that it's still early doors but this will be looked at in due course, but it is expected the units will meet relevant guidance.	
3.3	PFB – queried if there are any single aspect 3+ bed units. TK – confirmed there are none.	
3.4	DP – noted his concerns with the number of single aspect units fronting Rye Lane.	
3.5	JD – noted it's a fine balance between the build costs and viability with the scheme. This is not to say that we won't look at these. TK – noted that these are e/w facing units but any changes would affect the mix and loss of residential units. NA – noted we will take this away	SR
3.6	DP – queried the location of the affordable units, noting that this should not be an affordable housing block due to the number of single aspect units. TK – advised that the locations have not yet been fixed but details will be shared with Officers in due course. NA – noted that the affordable housing would be spread across all phases.	
3.7	Landscape	
3.8		
3.9	TK – noted The Yard provision to the rear of Peckham High Street buildings, which will be partly pedestrianised with servicing to take place to the eastern end.	
3.10	TK – noted that the scheme does not propose any changes within the bus station and improvements to the threshold spaces was summarised in addition to potential indicative improvements to the bus station.	
3.11	DP – queried if TfL has been engaged to discuss the emerging proposals. NA – noted that as confirmed at workshop 2, BH is continuing neighbourly discussions with TfL.	
	The Yard	

Meeting Items		Action
3.12	CH/TK – summarised the recent planning application submitted for the units fronting Peckham High Street and noted how the current proposals will respond positively to the recently approved applications. CH – noted that the existing access arrangements to the rear of the Peckham High Street properties will need to be maintained.	
	Rye Lane Proposals.	
3.13	TK – noted that a further architect will be appointed and the Rye Lane facade will be designed in detail.	
3.14	DP – suggested appointing a local architect who is born and raised in the local area as this would provide a great story. – CH/JD – noted that they have reached out to any/all local architects, including the appointment of Feix and Merlin and Downen Farmer architects and will continue to look at ways in which to bring in local born/raised architects as part of an apprenticeship programme.	
3.15	CL – queried whether a competition was held with the architects, CH, clarified that no competition has been held but SR have visited the Architect’s studios and interviewed the architects.	
3.16	DP queried the purpose of the Rye Lane Section – NA noted that it is to clarify the acceptability of building heights in this location.	
4.0	AOB	
4.1	CJ – queried servicing of the Peckham High Street properties and whether this will be provided through the site. JD – noted that this will be looked at with adjacent owners and discussed in due course.	
4.2	CW – noted a Ward Councillor raised concerns with perceived gentrification.	
4.3	CW – noted that it would be helpful to get BH/SR to brief Councillors again.	
4.4	DP – requested an updated community engagement plan. JD – noted this can be provided and that we are currently finishing the third round of consultation.	BH/AY
4.5	Next pre-application meeting to be held 25 January. Pre-app meeting topics to be agreed with LBS.	
4.6	POST MEETING NOTE – MK is liaising with CL and has requested that the 25 Jan pre-app meeting focuses on viability/affordable housing and have requested that BNPP attend the meeting with officers. Officers have suggested viability is discussed at 8 February pre-app meeting and 25 January is reserved for daylight/sunlight/overshadowing workshop.	
4.7	AY/LBS – to update/finalise pre-app meeting programme.	AY/LBS

19 January 2023

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre Daylight/Sunlight/Overshadowing Workshop		
Location of Meeting:	Point 2 – 17 Slingsby Pl, London		
Date:	25 January 2023	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	

Details:			
Attendees present			
Dipesh Patel	DP	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Philip Freeman-Bentley	PFB	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Katie Bone	KB	Point 2	P2
Liam Dunford	LD	Point 2	P2
Jacob Dunn	JD	Berkeley Group	BG
Leo Scarfe	LS	Berkeley Group	BG
Tom Kyle	TK	Sheppard Robson	SR
Claire Haywood	CH	Sheppard Robson	SR
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young	AY
Mark Knibbs	MK	Avison Young	AY

Note: Read meeting notes in conjunction with Point 2 Workshop Presentation Pack (dated 25 January 2023).

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Context	
1.1	KB – provided an overview of the Site and surrounding area, highlighting the residential properties adjacent to the Site experience high levels of existing VSC levels due to the underdeveloped nature of the Site. KB- further noted that despite this, when considering a target of 15% retained VSC values, the scheme preforms well. LD- clarified that the scheme is not producing results that are any different to schemes elsewhere in Southwark, noting that the 20% retained VSC values is a benchmark based on suburban locations, 15% retained VSC values is an established benchmark for urban locations and that the benchmark has been applied as low as 7% in City locations.	
1.2	LD – queried whether or not bedrooms are required to be tested as set out in the existing guidance. DP- indicated assessments should be in accordance with existing guidance and suggested the analysis should include a comparison between existing and superseded guidance.	P2
1.3	PFB – queried whether any other uses, aside from the residential uses have been tested. KB – clarified that the BRE guidance is clear that it is normally for residential purposes. LD – explained that in some cases non-residential uses are assessed but these are limited. DP – requested the windows above the bank building are assessed for completeness’. DP – queried whether it was worth assessing the Travelodge – KB – noted that the retained levels within the hotel will be good based on the visible results for the adjacent property Dunstall House but the hotel will be included within the assessment for completeness. DP – also requested for nos. 91 – 105 Peckham High Street to be included in analysis for completeness. P2 agreed.	P2
2.0	Potential Impacts	
2.1	KB – summarised potential impacts to the residential buildings surrounding the Site, noting that most buildings are performing well. It was emphasised due to the underdeveloped nature of the Site, any meaningful development will impact light levels within the adjacent residential buildings. KB – noted that the percentage change in light levels between the existing and proposed conditions will be beyond the 20% BRE permitted change due to the high existing light levels for neighbours and therefore looking at retained levels and assessing whether these are commensurate and appropriate for the site location is key in determining whether impacts are acceptable.	
2.2	DP – noted the residential blocks at Hanover Park and Purdon House are of interest and that the NSL results should be provided. KB – demonstrated NSL/daylight distribution results on screen using the interactive Point 2 modelling for 81 Hanover Park, Purdon House and properties to the south on Hanover Park. KB – noted that dual aspect rooms within 81 Hanover Park would continue to receive very good daylight levels, as shown by the results, based on the overall averaged VSC and NSL results for the rooms. NSL results demonstrate that the terrace houses on Hanover Park, which was used as a key receptor/benchmark in informing the massing on the south perimeter, retains good light levels in the proposed condition.	

Meeting Items		Action
2.3	DP – requested a jelly mould of massing which might produce results that are BRE compliant at 20%, querying whether this permits any meaningful development. KB – noted that a BRE compliant ‘jelly mould’ or massing would show very little additional massing over and above the existing building envelope due to inevitable large relative light reductions as a result of even a modest level of new massing on the site. P2 agreed to provide this to support the narrative and the appropriateness of using an alternative retained daylight benchmark.	P2
2.4	DP – queried whether 50% retained NSL is set out anywhere in guidance. LD – noted it is not set out within BRE guidance but there are a number of precedents where it is considered acceptable.	
2.5	DP – confirmed that he is generally comfortable with the retained values experienced at Purdon House and requested Point 2 provide internal layouts for 43 Rye Lane.	P2
3.0	Overshadowing	
3.1	DP and PFB – noted it is helpful to have the date in which the square meets the 50% threshold for sunlight, which is 3 weeks later than the 21 March, occurring 14 th April	
3.2	DP – noted that understanding how people, including existing residents would use the outdoor space is important. DP – noted the daylight/sunlight assessment should be used to inform the landscaping/play strategy.	
4.0	AOB	
4.1	MK – noted the pre-app meeting programme has been updated and AY will liaise with officers to agree the fortnightly meeting programme as part of closing out the PPA discussions.	
4.2	MK – noted, the applicant team would like to present the emerging proposals to the DRP in February. DP – noted he would need to speak to Colin Wilson about DRP dates.	
4.3	DP – confirmed receipt of the pre-application FVA, and suggested officers need time to review with BNPP before they can commit to the 8 February pre-application meeting.	BH/AY
4.4	JD – clarified that the applicant team sees this first meeting as chance for DS2 to talk through with officers and BNPP their methodology and inputs used, therefore it would be preferable to hold the meeting on the 8 February.	
4.5	DP – noted he would like to review the FVA prior to committing to the meeting.	

8 February 2023

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre Viability Pre-app Meeting		
Location of Meeting:	LB Southwark Council Offices and Teams		
Date:	22 February 2023	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	

Details:			
Attendees present			
Dipesh Patel	DP	Strategic Applications Manager, LB Southwark	LBS
Philip Freeman-Bentley	PFB	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Ciara Lester	CL	Planning Officer, LB Southwark	LBS
Sacha Winfield-Ferreira	SWF	Senior Associate Director, BNP Paribas	BNPP
Chloe Young	CY	Berkeley Homes	BH
Jacob Dunn	JD	Berkeley Homes	BH
James Walker	JW	Berkeley Homes	BH
Pascal Levine	PL	DS2	DS2
Liam Janusz	LJ	DS2	DS2
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young	AY
Mark Knibbs	MK	Avison Young	AY

Note: Read meeting notes in conjunction with DS2 Pre-application FVA (January 2023).

Meeting Items		Action
1.1	<p>DS2 provided a summary of the following pertinent points of the Pre-app FVA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Affordable housing proposals - Key appraisal inputs - Existing uses - Overview of the phasing of the development - Pre-app FVA conclusions, illustrating that 4% affordable housing is the maximum viable position. 	

1.2	SWF provided high level comments noting that a full detailed review of the Pre-app FVA has not yet been undertaken. Key comments are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No initial concerns with DS2's approach to the viability assessment - No initial concerns from CDM who are reviewing construction costs on behalf of BNPP - No initial concerns with the approach taken on building costs and residential values – noting that DS2 have taken a view that higher values and lower costs could be achieved. 	
1.3	SWF queried how the supporting information will be provided for 'other development costs'. JW suggested providing hard copies to BNPP which are returned without being copied once BNPPs review is complete. SWF confirmed this approach is not uncommon but would discuss with LBS and a proposal put forward to Berkeley Homes.	
1.4	DS2 queried timescales stressing the need for BNPP to raise any concerns as soon as possible so DS2 can provide a response, if required.	
1.5	SWF noted she was unable to commit to any timescales at the moment and would be speaking with LBS 23/02/23. SWF further noted that timescales would depend upon when CDM would provide their review of build costs.	
1.6	DP – queried the deficit identified in the Pre-app FVA and how the scheme could be delivered. DS2 – noted that the assessment is current day, and whilst the Pre-app FVA identifies a shortfall in profit against the target developer return, that the scheme does generate a profit and due to the length of the development period, a view has been taken that value growth would reduce the deficit identified and work towards meeting the target developer return. Moreover, JW highlighted that BH will be seeking GLA grant funding to deliver this level affordable housing. CY – stressed it illustrates the strain the scheme is under.	
1.7	SWF noted the expectation for the scheme to be subject to reviews and if the economics of the approved scheme compared to the baseline appraisal, then additional affordable housing would potentially need to be provided.	
1.8	PL – noted that in accordance with the London Plan, the scheme would meet the requirements of the Fast Track route as the scheme is providing 35% affordable housing with policy compliant tenure split. CL – noted that LBS policy requires 40% affordable in order to qualify for the Fast Track route.	
1.9	PL – queried whether it was possible to follow the Fast Track route at 35% in light of the amount of affordable being provided (i.e. the maximum viable position is 4%, however the scheme is providing 35%). DP – noted 40% is required to follow LBS's Fast Track route.	
1.10	DS2/BH – emphasised the need to receive the BNPP report as soon as possible in order to continue design discussions with LBS.	

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre Pre-application Meeting		
Location of Meeting:	Hybrid - LB Southwark Council Offices 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH and MS Teams		
Date:	26 September 2023	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	

Details:			
Attendees present			
Michael Tsoukaris	MT	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Catherine Jeater	CJ	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Philip Freeman-Bentley	PFB	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Colin Wilson	CW	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Dipesh Patel	DP	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Vicky Lewis	VL	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Chloe Young	CY	Berkeley Group	BG
Judith Stichtenoth	JS	dRMM	dRMM
Jonas Lencer	JL	dRMM	dRMM
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young	AY
Mark Knibbs	MK	Avison Young	AY

Note: Read meeting notes in conjunction with the dRMM Presentation Pack 01 (dated September 2023).

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Introduction	
1.1	NA set out the new lead architectural team at dRMM, noting the project brief prepared by Berkeley in consultation with LBS that the new design team is working with.	
1.2	CW welcomed early involvement with LBS planning and design officers which will be relayed to members. CW will be briefing Helen Dennis (Lead Member) on 3 rd October on the emerging proposals.	
2.0	Community Engagement	
2.1	Officers welcomed the approach to community engagement. MT highlighted the local community is aware of the built environment heritage of Peckham. When referring to "Peckhamness" need to be sensitive to the fact residents feel strongly that it has a strong heritage. Recommended that more emphasis needs to be placed on this within the pre-app presentation/planning application submission material and that a specialist heritage consultant should be involved.	
2.2	CY noted Berkeley has engaged Tree Sheppard who are working with existing businesses and Quod has been engaged to look at the economics of the town centre.	
3.0	Masterplan Principles	
3.1	MT flagged the barrier effect the bus station to the north has, limiting access to the High Street. Potential opportunity to improve access from the north/north-east. CY highlighted the level difference between the bus station and Aylesham Centre sites and confirmed aspirations to improve pedestrian and cyclist connectivity across the bus station.	
3.2	MT/CW queried the status of the Jones and Higgins Clock Tower. It was agreed that it is not currently locally listed but is on the draft local list and recognised as having townscape merit.	
3.3	MT location of the proposed tower block should be given careful consideration on site, noting that it can appear in the background views of the clocktower. Suggested potentially moving the tower further south.	
3.4	MT supportive of the opportunities to activate the backs of the properties fronting High Street. Important that the yard space is not 'leftover' space. CY noted that given ownerships outside of BH control, yard space proposals will be vision only. Noted that the scheme does not appear to be about 'grand gesture' urban planning – more subtle which represents the 'Peckhamness'. Suggested providing greenspace at the eastern part of the site.	
3.5	MT queried the type of application that will be submitted (i.e. hybrid/full). CY noted the previous discussions had with Officers on this and that it will be a full planning application in line with previous Officer requests.	
3.6	MT commented the design team has done well to get under the skin of Peckham. Dense and busy is what Peckham is about.	
4.0	Townscape and Heritage	

Meeting Items		Action
4.1	MT requested townscape views to enable Officers to reach an opinion on the acceptability of the layout and massing. Recommended using the same views previously agreed with Officers. Suggested these discussions are brought forward. MK noted this could be a topic to be discussed at one of the proposed pre-app workshops to be agreed with Officers and noted it is proposed that pre-application meeting 3 with Officers (targeting w/c 30 th October) focuses on the massing strategy.	
4.2	CJ – suggested scheduling a walkabout between to talk through townscape views.	
5.0	AOB	
5.1	CW raised the conversations between TfL and LBS regarding the bus stand. CW noted timescales for the proposed development are often discussed at Member briefings, with Members keen to see progress on site. Officers are aware of the impacts that including the bus station could have on this. CY noted the ongoing conversations BH is having with TfL and suggested arranging a separate meeting between BH and LBS.	KB
5.2	AY and LBS noted the conversations around the pre-app programme and PPA. LBS broadly in agreement with the proposed pre-app programme. AY to amend draft PPA prior to issuing to Officers.	
5.3	Next meeting 3 October 2023.	

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre Pre-application Meeting		
Location of Meeting:	Hybrid - LB Southwark Council Offices 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH and MS Teams		
Date:	03 October 2023	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	

Details:			
Attendees present			
Michael Tsoukaris	MT	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Catherine Jeater	CJ	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Philip Freeman-Bentley	PFB	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Colin Wilson	CW	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Dipesh Patel	DP	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Vicky Lewis	VL	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Harry Lewis	HL	Berkeley Group	BG
Chloe Young	CY	Berkeley Group	BG
Judith Stichtenoth	JS	dRMM	dRMM
Jonas Lencer	JL	dRMM	dRMM
Nimi Attanayake	NA	Nimtim Architects	NTA
Jas Bhalla	JB	Jas Bhalla Architects	JBA
Mark Knibbs	MK	Avison Young	AY
Shanali Counsell	SC	Avison Young	AY

Note: Read meeting notes in conjunction with the dRMM Presentation Pack 02 (dated 29 September 2023).

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Introduction	
1.1	MK Intro to pre-app two setting out scope of meeting and intro to the team.	
2.0	Site and character analysis	
2.1	NA conveyed historic evolution of Peckham, noting evolution of Rye Lane and change in demographic through the years, building set back, civic quality of Peckham High street and poor connection from McKerrell Road.	
2.2	MT welcomed the clear analysis and informative diagram, in particular the analysis around all four sides of the Site.	
2.3	JB summarised the work undertaken identifying the various retail character areas including detailed retail analysis. JB discussed character of Peckham, emphasising the scale/compression and expansion of the area. Noted the scale of frontage differs from traditional to wide frontages. Correlation between frontage and type of occupiers.	
2.4	MT acknowledged the importance of the background research that has been undertaken. noting that recent internal assessment work undertaken by LBS work aligns with the JBA findings. MT noted he would be willing to share/compare the Council's analysis in due course. MT also wanted to see how the different retail spaces identified could be codified and this used to help inform the design of new spaces.	
2.5	MT – highlighted the sense of safety on Rye Lane and noted to some the images of long narrow, overgrown alleys with graffiti may not feel safe to others. Whilst characteristic of Peckham, the design team needs to be mindful of such aspects when looking at the emerging masterplan proposals.	
2.6	JB acknowledged and noted that the successful aspects on compression and expansion will be picked up within the scheme. It's about lessons – taking the good and leaving the bad behind.	
2.7	CW noted that the income analysis was interesting and has painted a clear picture of area. Important to link the analysis to aspects of the evolving design.	
2.8	DP welcomed the inclusion and thought around night time economy.	
2.9	JS/JL reiterated that the work done has directly influenced the design and the site gives opportunity to link and open up the site.	
3.0	Scope of demo/carbon optioneering	
3.1	MT flagged that an audit of the materials on site should be undertaken.	
4.0	Masterplan layout principles	
4.1	MT queried the 'key viewing corridors' image and that there was no view of the tower.	
4.2	dRMM noted and confirmed that all views as previously agreed with LBS are being considered with the Townscape Consultancy.	
5.0	Links, retail strategy, access and servicing	
5.1	JL summarised the proposed retail loop (primary and secondary) through the site, noting it is at the early stages.	

Meeting Items		Action
5.2	MT confirmed that a retail loop is likely to be the preferred approach. MT noted that entrances to supermarkets are usually 'plastered over' limiting ground floor activation, suggested looking at relocating the Morrison's entrance to be at the north. MT further noted exploring a key façade on the corner acknowledging this could be difficult with the bus station to the north.	
5.3	JL - relocation of the entrance is being explored noting that the ground floor could be activated with residential entrances.	
5.4	MT - the bleeding of residential into commercial space is a characteristic of the area. Maisonette style residential at ground floor is appropriate but defensible space needs to be considered. Residential could be raised above pavement level so passers-by can't look into living areas. A change of level should be explored.	
5.5	MT agreed with proposed pedestrian route. Encouraged by the 'wiggle' route that been created within the site and use of compression and expansion.	
5.6	JL looking at making Rye Lane 'double fronted', in and through the lane to activate whole zone. The focus to be on intensification and not displacement.	
5.7	MT encouraged by the idea of Rye Lane being double fronted.	
5.8	JS introduced successful examples of yard spaces.	
5.9	MT queried if there was a more efficient way of consolidating the buildings as servicing may be difficult given that Rye Lane is serviced all through the day. The spaces between and around the buildings may be difficult. To consider servicing throughout different times of the day.	
5.10	HL agreed that servicing will be looked at as part of the emerging masterplan proposals.	
5.11	CW positive that the layout may work even with buildings that are spread apart and would consider any justification being brought forward if policy requirements such as cycle parking cannot be met.	
5.12	VL noted that a fully commercial building works for ease of use for occupiers without having restrictions of hours of working, noise etc.	

Meeting Items		Action
6.0	Peckham Yards Opportunity	
6.1	JS summarised the emerging yard space proposals, including potential for activation of the rear of the Sites fronting Peckham High Street, noting a framework could be established to allow the activation of the rear of the properties fronting Peckham High Street.	
6.2	MT ground floor of the site has to work hard, the direction of travel is positive and has a sense of Peckham. The change in character through the site is good and a double sided approach to Rye Lane brings another dimension to the area. MT queried if the team have spoken to the owners of Jones and Higgins.	
6.3	CY confirmed BH has met with the owners a number of times and will continue the conversation but the owners have expressed no interest in selling their long lease hold.	
6.4	DP liked the idea of 'opening up the roof of the Aylesham' as a narrative for the site.	
7.0	AOB	
7.1	Confirm walkabout on the 18 th 2pm-4pm [POST MEETING NOTE - diary invites have been issued]	AY
7.2	AY and LBS noted the conversations around the pre-app programme and PPA. LBS broadly in agreement with the proposed pre-app programme. AY to amend draft PPA prior to issuing to Officers. PPA to be signed.	
7.3	Next meeting 1 st November 2023.	

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre Pre-application Meeting		
Location of Meeting:	LB Southwark Council Offices 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH		
Date:	01 November 2023	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	

Details:			
Attendees present			
Catherine Jeater	CJ	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Matt Redman	MR	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Eleanor Heagney	EH	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Colin Wilson	CW	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Dipesh Patel	DP	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Vikki Lewis	VL	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Harry Lewis	HL	Berkeley Group	BG
Tom Oluade	TO	Berkeley Group	BG
Judith Stichtenoth	JS	dRMM	dRMM
John Naylor	JN	dRMM	dRMM
Lewis Eldridge	LE	The Townscape Consultancy	TTC
Mark Knibbs	MK	Avison Young	AY
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young	AY

Note: Read meeting notes in conjunction with the dRMM Presentation Pack 03 (dated 1 November 2023).

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Introduction	
1.1	NA Introduced setting out the purpose of the meeting, focusing on layout and massing, with the desired outcome as clear feedback from Officers on the massing presented.	
2.0	Engagement	
2.1	JS summarised initial engagement feedback, noting it has been positive, particularly the ACA and ACCF and generally the public and key stakeholders are welcoming of the approach to the site character analysis undertaken. JS noted that the ACA is keen to see the LBS housing evidence base used to support the New Southwark Local Plan.	LBS
3.0	Development of Design Principles and Massing	
3.1	JS- noted the emerging proposals build on pre-apps 1 and 2 and there are four key drivers guiding the proposed development: 1) joint project brief between LBS and BH; 2) masterplan design principles established through site analysis; 3) local character and retail analysis mapping; and 4) general engagement feedback from the public and LBS Officers	
3.2	JS summarised the project vision noting the development has to be part of Peckham and integrated within the local context. Connectivity, homes for everyone, enhance and extend the existing town centre, opportunity for all businesses, residents and resilient.	
3.3	JS noted the masterplan layout is similar to the previous revisions shown to Officers further noting there is a layering of buildings and a number of different typologies for buildings proposed. 3 'point elements'; mansion blocks and the edge conditions are addressed with different typologies needed to address different points raised by residents and existing surroundings. Further activation of the retail and public realm at ground floor. Morrison visible through the cut through at Rye Lane	
3.4	JS – provide a brief overview of key townscape views that have formed part of the early design proposals – Peckham High Street (Burger King View); Peckham High Street (Persepolis View); Peckham Hill Street; Cerise Road.	
4.0	Discussions	
4.1	CW noted as part of the Sheppard Robson (SR) scheme, a townscape view from Purdon House north east of the site was produced, suggesting it would be helpful to compare the emerging proposals against the previous SR scheme when viewed from north east of the site.	dRMM/TTC
4.2	JS confirmed that this view will be prepared in due course and only a few key viewpoints were presented as part of this initial work. JS noted that when compared to the SR scheme, the tall building has been located further south than before, seeking to address previous comments provided by Officers from this key view. Officers advised that views from the Bussey Building and Peckham Levels need to be submitted soon.	
4.3	CJ requested the VuCity model. It was suggested a workshop with dRMM/TTC and Officers would be helpful. [Post Meeting Note – meeting arranged for 8 November 1-2pm at dRMM's office]	dRMM/TTC

Meeting Items	Action
4.4	CJ noted that Officers are comfortable with the direction of travel of the masterplan principles. They would like to see more on individual character areas within the masterplan. Officers advised that the route from Peckham High Street needs to be improved.
4.5	CJ – noted the Persepolis viewpoint is the key location with regards to setback from the Jones and Higgins (J+H) clocktower, it was suggested moving the building further south would provide a greater sky gap. Harry & Lewis noted it's a dynamic view so there will always be an element of encroachment, but acknowledged CJs concerns relate specifically to the Persepolis viewpoint.
4.6	CJ confirmed Officers are generally comfortable with the approach to massing from the Peckham High Street viewpoint. MT commented that the roofline of the lower block at the rear of Peckham Hill Street would need to be improved, potentially through the introduction of gables or similar.
4.7	CJ requested further information on the interface with the bus station and the site noting Officers want to avoid a blank façade along the northern boundary, fronting onto the bus station. Officers requested that the retail route through to the bus stand be detailed on the master plan layout, to show active retail frontages and public realm.
4.8	CJ suggested looking at how the bus station could be refurbished through environmental improvements such as, shelters, paving, lighting, etc.
4.9	CJ noted the buildings fronting Rye Lane need to be integrated well, suggesting 7 storeys is potentially too tall. A shoulder height of 5 storeys with two upper storeys setback was suggested as a possible alternative.
4.10	CJ – queried the demolition of the Rye Lane building. JS noted the design team is reviewing this from a sustainability, embodied carbon perspective.
4.10	VL – noted the conversation around servicing needs to happen sooner rather than later. AY noted they are looking at the wider pre-app meeting programme and will factor this in.
4.11	CJ noted the potential for design coding of the properties outside the redline boundary backing onto the proposed Peckham Yards space. JS confirmed this is being considered as part of the emerging proposals, noting that anything falling outside of the redline boundary would be indicative only.
4.12	CJ confirmed officers are comfortable with the principle of layering which was evident in a number of key views. Officers commented that in considering the massing approach as viewed from Burger King,. Further information is required regarding the Hannover Park views, the buildings to the east of the proposed Aylesham Gardens should be pushed back at upper floors, to continue roof line of staggered frontages. In the Cerise Road view, officers raised concerns regarding the width of the blocks and that the two towers appear to be a similar height.
5.0	AOB

Meeting Items		Action
5.1	VL noted the technical discussions around servicing, fire access, dual aspect, and daylight and sunlight is required. AY noted this has been programmed within the pre-app meeting schedule to be agreed as part of the wider PPA discussions.	AY/LBS
5.2	AY noted the pre-app meeting programme is currently under review and suggested being placed on the 11 December DRP meeting agenda. LBS would discuss internally.	LBS
5.3	GLA pre-app meeting has been scheduled for 16 November	

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre Pre-application Meeting		
Location of Meeting:	LB Southwark Council Offices 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH		
Date:	29 November 2023	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	

Details:			
Attendees present			
Matt Redman	MR	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Rob Davies	RD	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Michael Tsoukaris	MT	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Colin Wilson	CW	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Oliver Stutter	OS	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Vikki Lewis	VL	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Chloe Young	CY	Berkeley Group	BG
Tom Oluade	TO	Berkeley Group	BG
Judith Stichtenoth	JS	dRMM	dRMM
John Naylor	JN	dRMM	dRMM
Armel Mourgue	LE	Gillespies	GIL
Daniella Favero Joined on Teams	DF	Gillespies	GIL
Brendan Weaver	BW	Arup	ARU
Babak Samangouei Joined on Teams	BS	Arup	ARU
Mark Knibbs	MK	Avison Young	AY
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young	AY

Note: Read meeting notes in conjunction with the dRMM Presentation Pack 04 (dated 29 November 2023).

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Introduction	
1.1	NA Introduced setting out the purpose of the meeting, focusing on landscape, design, and transport/servicing strategies, building on previous workshops.	
2.0	Engagement	
2.1	JS – provided a brief update on engagement. A further meeting with the ACCF in November where early masterplan layout strategies were presented. A public consultation events took place over the past two weekends and drop in sessions including meeting with Peckham Heritage.	
2.2	MT – queried what has been presented to the public. JS noted layout, uses and sketch views. AY to provide LBS with consultation boards.	AY
2.3	MT – queried how Peckham Heritage reacted. JS noted they reacted positively but were interested in height scale and massing, which will be shared in due course.	
3.0	Ground Floor Design Development and Experience	
3.1	JS –described the retail loop. The idea is to create various kinds of commercial spaces including workspace, retail and small scale F&B activating the ground floor.	
3.2	MT – liked the double height retail along Rye Lane frontage, noting it is important and a good ambition. MT – noted that Rye Lane needs to retain the primary retail frontage which could potentially mean a lot of retail along the Rye Lane frontage.	
3.3	JS – noted the ambition is for a lively ground floor with a focus on the retail loop leading to the Morrisons visible from Rye Lane through the double height cut through.	
4.0	Landscape Design Development	
4.1	AM – provided a summary of the survey work of the site and surrounding area undertaken in relation to landscape and public realm noting the diversity around the site including pieces of elevated spaces. The intent of the exercise is to inform the design and link the site to the surrounding area through landscape and public realm.	
4.2	MT – queried the connection from Rye Lane into the site, south of Block D (commercial unit), noting the desire line is likely to the north into the Yards or south along the back of the units at Rye Lane. CY noted that the Yards space will take time to develop so do not want to necessarily push people that way immediately but noting in the future it will likely be the preferred location and is something to consider.	GIL/dRMM
4.3	MT – noted it is important to consider DLSL and would be looking to exceed BRE guidelines but noted he is particularly interested in the 21 March. AM – confirmed the team will continue to track this.	
4.4	OS – queried the extent of basements in relation to tree planting – JS noted there is only basement under the Morrison.	
4.5	AM – noted that the site would look to accommodate doorstep and neighbourhood play on site but youth play would be offsite.	

Meeting Items		Action
4.6	VL – queried if the TPO trees are within the redline boundary. AM confirmed there are and some of the TPO trees may need to be removed.	
4.7	MT – queried what is happening along McKerrall Road. AM – confirmed this is something that is being explored in addition to Hanover Park.	
4.8	OS – noted that an Arboricultural Impact Assessment is required to inform the design.	BG
4.9	MT – suggested overlaying the landscaping with the servicing routes and parking.	GIL/ARU
4.10	VL – queried what the landscape strategies along McKerrall Road is. AM – noted tree planting and defensible space but the details are being explored. JS noted that they are currently exploring straitening the Morrisons building, potentially providing opportunity for additional landscaping/planting.	GIL/dRMM
4.11	MT – noted the helpful benchmarking that has been undertaken in terms of size/scale of public realm but the Yards space needs a ‘centre of gravity’. If the commercial public are relocated south and the residential block moved north reducing the gap between the buildings, it could potentially enhance the Yards space.	dRMM/GIL
4.12	OS – suggested exploring more greening within the Yards space.	GIL
4.13	MR – queried if there will be any defensible greening between the sit and the bus station. AM noted boundary treatment will be explored.	GIL
5.0	Transport and Servicing	
5.1	JS – provided a brief overview of the location of the cycle stores, noting that a cycle hub is being explored within the north façade of the Morrisons block to activate the ground floor.	
5.2	MT – noted that LBS do not support vertical hanging bikes. VL queried if there is a percentage of Sheffield stands – RD noted requirements for 20% Sheffield and 5% for larger bikes.	
5.3	RD – queried if the Southwark Plan cycle parking standards have been reviewed. JS – confirmed they have been and would result in ca 800 additional spaces over the London Plan requirements. RD Suggested using the London Plan standards as a minimum focusing on quality as opposed to meeting Southwark requirements.	ARU/dRMM
5.4	MT – suggested overlaying how cyclists arrive to and from the cycle stores within the site. MT noted the two storey cycle stores could work nice, providing a visual connection, prioritising sustainable transportation. MT – further noted safety also needs to be considered within and around cycle stores. BW – noted this is being considered.	ARU/dRMM
5.5	BW – noted that a minimum 140 car parking spaces at basement level below the Morrisons which are a contractual requirement by Morrisons in order to bring forward the development. BW further noted the existing provision is ca 340 spaces so a significant reduction.	

Meeting Items	Action
5.6 BW – noted that the principle of 0% blue badge spaces has previously been considered acceptable by TfL but noting there is a conversation to be had with LBS and impacts that providing blue badge spaces will have on public realm. MT noted blue badge parking is a priority for the Council and members are asking for disabled parking being provided in the Council, therefore 0% will not be acceptable. MT – suggested potentially locating some within the Morrisons car park and these cannot be on along Hanover Park, they will need to be located on site.	
5.7 BW – noted there is a potential for ca 5 blue badge spaces within the basement car park for residents, but this would need to be separate from the Morrisons car park However, this is subject to change.	
5.8 RD – noted the location of the blue badge spaces and where the wheelchair uses are. BW - noted the London Plan does not specify where the blue badge spaces are provided as long as they are provided and that no other car parking spaces are being provided closer.	
5.9 BW – noted further blue badge spaces are being explored elsewhere on site but this needs to be considered with the landscape strategy.	ARU/GIL
5.10 CW – suggested providing secure space for mobility scooters at ground floor/basement level.	ARU/dRM M
5.11 BW – noted the strategy is for vehicles and pedestrians to co-exist with different degrees of segregation.	
5.12 MT – queried if servicing within the site will be controlled. BW – clarified that for the residential this cannot be controlled but the retail will be controlled. This will be worked through. BW noted there will be some form of concierge, post room but this is to be developed.	ARU/dRM M
5.13 RD – requested tracking and cross sections through the site.	
5.14 RD – queried the servicing to the site from the bus station. BW noted the intention is to retain this as there is a current access rights over the bus station. BW noted that what servicing strategy is agreed with LBS will determine how/if the access over the bus station is used in the future.	
5.15 RD – noted a live application to a property on Peckham High Street and TfL have objected to this.	
5.16 MT – raised some concerns with the Hanover Park frontage with large portions of it used for access/servicing.	dRMM/AR U
5.17 RD – noted the junction on Hanover Park will need to be engineered to withstand 16 m HGVs.	ARU
5.18 MT – noted ventilation for the basement and the conversation that needs to be had about this. MT – requested a basement plan.	
5.19 RD – suggested a view from the north east.	dRMM
5.20 MT – queried if there is any scope for greening along Rye Lane. AM noted that it is a quite constrained area as it is with the cycle and bus lanes, but this is a separate conversation to be had with TfL and LBS.	GIL/ARU

Meeting Items		Action
5.21	MT – noted that LBS have commissioned a study north of Rye Lane to improve pedestrian crossings and cycle lanes. AM queried if the study includes Rye Lane. LBS to confirm.	LBS
5.22	MT – highlighted the bus station needs careful thought noting the visual barrier to the site. BW – noted the team is looking at improvements to the pedestrian routes, landscaping (hard and soft, lighting) through the site including connection to Bull Yard.	ARU/GIL
6.0	AOB	
6.1	LBS – queried the status of the PPA. AY/BH noted there is concerns with fees. CW noted he would pick this up directly with BH. [POST MEETING NOTE – PPA fee has been agreed between LBS/BH. AY/BH to review pre-app meeting programme and issue revised draft PPA back to LBS].	BH/AY
6.2	AY queried the January DRP. LBS noted they would like to understand the materials to be presented at this meeting. AY noted an internal meeting will be held on 30.11.2023 where this will be discussed after which this would be confirmed.	
6.3	Next Pre-app Meeting 13 December 10.30-12.00pm (TBC)	

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre Daylight/Sunlight Pre-application Workshop		
Location of Meeting:	Point 2 Surveyors - 17 Slingsby Pl, London WC2E 9AB		
Date:	16 January 2024	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	

Details:			
Attendees present			
Vikki Lewis	VL	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Matt Redman	MR	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Eleanor Heagney	EH	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Tom Oluade	TO	Berkeley Homes North East London	BG
Leo Scarfe	LS	Berkeley Homes North East London	BG
Judith Stichtenoth	JS	dRMM	dRMM
Katie Bone	KB	Point2 Surveyors	P2
Mark Knibbs	MK	Avison Young	AY
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young	AY

Note: Read meeting notes in conjunction with the dRMM Presentation Pack (dated January 2024).

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Introduction	
1.1	<p>Judith provided a brief overview of the design changes since pre-app 3, summarised below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Existing Rye Lane buildings will be demolished. Set back of the upper floors of Rye Lane buildings have been stepped back. Hanover Park – Building H, top floors setback Hanover Park - Building J has been made slimmer and setback to protect existing trees Building L additional height Building M has been moved south ca 15m Morrison Block – gaps between Blocks S, M, N and Q and R . realignment of Blocks Q and R 	
2.0	Daylight/Sunlight	
2.1	<p>KB - summarised previous discussions with LBS officers, noting agreement of the 15% retained VSC values. VL - queried how 15% was arrived at and noted specific local precedent examples where this was previously agreed should be set out in the submission documents. NA noted 15% is the standard retained value across town centre locations in London. MK noted previous work around specific local precedent examples was undertaken last year as part of the work for justification around the 15% retained VSC values which will be shared again with LBS for information</p>	Point2/AY
2.2	<p>KB – noted the 3 key receptors adjacent to Aylesham Centre:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Purdon House 81 Hanover Park key worker accommodation Hanover Park <p>KB further noted that whilst the material for the workshop focused on the above receptors, an analysis for all immediate adjacent residential receptors has been undertaken and is set out in the recently submitted Scoping Report. KB confirmed impacts on the surrounding residential units are minimal noting retained VSC values are in the high teens/low 20s and will be set out in the planning application submission documents. KB requested that if there are receptors not identified within the Scoping Report that LBS would like to be tested from a daylight perspective for these to be set out. VL – confirmed officers will review and respond back with any additional residential properties, if required, through the ES scoping opinion. Officers will endeavour to provide this in advance of the scoping opinion being issued given that modelling can take some time. KB confirmed that the 25 degree rule in the BRE guidance for identifying properties for testing had not been used because it can result in isolated impacts being identified for individual buildings a considerable distance from the site, and that professional judgement had been used instead.</p>	LBS/Point 2
2.3	<p>KB – confirmed that the analysis has been undertaken with and without balconies noting the effect balconies have on VSC levels.</p>	

Meeting Items		Action
2.4	KB – noted that whilst retained VSC values at Purdon House with balconies fell below the 15% retained VSC values, this was due to low VSC values to beginning, primarily related to the overhanging balconies. Once the balconies were removed, the retained values were all above 20%.	
2.5	MR – queried the distance between proposed Building R and S and Purdon House. JS – clarified ca 22m separation distance between Building S and Purdon House and ca 19m between Building R and Purdon House.	
2.6	KB – summarised the impacts on 81 Hanover Park noting the low retained VSC values even with balconies removed, noting that any form of development on site will impact the VSC values, primarily due to the existing location of the building in proximity to the Site.	
2.7	VL – noted the impacts to 81 Hanover Park need to be considered by officers and a view taken but noted the town centre of the site. VL – requested that the application submission documents clearly set out how the proposals have sought to improve retained values to 81 Hanover Park as much as possible and set out what height / massing would be required on the site in order for the BRE guidance to be met. KB – noted gaps that have been included in the massing to the buildings above the proposed Morrisons and reduction in massing to Building R. KB suggested that in order to see material improvements to the retained VSC values buildings would need to be reduced to ca 5 storeys. VL – suggested this is clearly set out in planning application submission documents.	Point2/dR MM/AY
2.8	KB – summarised the impacts to the Hanover Park receptors noting the retained values exceed 15% retained VSC values.	
2.9	VL – queried if no-sky line (NSL) of existing properties will be included in the DL/SL analysis submitted with the planning application. KB – confirmed it would but VSC is the industry standard to inform massing changes noting NSL does not always provide a clear indication. VL – noted Southwark primarily focuses on retained VSC values but NSL values need to be included. VL noted that where the sun on the ground test would not be met for an open space on 21 st March the submission should advise what percentage of the space would receive 2+ hours of sun on the ground on this date, and should also confirm on what date the 2+ hours would be met.	
3.0	Overshadowing	
3.1	KB – summarised the sunlight analysis within the public looking at the 21 March and 21 June noting the revised massing changes resulted in good sunlight penetration between buildings from the south. The design team will look at ways to improve sunlight within site on 21 March.	
4.0	AOB	
4.1	VL – noted the scheme has been placed on the 12 March DRP agenda but LBS require further details on the emerging proposals ahead of this meeting.	

Meeting Items	Action
4.2	NA – noted that there will be some information that will not be available ahead of the DRP as it will still be worked up. NA – further noted the pre-app meeting programme as set out in draft PPA as agreed with VL sets out 3 further design focused pre-application meetings prior to the 12 March DRP. The intent is to share further details at each of the forthcoming pre-app meetings in the lead-up to the March DRP.
4.3	VL – noted she would speak with Michael T and provide a list of requirements and confirm when information is required to be issued ahead of the DRP meeting.
4.4	Next Pre-app Meeting 31 January 10.00-12.00pm

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre Pre-application Meeting		
Location of Meeting:	London Borough of Southwark – 160 Tooley St, London SE1 2QH		
Date:	31 January 2024	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	

Details:			
Attendees present			
Colin Wilson	CW	Head of Services, Strategic Applications, LB Southwark	LBS
Dipesh Patel	DP	Group Manager, Strategic Applications, LB Southwark	LBS
Vikki Lewis	VL	Team Leader – Strategic Applications, LB Southwark	LBS
Michael Tsoukaris	MT	Design and Conservation Manager, LB Southwark	LBS
Catherine Jeater	CJ	Design and Conservation Team Leader, LB Southwark	LBS
Matt Redman	MR	Senior Planning Officer, LB Southwark	LBS
Eleanor Heagney	EH	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Oliver Stutter	OS	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Chloe Young	CY	Berkeley Homes	BH
Tom Oluade	TO	Berkeley Homes North East London	BG
Judith Stichtenoth	JS	dRMM	dRMM
Jas Bhalla	JB	Jas Bhalla Architects	JBA
Brendan Weaver on Teams	BW	Arup Transport Consultants	Arup
Armél Mourgue	AM	Gillespies Landscape Architects	GLA
Daniella Favero on Teams	DF	Gillespies Landscape Architects	GLA
Mark Knibbs	MK	Avison Young	AY
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young	AY
Tom Matheou on Teams	TM	Avison Young	

Note: Read meeting notes in conjunction with the dRMM Presentation Pack (dated 31 January 2024).

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Introduction	
1.1	<p>JS provided a brief overview of the design changes since pre-app 3, as set out in key townscape views summarised below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. From BK view, the tall building has been moved 15 m south, away from the J&H building. 2. Cerise Road view – building H has been pushed back and set at 5 storeys along Hanover Park Road. 3. Bussey Building – views in between building of key London Landmarks. 4. Peckham High Street – Bus Stand – additional layering of buildings, n/s orientation 	
2.0	Masterplan Development	
2.1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Existing Rye Lane buildings will be demolished. Set back of the upper floors of Rye Lane buildings have been stepped back. 2. Hanover Park – Building H, top floors setback, 3. Hanover Park - Building J has been made slimmer and setback to protect existing trees 4. Building L additional height 5. Building M has been moved south ca 15m 6. Morrison Block – gaps between Blocks S, M, N and Q and R . realignment of Blocks Q and R on McKerrell Road. Blocks have been increased and decreased, primarily in response to DLSL to adjacent residential properties. 	
2.2	VL – queried the quantum of retail floorspace not aligning with what is set out within the site allocation. CY – noted that a detailed survey was undertaken which slightly contradicts the site allocation so the 10,500 sqm (GIA) is a reprovion of existing based on the detailed survey.	
2.3	JS – summarised the affordable provision 35% distributed across the site.	
2.4	JB – summarised the Rye Lane design approach being undertaken by DF Architects, F&M Architects and JBA.	
2.5	JB – noted buildings range in height from 4 to 7 storeys, stepping down at either end adjacent to the J&H building to the north and Spec Savers to the south. Two cut throughs have been provided, a smaller single storey height at the north and a wider, two storey height angled cut throw emphasising views into the stie from Rye Lane toward the Morrisons.	
2.6	JB – summarised refinements to the back of house and servicing to the rear of the Rye Lane retail units providing more active frontages onto Aylesham Gardens within the site with the use of through units.	
2.7	CW – noted the Roberts Close (Canada Water K1) development with a lightwell between the residential units and the deck access. MT – noted this acts as defensible space between the deck access and buildings. dRMM noted potential technical issues around fire regulations.	JB/dRMM

Meeting Items		Action
2.8	DP – queried where the private amenity space will be for the Rye Lane block. If it is going to be on Rye Lane, air quality input at an early stage is recommended, noting new guidance coming into effect (PM2.5). DP also highlighted noise. CJ – suggested a separate workshop session on Rye Lane, noting there are still some details to resolve on Rye Lane.	
2.9	MT – queried the location of the cut through at the north – TO noted it provides direct access to the main workspace entrance. MT suggested the workspace building is moved further south.	
2.10	JS – clarified that the ground floor of the workspace building would provide the office entrance and flexible workspace with office space above. The first floor of Block K would contain, gym, flexible retail floorspace at ground floor. It was confirmed that affordable workspace would be provided on-site.	
2.11	MT – queried greening on Rye Lane. AM – noted the pavement is too narrow.	
2.12	CJ – noted the 2 no. residential homes on Mckerrell Road, south of the bus station appear isolated, JS – noted when considering the wider context and adjacent residential blocks they don't.	
2.13	MT – noted the stepped arrangement along Mckerrell Road helps with the rhythm along the road. Street trees would also be beneficial.	
2.14	MT- queried the location of the proposed Morrisons car park. JS confirmed at basement level, accessed off Hanover Park.	
2.15	VL – queried the residential amenity space for the duplexes on Hanover Park. JS – noted there will be an alternative provision to the rear of the block.	
2.16	CJ – queried the residential backing onto the bus depot. JS suggested the cycle store as an active frontage. Retail was explored but not attractive in this location. Morrison façade would not provide the active frontages so the combined cycle store was considered appropriate. MT- could a small commercial unit be explored. TO – this was explored with the Berkeley asset management team but the letting of this space would be difficult. Keeping Rye lane as the main retail with further retail/leisure within the site. TO – noted an art strategy is being explored.	dRMM
2.17	CY – noted the ground floor adjacent to the bus depot (east and west of the entrance to the linear park) needs to act as a secondary entrance to the site with active frontages.	dRMM
3.0	Servicing	
3.1	BW - provided a brief summary of the parking and servicing strategy.	
3.2	MT – queried servicing access to the site. JS noted access is the western most entrance, clockwise around the site, in front of the Morrisons then exiting left on Hanover Park Road. Approximately 5 vehicles per day through the middle of the site, primarily refuse with the odd delivery. MT – queried the swept path of lorries turning onto Hanover Park. BW – noted the limited vehicle movements on Hanover Park means crossing over the white line is appropriate.	
3.3	DP – noted the location blue badge parking space in the basement. BW, noted the blue badge for Morrisons is next the Morrisons entrance and the remainder blue badge spaces are for the residential units adjacent to the residential core.	

Meeting Items		Action
3.4	MT – queried ventilation into the basement car park. JN – noted there is ample height for ventilation at high level ground floor in the face facades due to level changes. MT – noted ventilation needs to be properly integrated.	dRMM
4.0	Landscape	
4.1	AM – summarised the landscape and public realm proposals from a site wide perspective as oppose the detailed landscape design.	
4.2	MT – requested the sunlight details included with public realm landscape details.	GLA
4.3	AM – provided an overview of the wider greenspace/play context.	
4.4	AM – noted the use of podium space for playspace and the potential for offsite contribution for the 12+ play. NA – noted the wider public benefit an offsite contribution provides. VL confirmed as long as there is some provision of 12+ play onsite, then offsite is acceptable. DP – noted some gathering space on site for 12+ will be required. DP – suggested LBS planning officers speak with Parks colleagues about what improvements in the area should being explored.	LBS
4.5	MT – noted the ground floor will be working hard providing communal space, play space, so important for the scheme to deliver private amenity space.	
4.6	CJ – queried the condition of the TPO's trees – AM noted category C trees but the next stage would be to look at trees in detail.	GLA
4.7	TS – noted buildability and tree retention needs to be considered.	
4.8	OS – noted additional trees that have recently been planted by LBS on Hanover Park. 33 trees being removed. An AIA is urgently required and has been asked for previously.	
4.9	MT – queried the servicing of the buildings fronting Peckham High Street to the north of the site. TO confirmed that these properties are serviced from Peckham High Street. DP queried whether there is currently informal servicing from the rear. CY – noted ANPR has been installed but Berkeley will speak with the onsite management team to quantify the number of vehicles informally using the rear for servicing.	BH
4.10	MT – noted a wider conversation that is required along the bus station interface and how it could work. CY – noted previous conversations but it has been a while since details have been discussed, but further details will be provided.	dRMM /BH/GLA
5.0	Façade Principles	
5.1	JS – provided an overview of the existing site surrounding context and how this has informed emerging design.	
5.2	JS – noted that buildings will have 'moments of articulating' plinth for retail, entrances, cycles etc., as opposed to articulating the whole buildings. MT – noted the 2-storey datum allows for this to work well.	
5.3	CJ – in terms of the massing and facades, previously, the elevation that faces the bus station appeared quite wide. CJ – noted the verticality and articulation now proposed works well and should be worked through further. JS noted that further articulation of the top 3 floors is being explored.	dRMM

Meeting Items		Action
5.4	MT – highlighted projecting balconies and LBS would prefer inset balconies, particularly when there's environmental challenges (i.e. inclusion of winter gardens). MT – noted on Rye Lane there are no balconies oversailing Rye Lane and should be integrated and suggested a detailed balcony strategy looking at balcony designs responding to the immediate context.	dRMM/JB
5.5	CY noted that projecting balconies will be included but done the right way in the right location. MT – there is ways in which these can be integrated into the design. JS – noted the Wick Lane scheme using vertical balustrades that have been angled providing privacy.	dRMM
6.0	Residential Quality	
6.1	VL – noted the over provision of studio units – Policy is no more than 5%. Applicant to provide further information on the difference between a studio and a 1b 1 person unit and the appropriate space standards.	
6.2	MT – requested distances face to face between blocks within the Site. This has been asked for previously and is urgently required. MT asked to see all of the views which have been agreed.	
6.3	JS – noted every unit will include private amenity space. All 3+ units will include 10 sqm private amenity space, 2+ and below will provide 5 sqm with the offset being allocated to shared amenity space. All balconies will follow LBS guidance, where balconies are less than LBS guidance, offset is allocated to shared amenity space on the roof of each relevant building.	
6.4	JS – noted the scheme averages 8 units per core. Some of the lower floors provide 9 or 10 and upper floors are 7.	
6.5	MT – requested a detail schedule of accommodation in order to ensure the standards are being met.	
6.6	NA – AY to prepare a briefing note setting out GLA/LBS standards.	AY
7.0	Fire Principles	
7.1	JN – provided a brief overview of the fire principles. The design team will be engaging HSE prior to Gateway 1 imminently.	
7.2	VL – suggested engaging with London Fire Brigade pre-submission. VL to provide contact details.	
7.3	MT – suggested highlighting the dry riser points to understand what is happening at ground floor.	
8.0	AOB	
8.1	MT – noted the DRP would take place on the afternoon of the 12 March. 24 Boards. First 12 boards to go through masterplan. Then second 12 boards to go in to block by block details. Architectural expression.	
8.2	GLA Pre-app 16 February 10-11.30 (GLA Southwark Offices)	
8.3	Next Pre-app 21 February - Façade Principles, Initial Elevations, Materiality, Design Development and Townscape Views	

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre Pre-application Rye Lane Workshop		
Location of Meeting:	London Borough of Southwark – 160 Tooley St, London SE1 2QH		
Date:	21 February 2024	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	

Details:			
Attendees present			
Colin Wilson (part)	CW	Head of Services, Strategic Applications, LB Southwark	LBS
Vikki Lewis	VL	Team Leader – Strategic Applications, LB Southwark	LBS
Michael Tsoukaris	MT	Design and Conservation Manager, LB Southwark	LBS
Catherine Jeater	CJ	Design and Conservation Team Leader, LB Southwark	LBS
Matt Redman	MR	Senior Planning Officer, LB Southwark	LBS
Chloe Young	CY	Berkeley Homes	BH
Tom Oluade	TO	Berkeley Homes North East London	BH
Judith Stichtenoth	JS	dRMM	dRMM
Romain Muller	RM	dRMM	dRMM
Tarek Merlin	TM	Feix&Merlin Architects	F&M
Shidan Belay Hagos	SBH	Feix&Merlin Architects	F&M
Tom Farmer	TF	Dowen Farmer Architects	DFA
Lucy Stittle	LS	Dowen Farmer Architects	DFA
Emer Loraine	EL	Jas Bhalla Architects	JBA
Mark Knibbs	MK	Avison Young	AY
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young	AY

Note: Read meeting notes in conjunction with the dRMM Presentation Pack (dated 21 February 2024).

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Introduction	
1.1	JS provided a brief overview of the scope of works for the Rye Lane block as agreed through the design brief – a collective approach by three architectural practices, JBA, F&M, and DFA) overseen by dRMM as the masterplan architects.	
2.0	Design Proposals	
2.1	<p>JBA/F&M and DFA provided an overview of the Rye Lane proposals as summarised below:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - modulations to the form and massing with 2 cut throughs proposed from Rye Lane leading to the centre of the Site. - Ground floor retail aligning with the existing Jones and Higgins (J&H) and Spec Savers buildings to the north and south with residential blocks above a setback. - An organic/playful approach at upper levels - Linear block providing dual aspect units with deck access to the rear and private balconies along Rye Lane. - The retail datum tying the scheme together respecting the existing buildings to the north and south. - Establishment of a vertical rhythm to break up the verticality of the linear block. 	
	<u>Ground Floor</u>	
2.2	LBS queried the distance of the north cut through recognising Peckham is a 24 hr space, consideration needs to be given to the narrowness and safety within the cut through. The space should be safe and welcoming – officers would resist the inclusion of gates at either cut through at night time as a solution to antisocial behaviour. LBS raised further concerns with the columns in the south cut through.	
2.3	FM – clarified the length of the north cut through is ca 20m, but chamfered corners and active frontages within the cut through are proposed to make the space safe and welcoming.	
2.4	CY – noted the space would be lit appropriately at night and these details will be provided. CY further noted that the columns will be re-considered.	
2.5	LBS suggested the length of the north cut through could be considered appropriate if it was double height. JS – noted there is potential for the cut through to be double height if it was located further north.	
2.6	CJ – noted the Woolworth Road scheme as a good example of a cut through that worked well.	
2.7	MT – suggested officers are looking for a scheme that compliments the finer grain nature of Rye Lane.	
	<u>Façade/Amenity</u>	
2.8	LBS raised concerns with the balconies which are not a feature along Rye Lane. Balconies should be inset. LBS questioned the usability of the balconies and potential environmental constraints (noise, air quality).	
2.9	LS – queried potential smaller balconies, offset through communal space at roof level.	

Meeting Items		Action
2.10	LBS agreed that any shortfall for 1&2 beds could be re-provided through shared amenity space. All 3+ bed units must have at least 10sqm private amenity space.	
2.11	NA – queried the potential of inset balconies at lower levels with projecting balconies higher up.	
2.12	LBS – agreed that projecting balconies on upper floors could be accepted in principal but queried whether these would draw the eye up.	
	<u>Façade</u>	
2.13	LBS suggested consistency throughout the block. Something to unify the design. LBS noted the ground floor could be a modern interpretation of the former J&H building. Potentially a set of design principles to work from.	
2.14	MT- noted there needs to be a more granular feel. The centre element of the block is not setback and suggested setting back the top floor.	
2.15	LBS – suggested considering angling the building for the first 3 floors.	
2.16	MT – suggested setting the shoulder lower g+3 storeys, then setback above this.	
2.17	LBS – queried the relationship with the SpecSavers building and the southern flank.	
2.18	LBS – noted the importance of the rear elevation fronting on the Aylesham Gardens. LBS want to see an element of playfulness that takes away from it being front doors to residential blocks. Colourful screens or pop out features that brings the eyes to the surface as opposed to the back.	

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre Pre-application Meeting 6 Façade and Public Realm		
Location of Meeting:	London Borough of Southwark – 160 Tooley St, London SE1 2QH		
Date:	28 February 2024	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	

Details:			
Attendees present			
Colin Wilson	CW	Head of Services, Strategic Applications, LB Southwark	LBS
Vikki Lewis	VL	Team Leader – Strategic Applications, LB Southwark	LBS
Michael Tsoukaris (part)	MT	Design and Conservation Manager, LB Southwark	LBS
Catherine Jeater	CJ	Design and Conservation Team Leader, LB Southwark	LBS
Matt Redman	MR	Senior Planning Officer, LB Southwark	LBS
Eleanor Heagney	EH	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Oliver Stutter (part)	OS	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Mark Bacon	MB	Berkeley Homes	BH
Tom Oluade	TO	Berkeley Homes North East London	BG
Judith Stichtenoth	JS	dRMM	dRMM
Jonas Lencer	JL	dRMM	dRMM
Tim O'Callaghan	TOC	NimTim	NTA
Varun Nambiar	VN	Jas Bhalla	JBA
Armel Mourgue	AM	Gillespies Landscape Architects	GLA
Daniella Favero on Teams	DF	Gillespies Landscape Architects	GLA
Mark Knibbs	MK	Avison Young	AY
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young	AY
Tom Matheou on Teams	TM	Avison Young	

Note: Read meeting notes in conjunction with the dRMM Presentation Pack (dated 28 February 2024).

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Introduction	
2.0	Site Wide Façade Strategy	
2.1	JL – provided a brief overview of the site wide façade strategy including response to technical challenges (i.e. daylight/sunlight, overheating, acoustics, etc).	
	<u>Residential Typologies</u>	
2.2	JL – bold colours proposed for perimeter buildings, lower in height, taller buildings designed to blend into the skyline. Parapet articulation,	
2.3	CJ – generally happy with the height scale and massing – look at the function of the building first then go into the details. Strategy about jewels. Information is here but the parts. Going back into typologies, useful information in layering and use but missing what is happening at ground floor.	
2.4	CJ – details about mansion blocks, but not sure what the mansion blocks are	
2.5	CJ – more information on the reasoning for the façade of each building. What's its role in the street. Need more explanation and more understanding on the typologies.	
2.6	CJ – façade strategy for Peckham High Street (buildings next to J&H) and Peckham Hill Street need to be more subtle.	
2.7	JL – noted the workspace building shouldn't have a bright top but a bright base.	
	<u>Block F</u>	
2.8	TOC – provided an overview of Block F façade principles, looking at the various frontages (noisier south elevation along Hanover Park and quieter north elevation fronting Aylesham Gardens).	
2.9	TOC – brick faced which responds to its surroundings.	
2.10	VL – queried the uses at ground floor – TOC mix of commercial, residential entrances, bin and bike stores. The corners at ground floor north and south are chamfered, opening up the building at ground level.	
2.11	CJ – noted it is somewhat of a secondary gateway with the view from Rye Lane. Commercial with chamfered on the south elevation is welcomed but it needs to be welcoming and needs to 'pop' a slightly different character from Rye Lane buildings. Good principles in verticality but isn't coming through in the images and should be more detailed and more vertical in the street. Useful to understand how it works with the rest of the street. CJ – concerns with applied rather than inset balconies. Inset balconies on principle facades and keep applied to the internal facades. The balconies on the north elevation corners need more coherence to tie in with the rest of the building.	
2.12	CJ – how will the Hanover Park faced be articulated – it appears flat at the moment. TOC – working within the parameters established for the site with the setback of the bricks. Different type of brick will be use to accentuate verticality, potentially a different bond.	
2.13	VL – on the Aylesham Gardens elevation, it comes across very vertical but more horizontal on the Hanover Park façade. TOC it's deliberate with a more horizontal emphasis on Hanover Park. Being south facing and overheating, higher sill with wider windows.	

Meeting Items		Action
2.14	CJ – noted the heavy stone of the former bank building. Maybe the base of Block F blends in with this a bit more. A slightly calmer building that picks up on the hierarchy of the buildings.	
2.15	JS – noted the ground floor strategy is for commercial units fronting on to Aylesham Gardens, residential entrances are east/west of buildings.	
2.16	CW – queried the window configuration. TOC, from a safety and efficiency perspective. JL – noted the proportion and size is being driven by the technical aspects but there is room within the frame	
2.17	CW – put an explanation into the reason why the windows are they way they are.	
2.18	CJ – suggested placing the vertical element (piers) are closer together to make it appear more vertical. TOC countered this comment by saying we tested it but found it had the opposite effect: making the piers feel less like piers and less vertical in general.	
	<u>Building G</u>	
	VN – provided an overview of Block G.	
	CJ – it is clearer what it's role is in the masterplan. The principles with articulated ground floor with a middle and top are sound and should be developed more. Some concerns with the horizontalness – could it appear as two or three buildings vertically? This needs to be a robust building. VN – noted this is something that can be explored.	
	CJ – noted the importance of the ground floor treatment and how it ties into the wider side.	
	MT- noted the ground floor treatment needs to be unified within the block with a unified datum.	
	CL – noted the internal layouts justifying the rationale for the façades, windows, balcony placement etc. Does the building function efficiently and practically.	
	<u>Typology Overview</u>	
	Gallery Access – for the Block adjacent to the bus station – is missing the verticals on the north façade. MT – the façade should come forward and be grounded. Residents should feel protected. CJ – noted the ground floor could be more playful in this location. JL – noted that the language from other parts of the building to emphasis the verticality.	
	MT – suggested providing precedents that were used for the rationale for the mansion block typologies. Heygate Street and Rodney Road in Elephant Park are good references to use. MT likes the mansion block aesthetic but needs to weave its way into the narrative.	
	CJ – noted the Hanover Park façade works well and playful. MT – noted the bookends need to work and land on either side and linking element that is recessive and not so much jumping out. MT – is not sure if the red is working. CW – noted he likes the bold colour choices. MT – likes the row of terraced houses setback and consider it to be Peckham.	
	MT - Point Block/Tower, building above Morrisons entrance is reading as quite broad and needs some verticality in it. The recess in the corners give it a strong verticality but maybe more emphasis could be included to provide more verticality/slenderness.	

Meeting Items		Action
	MT – something that takes the eye up on the recesses or treating the middle bit with vertical articulation. Is there something that can be done to create a more emphasised step between the left and right of the block. It reads as three buildings stacked on top of each other. The roof should be looked at. Base is strong, then a vertical element, with a potential colonnade/crown at the top.	
	JS – noted the horizontal approach was appropriate based on townscape views but more verticality can be explored.	
	MT – suggested using the grey colour for the recesses and bringing the white façade all the way down the block could	
	MT – the choice of colour will need to work on its own merits and not necessarily linked to the Morrisons green. Podium to be a different colour – brightness of Peckham.	
	CJ – buildings being grounded as opposed to blocks sitting on top of the podium is preferred approach.	
	MT – noted Block E need to speak with the NimTim block. LBS noted the art deco feel which is supported.	
3.0	Public Realm	
3.1	OS – asked if the AIA could be shared now. It was noted this would be submitted with the planning application.	
3.2	OS – noted a potential conflict between the retail loop.	
3.3	OS – noted the gateway from the bus station and the edge conditions.	
3.4	OS – queried the shading of the discovery garden. JS – noted changes to the massing which could potentially improve this.	
3.5	MT – noted having to look at the perimeter and trees around the edges. The softening of McKerrall Road. Make every place as green as it can be. Inclusion of raingardens	
4.0	AOB	
4.1	MT – noted the DRP would take place on the afternoon of the 12 March. 24 Boards. First 12 boards to go through masterplan. Then second 12 boards to go in to block by block details. Architectural expression.	
4.2	GLA Pre-app 16 February 10-11.30 (GLA Southwark Offices)	
4.3	Next Pre-app 21 February - Façade Principles, Initial Elevations, Materiality, Design Development and Townscape Views	

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre Pre-application Meeting 7 – Design Update			
Location of Meeting:	London Borough of Southwark – 160 Tooley St, London SE1 2QH			
Date:	01 May 2024	Ref:	02C102578	Meeting No: 7

Details:

Attendees present

Colin Wilson	CW	Head of Services, Strategic Applications, LB Southwark	LBS
Vikki Lewis	VL	Team Leader – Strategic Applications, LB Southwark	LBS
Michael Tsoukaris (part)	MT	Design and Conservation Manager, LB Southwark	LBS
Catherine Jeater	CJ	Design and Conservation Team Leader, LB Southwark	LBS
Rob Davies	RD	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Eleanor Heagney – via Teams	EH	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Chloe Young	CY	Berkeley Homes North East London	BH
Tom Oluade	TO	Berkeley Homes North East London	BG
Judith Stichtenoth	JS	dRMM	dRMM
Jonas Lencer	JL	dRMM	dRMM
Armel Mourgue	AM	Gillespies Landscape Architects	GLA
Lewis Eldridge	LE	The Townscape Consultancy	TTC
Mark Knibbs	MK	Avison Young	AY
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young	AY
Tom Matheou via Teams	TM	Avison Young	AY

Note: Read meeting notes in conjunction with the dRMM Presentation Pack (dated 1 May 2024).

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Engagement	
1.1	MT – queried whether community spaces proposed – JS – noted this is primarily located within the public realm (i.e. the Yards and Aylesham Gardens)	
1.2	MT – queried the affordable retail strategy. CY – noted the sizing of the units, there are currently 7 units on site less than 80sqm – these would be replaced within the proposed development. It was agreed that we will have a detailed conversation on affordable workspace when we discuss s106 obligations	
1.3	VL – noted a lot of work with traders at Elephant and Castle, traders provided funds for fit out costs, temporary space while building works are undertaken. This can be picked up at the s106 pre-app meeting but potentially a further meeting required with the regeneration team.	
1.4	VL – noted using the E&C Equalities Impact Assessment as a basis for the Aylesham Centre EqlA.	
1.5	MT – suggested focusing in on each building. JS – noted this is the intent for the next pre-app meeting scheduled for 7 May.	
1.6	JS – noted the meeting with Historic England on 19 March was positive. HE raised some commentary about the height in respect to the Conservation Area which the design team are currently looking to address.	
2.0	Masterplan Development	
2.1	<p>JL – provided a brief overview of the amendments to the buildings responding to feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building ABC has been simplified, the pullback from the clock tower, top two floors pushed back from the street edge, forming a proper edge to the site. - Building D-E amendments to the tops, height remain the same. Building E, more articulation to the sides and D sets in from the north to improve the Persepolis view. - Buildings G,K, P, N have increased in height - Datum line across Hanover Park - Additional height within the middle of the Site. 	
	<u>Townscape view</u>	
2.2	MT – noted building L from Peckham Hill Street View 5 and the sensitivity looking from within the Conservation Area. The mid-height block layering with the taller blocks behind – this is happening on the right hand side of the view but not the left. MT noted more clarity is required.	
2.3	MT – View 8 Rye Lane/Hanover Park – Building N looks like it is over hanging Hanover Park/top heavy. Likely to come out in the detailed design but flagging. JL – it was agreed these details would be presented at the next pre-application meeting.	
2.4	JS – for the next pre-app meeting, local street views will be provided.	

Meeting Items	Action
2.5 MT – noted the flank of the ABC block is too wide. The middle of the building appears to step forward but could be the way it has been rendered. MT – suggested pushing back the lower 5 floors to align with floor 6 above. JS – clarified it's likely the VuCity view and the tilt of the camera. MT – requested the VuCity model ahead of submission to help inform design.	
2.6 MT – the Peckham Levels view shows change in articulation from the west.	
2.7 VL – requested the east elevation from Peckham High Street, junction with Marmot Street	
2.8 MT – noted the Bussey Building east view shows significant stepping down towards the Conservation Area. He added that this is a good view, it shows good gaps between buildings and helps to better understand the massing. This makes the Site look much more permeable and works a lot better. JS stated that the design team is focusing in on the architecture and the edges, the focus will be how this works on the Site edges.	
2.9 MT – requested proposal for the J&H flank wall – could it be art work, curated to draw people in – historic rendering. NA noted that it's not within the Site boundary, an indicative strategy could be proposed but the design team will take this away.	
<u>Site-wide Strategies</u>	
2.10 JS – summarised the mix and tenure. 35% affordable housing with 25% Low-Cost Rent 10% Intermediate.	
2.11 VL – queried the 1B1P units. NA noted detailed plans will be presented at the next pre-app as well as real world precedents.	
2.12 VL – queried the intermediate product. CY noted ongoing discussions between Berkeley and LBS but a mix of CLT and shared ownership.	
2.13 VL – noted that the number of 3 beds looks to be slightly under the 20%. Currently 19.7%. VL suggested increasing the number of 3 beds to 20% .	
2.14 JS – highlighted the cut through at Rye Lane to the north and flexible retail, commercial, leisure proposed at ground floor. Small retail units under 80sqm are pepper potted around the site.	
2.15 JS – ground floor maisonettes along Hanover Park	
2.16 CJ – the rear to the Rye Lane Block with a loading bay may feel like a main servicing road but understandings this may be made clarified through the detailed landscaping. AM – suggested exploring the idea of breaking the soft landscape blocks to the south of the loading bay and bringing some in front of the residential entrance.	
2.17 MT – frontage to the bus station – LBS have been speaking with TfL and believe the frontage requires more activation. LBS requested a section through the space fronting onto the bus station and levels and landscape proposals to be clarified. CY noted imagery will be provided at the next pre-application meeting but a cycle hub is proposed along with residential entrance, the intent is for this frontage to be activated.	
2.18 RD – noted a workshop with the design team, LBS and TfL would be helpful. CY noted the team has been trying to schedule a workshop with TfL for a number of weeks but indicative improvements will be included as part of the planning application submission details.	

Meeting Items		Action
2.19	RD – queried what is in the cycle hub. CY – benches and bike tools will be provided for residents along with cycle parking. CJ – noted Southwark do not want to see the cycle hub windows covered in decals and for it to be truly active.	
2.20	CJ – requested sections to understand level changes to the public realm adjacent to the bus station and the cycle hub. AM – noted this can be presented at the next pre-application meeting.	
2.21	NA clarified the mix of non-residential floorspace. The fix is the supermarket floorspace and workspace floorspace, the remainder of the non-residential floorspace would be flexible retail, commercial, leisure with caps on the amount of drinking establishment and additional workspace.	
2.22	VL – requested the latest sun on the ground information.	
2.23	MT – noted an existing conditions survey will likely be requested for the flank wall. This will allow for further details to be explored with the long lease holder post resolution to grant.	
2.24	CJ – flagged concerns with colonnades – JL noted this is being looked at and will likely be design out.	
2.25	MT – noted the positive moves made along what has been called Floral Walk.	
2.26	RD – suggested a cross section to understand what is proposed along the servicing route in terms of it being shared surface, particularly the area around Peckham Yards. AM – noted the sections can be presented at the next pre-app meeting.	
2.27	MT – noted it would be helpful to understand the basement car park ventilation.	
2.28	VL – queried the car parking management, will it be free? CY – that the set up will remain as Morrisons currently operates.	
	RD – queried the number of car parking spaces and whether there is flex. CY noted this is a Morrisons requirement and what is required for the scheme to come forward.	
	LBS – queried if the resident blue badge spaces in the basement would be fob accessed. This was confirmed.	
	LBS – queried the safety of the car park after hours and what safety measures are in place.	
3.0	Landscape/Public Realm	
3.1	AM – summarised the masterplan in detail, focusing on the key spaces.	
3.2	MT – noted the positive setback along Hanover Park, good opportunity for landscaping at this location.	
3.3	MT- queried whether little huts are still proposed for the Peckham Yards. AY – noted these were shown as indicative examples previously. AM noted that coffee carts, could be located here activating the space.	
3.4	MT – noted the footpath along the northern boundary is a positive improvement and will assist with activating backs of the buildings along Peckham High Street should they come forward in the future.	
3.5	LBS Tree Officer comments provided by CJ – noted trees cannot be in free standing planters.	

Meeting Items		Action
3.6	MT – noted any internal communal residential space should be located in close proximity to the outdoor communal space (i.e. at podium level).	
3.7	VL – queried the 12+ space potentially moving adjacent to the ‘gym’ unit.	
3.8	MT – noted it would be helpful for the spill out space to be clearly demarcated on a plan to avoid incidental creep into the public realm.	
3.9	MT – noted the improvements made to the character areas. Cross sections with the residential blocks and landscaping would be helpful.	
4.0	AOB	
4.1	Potential train strike next week. AY/LBS to pick this up offline.	
4.2	VL – requested floorplans ASAP ahead of next week’s pre-application meeting.	
4.3	MT – reiterated the BRE sun on the ground details would be helpful. VL – noted if the sun on the ground on 21 March can’t be met, when are these met.	

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre Pre-application Meeting 08 Design Development			
Location of Meeting:	dRMM – 148 Tooley St, London SE1 2TU			
Date:	08 May 2024	Ref:	02C102578	Meeting No: 8

Details:

Attendees present

Colin Wilson	CW	Head of Services, Strategic Applications, LB Southwark	LBS
Vikki Lewis	VL	Team Leader – Strategic Applications, LB Southwark	LBS
Michael Tsoukaris	MT	Design and Conservation Manager, LB Southwark	LBS
Catherine Jeater	CJ	Design and Conservation Team Leader, LB Southwark	LBS
Matt Redman	MR	Senior Planning Officer, LB Southwark	LBS
Eleanor Heagney	EH	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Chloe Young	CY	Berkeley Homes	BH
Tom Oluade	TO	Berkeley Homes North East London	BH
Judith Stichtenoth	JS	dRMM	dRMM
Jonas Lencer	JL	dRMM	dRMM
Romain Muller	RM	dRMM	dRMM
Neil Matthew	NM	Gillespies	GLP
Lewis Eldridge	LE	The Townscape Consultancy	TTC
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young	AY
Tom Matheou	TM	Avison Young	AY

Note: Read meeting notes in conjunction with the dRMM Presentation Pack (dated 01 May 2024).

Meeting Items			Action
1.0	Introduction		

Meeting Items		Action
1.1	It was agreed that the meeting would be split into two parts, with the second half to take place on 15 May. dRMM will circulate an updated set of presentations to LBS to reflect this.	
2.0	Masterplan Overview	
2.1	dRMM provided an update on the Masterplan, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The façade approach across the Site; - Pedestrian experience; - Design quality; and, - views 	
2.2	MT noted that all larger social rented units should have separate kitchen and living space. dRMM confirmed for the majority of the 3 bedroom homes, the main living area can be easily modified to provide 2 separate living spaces (i.e. a living room and a separate kitchen) each with an openable window in like with the Mayor's Design LPG.	
2.3	VL also noted that balconies should preferably be accessed from the living space. dRMM confirmed that this approach had been taken.	
2.4	VL noted the larger space requirements for wheelchair accessible dwellings. TO confirmed that these had been included. JS reiterated that all social rent wheelchair accessible units had been designed in accordance with Southwark Guidance.	
2.5	JL stated that there is slightly amended floor to ceiling heights to allow for level access to all roof terraces. VL queried the minimum floor to ceiling heights. JS confirmed that this is 2.5m.	
2.6	dRMM confirmed that each residential building included a mix of dwelling types.	
2.7	dRMM described the approach to facades. VL noted that the drawing on page 6 of the presentation is not realistic, it should not be included it in the DAS.	
2.8	MT noted that it would be useful to include a brick colour comparison in the DAS to show context around Peckham. dRMM confirmed that this has already been included. MT noted that some of the bricks have a very particular look and it important how you link that to the High Street / surrounding area.	
3.0	Phase 1	
3.1	<u>Building L</u> dRMM noted that in response to previous comments relating to the activation of the ground floor, they are looking to add a commercial unit in this space. MT stated that this is the first time that LBS have seen the composite of the northern elevation relative to Purdon House. He noted that this building has a prominent location in visual terms. He stated that in the buildings to the northern edge of the masterplan should form a front layer of lower buildings with the taller buildings behind (as per the principles for building D, K etc). In terms of height, MT expressed the view that Building L should relate more closely with Purdon House (and the eastern wing reduced by ca 2 storeys) and that as currently designed it is too big (width and height). MT encouraged dRMM to reconsider this building to include stepping it down to better interact with Purdon House. MT supported the tall element on the northwest corner. JS	dRMM to review height and stepping approach to Building L

Meeting Items	Action
<p>felt the distance to Purdon House PH and the offset meant that the relationship works in spatial terms. Especially with the gap that is introduced on the corner.</p> <p>MT queried the acceptability of the outlook from Purdon House.</p> <p>VL added that other buildings had been designed to step up from the site edges.</p> <p>NA queried whether this is an outlook concern? VL confirmed that the concern relates to both outlook and urban design/ townscape.</p> <p>MT suggested that the deck is lowered down with a more deliberate step.</p> <p>NA advised that the design team reflect after the meeting and see how we can respond.</p> <p>MT added that there is scope for an eye-catching building to draw you into the masterplan.</p> <p>LBS welcomed the potential for a retail unit being provided, however there are still concerns that it is not particularly active and fear of crime issues could arise for those waiting for busses late at night.</p>	
<p>3.2 <u>Building M</u></p> <p>dRMM stated that the design has responded to LBS and DRP comments by adding more verticality to the building.</p> <p>MT expressed the view that to the proposal works a lot better now. He added that the top is quite abrupt and might benefit from a crown / colonnade.</p> <p>MT encouraged the proportion of dual aspect homes to be optimised.</p> <p>JS explained that balcony positions has been designed/set to minimise privacy/over-looking issues. Window pattern responds to overheating and environmental considerations.</p> <p>MR queried the distance between buildings M and N and whether there will be any issues with overlooking.</p> <p>dRMM confirmed that it is 10m at nearest point. But noted that these are dual aspect apartments with the main aspect not facing this direction.</p> <p>VL noted that there is blank wall to the side of supermarket. JL stated that this is the bin store. He added that the benefit of the solidity here is that it makes the corner solid and creates a separation between the residential and commercial spaces.</p> <p>CJ queried if the balconies are solid. dRMM confirmed that they are all railings in, noting that the view is due to the depth of the CGI. CJ suggested that it would be useful to understand more about the architectural quality in the DAS.</p> <p>JS stated that the balconies have similarity across the buildings and create a commonality. The variation across buildings comes from the colour.</p> <p>MT noted that the attractiveness of balconies (as an amenity space) is limited if they do not have adequate privacy. He suggested that the design could include some solid panels on the balconies to create some more privacy. VL agreed that might be useful here as this is the busiest space in the Masterplan.</p> <p>VL queried what the colours of the brick on the elevations are. JS stated that no.1 is almost white. CJ felt that we will need to look at the colours in more detail, noting that it could be a warmer tone.</p> <p>MT added that the mortar would also need to work with all three colours of brick. He suggested considering a glazed brick of some sort.</p>	<p>dRMM to review bin store elevation detailing</p>

Meeting Items	Action
<p>TO advised that the design intent is to keep the expression to the lower levels as far as possible and keep the taller elements simpler.</p> <p>MT suggested that there could be some consideration to detailing, perhaps around the windows. CJ added that the design has also included three shades of green around the windows.</p> <p>VL stated that she keeps being drawn to the solid part of the bin store. She felt that the base of the tower should be symmetrical. JS responded that the reason this has not been done is because of the openness of the public space and the experience is better without an entrance here.</p> <p>MR suggested that art could be provided in this location.</p> <p>dRMM suggested continuing the colonnade along detailing here with a recessed brick panel to give it some symmetry.</p> <p>LBS provided post meeting note that further planting to the green link should be considered, including lower-level green walls where they would comply with fire safety requirements.</p>	
<p>3.3 <u>Building N</u></p> <p>MT stated that the balconies seemed to creep over the red line. CY confirmed that it should not and that this would be clarified on drawings. MT suggested that the projecting balconies on the upper floors should be removed.</p> <p>MT suggested that the corner looks like the building is 'toppling over'. He noted that the balconies at the top are quite eye catching, but queried whether this was appropriate (in townscape terms) in terms of the relationship with Hanover Park.</p> <p>JL presented the entrance points at GF level, including the recessed residential entrance and service yard entrance from Hannover Park.</p> <p>MT queried if the balconies would have dividers or if it is a shared balcony for 1 bed units. JL confirmed that they will be private.</p> <p>MT queried whether there may be a conflict with a residential unit at podium level by the access to the service entrance. dRMM, suggested reviewing the yard facing window to make this feel more private.</p> <p>VL queried what is above and right to the service yard entrance. JL confirmed that it is plant room and cycle store.</p>	<p>dRMM to review residential unit adjacent to the service yard.</p>
<p>3.4 <u>Building Q</u></p> <p>The entrance to the building is on Mckerrell Road to give distance to the car park entrance.</p> <p>There are a variety of bricks with different layers and setbacks to add to depth.</p> <p>The Introduction of lintels will provide some detail here. Double height entrance from the outside does not continue to the inside.</p> <p>LBS raised concerns regarding the proximity of balconies to the entrance to the basement car park, and the potential for lack of privacy, noise and disturbance.</p>	
<p>4.0 Phase 2</p>	
<p>4.1 <u>Building D</u></p> <p>MT noted that the south elevation for D looks 'pragmatic', but flagged concern about the link between buildings D and E, as the narrow width could become a location for anti-social behaviour to converge.</p>	

Meeting Items	Action
<p>MT suggested considering moving building E north or create a link in this space to provide additional residential accommodation. MT accepted that the units may have issues such as single aspect.</p> <p>TO noted that this space is trying to link the workspace elements of the design. It is not necessarily a thoroughfare to a destination.</p> <p>MT noted that if the space is going to work it needs to try a bit harder. He added that the link building could offset any loss of units from building L.</p>	
<p>4.2 <u>Building E</u></p> <p>JS stated that the ground floor plan shows one commercial unit which is likely to be F&B. The entrance to the residential accommodation is recessed and there is a high proportion of dual aspect units. The building is designed as very symmetrical to respond to Aylesham Gardens. He added that balconies have been kept off the southern elevation altogether, which has informed by the façade design.</p> <p>JL added that there would be commercial (non-residential) on all four corners of the ground floor.</p> <p>MT suggested that it would be nice to see a strategy for the residential entrances, showing the bricks, materiality, articulation details, and recesses. Provision of glazed brick around the residential entrance to block E should be explored.</p>	
<p>5.0 AOB</p>	
<p>5.1 LBS and AY agreed that a standalone meeting would be required to discuss the Qualities Impact Assessment. AY and LBS to coordinate diaries. VL suggested that the design team review the EqlA submission for Elephant Park as a starting point.</p>	
<p>5.2 LBC confirmed that they had received the Historic England comments. VL advised that the design team should prepare a clear response to each of the points raised.</p>	

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre Pre-application Meeting 9 – Design Update			
Location of Meeting:	London Borough of Southwark – 160 Tooley St, London SE1 2QH			
Date:	15 May 2024	Ref:	02C102578	Meeting No: 9

Details:			
Attendees present			
Dipesh Patel	DP	Strategic Applications Manager, LB Southwark	LBS
Vikki Lewis	VL	Team Leader – Strategic Applications, LB Southwark	LBS
Michael Tsoukaris (part)	MT	Design and Conservation Manager, LB Southwark	LBS
Catherine Jeater	CJ	Design and Conservation Team Leader, LB Southwark	LBS
Oliver Stutter	OS	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Eleanor Heagney – via Teams	EH	London Borough of Southwark	LBS
Alasdair Young (part)	AY	Historic England	HE
Tom Oluade	TO	Berkeley Homes North East London	BG
Judith Stichtenoth	JS	dRMM	dRMM
Jonas Lencer	JL	dRMM	dRMM
Romain Muller	RM	dRMM	dRMM
Jas Bhalla	JB	Jas Bhalla Architects	JBA
Lewis Eldridge	LE	The Townscape Consultancy	TTC
Neil Matthew	NM	Gillespies	GLA
Mark Knibbs	MK	Avison Young	AY
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young	AY

Note: Read meeting notes in conjunction with the dRMM Presentation Pack (dated 15 May 2024).

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Overview and Rye Lane Block	
1.1	JS – provided a brief overview of the changes made to the scheme since meeting with HE in March	
1.2	JB – provided an overview of the changes to the Rye Lane Block (Buildings A, B and C). taking queue from the former Jones & Higgins Building, providing active frontages	
1.3	AY – noted the 7 storey heights occupying a large site. the current elevation is relentless and unforgiving. HE is looking for more animation and welcomes the amendments. Suggested ways at breaking up the 5 storey parapet – noting it's uniformity. Can the 3 component parts from the architects be broken up to create more variety in the roofline.	
1.4	CJ – suggested something more sculptural at the upper 2 storeys or the parapets need to change to break up the strong horizontality.	
1.5	JS – noted the uniform 5 storey building height was in response to previous LBS's comments, massing previously was stepping up and down but LBS requested this was made more uniform.	
1.6	JL – noted articulation of bricks recessing bricks at parapet level could achieve the desired results of breaking down the massing.	
1.7	AY – noted the opportunity through better architecture, street level animation when compared to the existing Aylesham Centre and an exciting opportunity to enhance the Conservation Area.	
1.8	CJ – noted the opportunity to be a bit more playful with the architecture.	
1.9	VL- queried whether the art depicted is proposed or indicative. TO – noted it's only inductive and that this would be secured through an appropriately worded condition.	
2.0	Individual Buildings	
	<u>Building E</u>	
2.1	JL – summarised the revisions to the scheme including relocated balconies on Building N to remove them from the Hanover Park view.	
2.2	CJ – noted Building F the building should be made to appear more vertical with more presence at ground floor. Having a 1.5 height shop front might help extra presence.	
2.3	CJ – noted Building F façade needs a bit more vertical emphasis on the south façade.	
2.4	LBS suggested the top of Building F has more articulation at roof level.	
	<u>Building I</u>	
2.5	JL – noted the narrowing of the building and mirroring the rhythm of the adjacent buildings.	
2.6	CJ – noted the maisonettes need to read as individual units. Could be the same architectural language as the rest of the block but something that sets them apart from the rest of the Building.	

Meeting Items		Action
2.7	CJ - Maisonettes need private amenity space at first floor level in addition to what is provided at ground floor. JL – noted this could assist with the maisonettes looking more individual. RM – noted the balconies may disrupt the legibility of the ground floor plinth. CJ – noted then maybe it is something more architectural.	
2.8	VL – the amenity space needs to be private and well used so the design should reflect this.	
2.9	CJ – noted LBS is relatively comfortable with the rest of Building J and is quite successful. Ground floor could potentially have a stronger base.	
	<u>Building N</u>	
2.10	JL – noted the relocation of the balconies off Hannover Park onto the Green Link	
2.11	CJ- noted support for Building N.	
2.12	JL – noted the inclusion of windows looking onto the entrance of the Morrisons. LBS confirmed no objection to the windows.	
	<u>Buildings P</u>	
2.13	CJ – noted the same principles for the maisonettes apply to Building P as Building J.	
2.14	JS – noted the entrances to the maisonettes are setback separating them from the rest of the building.	
2.15	DP – noted looking at balconies on the first floor of the maisonettes.	
2.16	DP – requested looking at more generous balconies, greater than the 1.5 m minimum depth.	
2.17	CJ – noted slight concerns with the contrast between the darker and lighter bricks. Noting it's potentially the darkness of the grey brick. Vertical emphasis is supported.	
	<u>Building L</u>	
2.18	JS noted that the design team is looking at reducing the height of Building L and Building D and E but the reduction in height is linked to the fire strategy and requires more detailed design .	
2.19	CJ- noted the view of Building E east onto Peckham Yards appears to look like a proper street and works well.	
2.21	DP – noted the retail unit within the cycle hub feels quite isolated and may not be successful. Suggested locating it west closer to the corner of the building.	
2.22	JL – noted it is going to be a flexible retail unit so potential for it to potentially offer goods/service to the residents who use the bike hub.	
	<u>Building K</u>	
2.23	CJ – noted support for the proposed building.	
	<u>Building D</u>	
2.24	CJ – requested a sketch view of the Building D from the arch in Peckham Square. The building has the potential to quite calm, making its presence felt but not overly distracting from the ‘first layer’ of the townscape in the foreground.	

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre Pre-application Meeting 10 – Engagement/eqIA		
Location of Meeting:	London Borough of Southwark – 160 Tooley St, London SE1 2QH		
Date:	29 May 2024	Ref:	02C102578
		Meeting No:	10

Details:			
Attendees present			
Vikki Lewis	VL	Team Leader – Strategic Applications, LB Southwark	LBS
Matt Redman	MR	Planning Officer – LB Southwark	LBS
Michael Tsoukaris (part)	MT	Design and Conservation Manager, LB Southwark	LBS
Catherine Jeater	CJ	Design and Conservation Team Leader, LB Southwark	LBS
Tom Oluade	TO	Berkeley Homes North East London	BG
Sasha Gordon	SG	Quod	QD
Ciron Edwards	CE	Kanda	KC
Mark Knibbs	MK	Avison Young	AY

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Engagement	
	<u>Early Engagement Strategy</u>	
1.1	Owners – need to provide more details on independent stakeholders.	
1.2	Highlight the range of consultees. Remove reference to Bussey Building (words in brackets).	
1.3	Stakeholder mapping exercise – LBS would like to see the details of this.	
1.4	Demographic data – add more specific figures – include age and protected demographics. SG – queried if LBS would like national data or LBS’s local data. XX noted – as long as it is specific to the local area. LBS has done a lot of work on this. XX to share data on public health data available.	
1.5	General – be as specific as possible about conversations around the Conservation Area.	

Meeting Items		Action
1.6	7 – include space syntax work that was undertaken. Pedestrian routes to also be included.	
1.7	8 – where site visits and desk assessments are referenced provide more detail and specific to the Aylesham Centre.	
1.8	9. equalities issue with climate change (overheating, etc.) – look at data around this. The GLA have undertaken some climate risk mapping underpinned by demographic information.	
1.9	Part 2 – if a group has been identified in the EES to link it through to the ES.	
1.10	In the SCI there is a best practice – but noted it has been an extensive consultation exercise. Be specific to different groups – be specific to Peckham.	
1.11	How you are going to incorporate the feedback – this needs to be more specific.	
	<u>Engagement Summary</u>	
1.12	Overarching comment – make sure the ES is responding to all questions.	
1.13	1. Make reference to the independent retailers. VL queried if anyone uses the AC for any other purposes. Element of people to get out of the rain, there are some small independent carts	
	<u>Local community / community infrastructure</u>	
1.14	LBS suggested engaging with Camberwell School of Arts – TO – noted BH have tried but not received a response. VL – noted the public art strategy and the potential with the Art School. TO – noted BH have reached out with limited response but noted the work going on at the AC with the Gallery On the Rye and working with local artists who are being engaged regarding the public art strategy.	
1.15	30% vacancy rates – what does this mean for the scheme. Has school vacancy been considered	
1.16	VL – queried whether the survey work identified if small retails congregate near one another.	
1.17	You Said, We Did Section – is important, if there is a reason it couldn't be done, robustly justify. Focus on resident comments.	
1.18	CE – summarised the community champions panel – looked at protected characteristics, seldom heard groups. A group of 15, met with 5 or 6 times.	
1.19	VL -queried whether different religious groups have been consulted. CE noted an effort has been made to engage with all religious groups.	
1.20	VL – Social Value – be specific and looking at direct, indirect impacts. How may the changing commercial offer affect people. Look at affordable workspace and environmental impact needs to be drawn out here. Health inequalities, the softer sides of social value – both direct and indirect. Change in the shops and who they cater for. Are local residents going to be using spaces that they once were.	
1.21	VL – health inequalities did some work around fresh food – shopping survey. XX to share a few links to the survey.	
3.0	EqIA	

Meeting Items	Action
VL - be specific how there are positive impacts on the general population and how this relates to protected characteristics.	
VL - demonstrating where no Peckham specific data, use Southwark data. (i.e. gender identity).	
VL - drawing out across all protected characteristics. Some of the assessments being more specific to older people. Informal uses of the spaces.	
VL - neighbourhood safety needs to be drawn out and how it has been mitigated. VL - noted ground floor of Building L adjacent to the bus station.	
VL - para 2.60 - the statement of disproportionate impacts on non-English speakers being not likely - worth considering how this statement is presented.	
VL - fear of crime and air quality come be brought out a bit more.	
VL - agent of change of adjacent churches in addition to the bus station should be considered.	
VL - how race and ethnicity are defined - Gypsy, Roma, Traveller Site, there is a potential site near the Police Station, north of the Site. They need to be considered.	
VL - noted a survey of visitors to the E&C site and queried if a similar survey will be undertaken for the Aylesham Centre. How is the site currently being used by visitors.	
VL - noted to review the list of groups to be consulted within the DCC - review this list against the engagement list within the SCI.	

Minutes of Meeting

Purpose of Meeting:	Aylesham Centre Pre-application Meeting 11 – S106 Obligations/Planning Statement			
Location of Meeting:	London Borough of Southwark – 160 Tooley St, London SE1 2QH			
Date:	12 June 2024	Ref:	02C102578	Meeting No: 10

Details:			
Attendees present			
Vikki Lewis	VL	Team Leader – Strategic Applications, LB Southwark	LBS
Dipesh Patel	DP	Strategic Applications Manager, LB Southwark	LBS
Tom Oluade	TO	Berkeley Homes East London	BG
Leo	SG	Berkeley Homes East London	QD
Nick Alston	NA	Avison Young	AY
Mark Knibbs	MK	Avison Young	AY

Meeting Items		Action
1.0	Programme	
1.1	TO – provided a brief update on submission programme. Now looking to submit mid July.	
1.2	VL – queried if any changes to Buildings D and L will be made prior to submission. TO – said no.	
	Submission	
1.3	NA – provided an summary of the documents for approval. The drawings and	
1.4	It was agreed that 3 hard copies of the planning submission documents 1 no. to LBS officers, 1 no. to the library 1 no. hub.	
1.5	VL – requested the Business Relocation Strategy submitted as a standalone document	
1.6	VL – summary version of the FVA to be submitted with the application. Full version of the FVA to be made public a week before committee.	

Meeting Items		Action
1.7	DP – requested a executive summary of the DAS no longer than 10 pages.	
2.0	Quantum of Development	
2.1	NA – summarised the proposed floor space highlighting there is a fix for non-residential floorspace in the supermarket and office building (building D). the flexible floorspace comprises E(a-g) with caps of 350 sqm drinking establishment and 320 sqm workspace E(g).	
2.2	VL – noted she is comfortable with the proposed uses but policy colleagues have noted it is a departure.	
2.3	DP – crucial element is the existing traders – every existing trader should be offered a place back	
2.4	VK – will set up a trader support meeting next week.	
2.5	VK – raised additional survey of people who use the internal mall/atrium. How is the space being used.	
2.6	VL – noted the 56% 2+beds, slightly short of the 60% and is a risk	
2.7	Table 5.6 change to height above ground (as opposed to AOD).	
2.8	VL – queried UGF – TO noted the scheme has worked extremely hard.	
	<u>Obligations</u>	
2.9	Archaeology, demolition and construction, affordable housing and monitoring fee, affordable housing review mechanism (up to a 50%), employment provision construction/completed development, business relocation strategy, on site affordable retail, temporary retail facilities, data base of relocation opportunities, public toilets within the shopping centre, public access through the site, CCTV, public realm and highway works, landscaping and management, wayfinding and signage, improvements to the bus station, tree planting, cycle hire, bus capacity and public transport capacity (TfL), playspace (12+); business relocation fund, local procurement, affordable workspace, street tree bond, street lighting, delivery servicing plan bond (to allow council the monitor the servicing as it should and not impacting as anticipated on the highway network), car club spaces (potentially contribution to it somewhere else) car club membership	
	<u>Benefits</u>	
2.10	VL – flush out the job/training benefits . Focus on local people and a lot of people 18-35 and employment and low income issues in the area. Try to make the benefits site/area specific	
3.0	AOB	
3.1	VL – queried whether any further contact has been made with the mosque. TO – noted Berkeley have tried but will continue.	
3.2	VL – agree a narrative with TfL in relation to the development of the TfL land.	