

ROYAL BOROUGH OF GREENWICH

PLANNING BOARD

20 OCTOBER 2020 AT 6.30PM

MINUTE

PRESENT:

Members:

Councillor Stephen Brain (Chair); Councillors Norman Adams, Olu Babatola, Gary Dillon, Denise Hyland, Mehboob Khan, Clive Mardner, Maureen O'Mara and Geoffrey Brighty.

Officers:

Assistant Director Planning & Building Control, Planning Manager (Major Developments), Senior Principal Planning Officer, Legal Officer and Corporate Governance Officer x 2.

At the commencement of the meeting (conducted remotely) the Chair announced the procedure which the Meeting of the Board would be followed for considering the item(s) before the Board. The Chair confirmed the names of members of the public who had registered to speak on the item(s) and clarified that only those members of the public who had registered to speak 2 working days before the meeting had been provided with a link to participate in the meeting.

Item

No.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received for Councillors Ian Hawking, Linda Perks and Nigel Fletcher.

2. Urgent Business

The Planning Board noted and accepted the Planning Officers' Addendum Report's, circulated in advance of the meeting, in relation to, Item 4 – Phase 3 (Blocks F & G only) and Phase 5 (Blocks c, E & J only), Kidbrooke Village. SE3 9YG – Ref: 19/3415/F

3. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Adams and Khan made personal declarations in that they owned property adjacent to the development and that they would take no part in the consideration or determination of Item 4.

Councillor Hyland made a personal, but not prejudicial, declaration as Chair of the World Heritage Site Greenwich Committee, in Item 4.

Resolved -

That the list of Councillors' memberships as Council appointed representatives on outside bodies, joint committees and school governing bodies be noted.

The Councillors Adams, Khan and Hyland's declarations be noted.

4. Item 4 - Phase 3 (Blocks F & G only) and Phase 5 (Blocks c, E & J only), Kidbrooke Village. SE3 9YG - Ref: 19/3415/F

Councillor Adams and Khan had made personal declaration's in that they owned property adjacent to the development and left the meeting, taking no part in the consideration or determination of Item 4.

Councillor Hyland had made a personal, but not prejudicial, declaration as Chair of the World Heritage Site Greenwich Committee and took part in consideration and determination of this item.

Before moving to consider the Senior Principal Planning Officers presentation the Chair read the following statement.

The Planning Board previously considered this application and decided to refuse it on conservation area setting, segregation of the affordable housing block and public transport grounds. Prior to the issue of the decision notice the applicant indicated they would submit revisions and further information.

The revisions and further information seek to address these concerns and have been consulted on by the Council. The latest documentation and representations are considered "material considerations" to be taken into account therefore this application is being referred back to the Board for reconsideration in light of the new information.

Paragraph 38 of the NPPF also states that "Local Planning Authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way" and

that they should "work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area."

Therefore, whilst the Board made a resolution on the application as reported to the 14th July Planning Board meeting, it is within the interest of adopting a positive and proactive approach that the Council takes the opportunity to consider these further amendments and clarifications from the applicant and the representations received in line with the requirement on the Council to determine the application taking into account all material considerations. These revisions have been considered by officers as set out in the committee report.

The Senior Principal Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation of the application and highlighted to the Board Members that Block F1 would be reduced by 2 stories from 17 to 15 floors. Block J would remain the single tenure affordable housing but was considered to be integrated into the overall development. The impact on train capacity, from the additional 302 units, would be negligible, at 0.65% of the overall forecast capacity. In addition, this demand would not materialise for a number of years, allowing time for potential Network Rail capacity improvements to be implemented

A Member noted that the transport impact was dependant on the DfT enhancements, due by 2028 and that guarantees were offered that capacity would be increased, noting that the stations were extended to accept 12 carriage trains some time ago, however, 12 carriage trains were not running on the line.

The Senior Principal Planning Officer responded that there was an understanding that there was pressure on the entire transport service and implementation of 12 carriage trains would form part of the DfT train operator appointment.

A Member questioned how the transport modelling equated 302 extra dwellings, including family sized, to 66 extra people travelling. The Member also noted that there were numerous developments, adjacent to nearly every station, before Kidbrooke on the Thameslink Line which would have a compound impact on capacity and further discussions may be needed with TfL.

The Senior Principal Planning Officer advised that the modelling was based on an assessment of what type of transport residents would choose to use and,

whilst appreciating the wider concerns, noted that the Councils Highway Officers, TfL or the Independent Assessor had questioned the figures.

NB – Councillor Mardner dropped out of the Zoom meeting for approximately 10 minutes and following legal guidance, the Chair advised that he could remain for the duration of the debate but could not participate in the vote.

The Planning Board accepted an address from the representative for the South Greenwich Forum and Blackheath Society who advised that both organisations welcomed the reduction in height of Block F1. Concerns were still held at the change to Block J from a single low rise block to a split of two, taller Blocks, J1 & J2 and the negative impact this would have on the residents of Meadowside. Placing all the social housing all in one block did not promote the ideal of mixed tenure and, whilst the proposal was at the request of the Housing Association, the Council Policy was for mixed tenure and there was an ongoing concern at the creation of ‘ghettoisation’.

The Planning Board accepted an address from a resident speaking in relation to the OneSpace Community centre which was an existing space with ties to community and should be considered as an integral part of the community and should be built upon. The future Provisions of the Kidbrooke village list community spaces, community halls and parks, most of which are shared spaces and OneSpace has not been assigned an area. The proposal does not take account of the impact on individuals, families and people who use the space as a community. The OneSpace building is not due to be demolished until work commences on Phase 3 Block and it was requested that the building is retained, and not removed for Phase 3 development, as it will segment the community.

In response to a Members question the speaker confirmed that OneSpace understood their use of the building was temporary but the community need should allow for this position to be re-assessed.

The Planning Board accepted an address from a resident who felt that the proposal was an overdevelopment, with the applicant trying to put too many people onto the site. There would be negative impacts on existing residents, road safety as people were averse to using public transport.

The Applicant addressed the Planning Board advising that the revised application sought to address previous concerns of the Council and other stakeholders.

The applicant's architect advised that the tallest building, F1 was being reduced in height to below the central tower and in line with others on the site. This will also greatly reduce its visibility from the Blackheath Conservation Area. Block J would be 6 minute walk to the Village centre and the redesign has also allowed the opportunity to provide more affordable homes, all of which are built tenure blind.

The Business Development Director for L&Q advised that the single affordable rent tenure of Block J was required to ensure the building was affordable for residents and it was industry practice to have single tenure buildings in order to minimise service costs and management charges.

The applicants transport consultant advised that the transport assessment methodology, for the application, had been agreed with both the Royal Borough and Greenwich and Transport for London (TfL). Southeastern Rail reported capacity existed at the Kidbrooke Station and the proposal would see a net increase of 0.6% passengers. Further, in terms of the wider demands the Department for Transport had accounted for future demands in their service rail future improvements planning. There were no transport capacity issues arising from the proposal.

The Divisional Manager for Berkeley Homes noted that there was a need to consider the implications from Covid-19 and 'Brexit' as well as changes in planning policy and building regulations. Berkeley Homes wished to continue providing high quality homes and amenities, with its partners, for the community.

In response to Members questions the applicants transport consultant confirmed that the impact of developments near transport locations adjacent to Kidbrooke Station had been considered, in terms of cumulative impact. He noted that it was TfL and Network Rails role to consider the wider cumulative impact of developments further along the line, feeding into the transport requirement levels.

In considering the application before them four Planning Board Members commented that they felt that the previously raised concerns had been addressed by the applicant.

A Member welcomed the reduction in height of building F. They also commented that they were not entirely convinced by transport figures or that there would be an increase in rail capacity by 2028 or that, with the Kidbrooke Square development and Thomas Tallis development there would

be no cumulative impact. They felt that, whilst housing was welcome, the uplift of 302 units was an overdevelopment of, an already large development.

A Member noted that they would like to see Berkeley Homes continue to work with the construction academy and GLLaB in respect of promoting local jobs for Borough residents. They noted that due to Covid-19 a lot of people were currently working from home and it was not possible to predict the future of commuting patterns. They also asked the applicant to work with OneSpace to provide an assured large communal space, with an outside court, for them to move into and to support the younger residents of the estate.

A Member noted that they had visited the site and were surprised to see how integrated Block J was. They were also pleased that the exterior appearance was the same as the private residents.

A Member felt that there was a need for Greenwich to lobby Bexley and Lewisham Councils to join in putting more pressure on TfL to improve the transport infrastructure and fulfil on improvement promises.

On behalf of and at the request of the Chair the Clerk sought confirmation from all Members' that they had maintained zoom connection to the meeting for the entirety of the presentation and discussion on this item. Cllr Mardner dropped out for about 10 mins after presentation and did not vote on the application. No other Member indicated that they had experienced any loss of connectivity.

The Planning Officers recommendation to approve the application was put to the vote with 5 Members' in favour, 1 against and 0 abstentions.

Resolved -

That, in line with the amendments referred to in the report documents and appendices, consent be granted for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of residential units, publicly accessible open space and associated access, car parking, cycle parking and landscaping, erection of a new pavilion building within the Park. The proposals result in the uplift of residential units compared to approved Planning Permission refs. 14/2607/F (as amended) related to Phase 3 and ref. 14/2611/F (as amended) related to Phase 5.

That consent be granted subject to:

- (i) The prior completion of an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) containing the planning

- obligations as summarised in the heads of terms set out in section 27 of the main report dated 14th July 2020, any further addendums, and the minutes of this Planning Board meeting.
- (ii) (ii) Referral of the application to the Mayor of London as required under the terms of The Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008;
 - (iii) Members, by way of their decision, confirmed that their decision took account of environmental information, as required by Regulation 13 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011.
 - (iv) A statement being placed on the statutory Register confirming the main reasons and consideration of which the Planning Board decision was based as required by Regulation 24(1)(c) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011;
 - (v) The authorisation of the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to:
 - a. make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in Revised Appendix 2, addendum reports and the minutes of this Planning Board meeting, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice; and
 - b. finalise the detailed terms of the planning obligations pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), as set out in the main report, its addendums, and the minute of this Planning Board meeting.
 - (vi) In the event that the Section 106 Agreement is not completed within three (3) months of the date of this Planning Board meeting, to authorise the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to consider whether permission should be refused on the grounds that the proposals are unacceptable in the absence of the benefits which would have been secured, and if so, to determine the application with reasons for refusal which will include the following:

In the absence of a legal agreement to secure financial and non-financial contributions including for Affordable Housing, Transport, Highway Works, Child Play Space, Employment and Training, Environmental Sustainability, Public Realm Improvements, Open Space provision, Community provision and marketing of wheelchair units the development is contrary to policies H3, H5, H(e), EA(c), OSI, EI, CH(a), IM1, IM4, IM(b) and IM(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (Adopted July 2014)

and the Planning obligations (s106) Guidance SPD (adopted July 2015); and

- (vii) The Conditions set out in Revised Appendix 2 of the main report, including condition 4 to secure the details of the development.

The meeting closed at 7.57pm

Chair