

ROYAL BOROUGH OF GREENWICH

PLANNING BOARD

17 NOVEMBER 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, Linda Perks, Geoffrey Brighty and Nigel Fletcher

Officers:

Assistant Director Planning & Building Control, Planning Manager (Major Developments), Senior Principal Planning Officer, Principal Planning Officer, Principal Development Officer, Assistant Head of Legal Services and Corporate Governance Officer.

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 Councillor Ian Hawking.

Apologies for leaving the meeting early were received from Councillor Geoffrey Brighty.

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 5 – Land to the West of Kidbrooke Park Road, Kidbrooke, SE3 9PX

Item 6 – Greenwich Peninsula Masterplan and Plots 18.02 and 18.03,
Greenwich. SE10

3. Declarations of Interest

In respect of Item 5 (Land to the West of Kidbrooke Park Road, Kidbrooke, SE3 9PX).

Councillor Mehboob Khan made personal declarations as a close relative lived adjacent to the proposal. He would take no part in consideration of or determination of the application

Councillor Denise Hyland made personal declaration, as President of the Greenwich World Heritage Site. As she had no involvement in any prior debate on the application the Assistant Head of Legal Services advised she could continue to participate in the consideration and determination of the application.

Item 6 (Greenwich Peninsula Masterplan and Plots 18.02 and 18.03, Greenwich. SE10).

Councillor Nigel Fletcher advised that, he was Council appointed representative Greenwich Theatre Trustee however, he had not been involved in any debate on this application he could continue to participate in the consideration and determination of the application.

Resolved –

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

4. Minutes

Resolved –

That the minute of the meeting of the Planning Board held on 16 June 2020 be agreed and signed as a true and accurate record.

5. Land to the West of Kidbrooke Park Road, Kidbrooke, SE3 9PX – Ref: 20/2330/F

Councillor Mehboob Khan withdrew from the meeting having made a personal declarations as a close relative lived adjacent to the proposal.

Councillor Denise Hyland made a personal declaration as President of the Greenwich World Heritage Site, though she had had no involvement in any prior debate on the application.

The Board noted that Planning Officer addendum report, published in advance of the meeting and accepted an illustrative presentation of the application from the Senior Principal Planning Officer.

In response to Members questions, the Senior Principal Planning Officer advised that Block C had been stepped down to reduce the impact on neighbouring allotments. That, as Block B was five floors with no wheelchair accessible flats, one lift provision was in accord with the London Plan and met fire regulation requirements. The affordable rent units would be made available at London Social Rent level.

The Planning Board accepted addresses from representatives for the South Greenwich Forum and Blackheath Society. Both organisations supported the building of social housing but felt the proposal could be improved. As part of their addresses the following was raised –

- It was understood that the lift contract was in urgent need of address and assurance should be given that any repairs would be undertaken within 3 hours, on the same day, as many different residents needed to use a lift.
- A combined kitchen, dining, living room area maybe considered an acceptable design but a separate kitchen would create a better living space for families with children doing homework and parents home working.
- Concern was expressed that the 10 Story block could result in higher blocks proposed for area K4.
- The pressure on transport and infrastructure did not appear to be adequately addressed.
- Safe pedestrian crossings should be secured by condition for swift implementation.

The applicant and their specialist addressed the Planning Board advising

- the proposal was for Council housing provision, built to a high standard and environmentally sustainable level.
- the principle of development had been established for the site.
- the proposal would step down to the areas adjacent to the school and allotment areas and was designed with the future development of Plot K4 in mind.
- the proposed reflected the Victorian elements of the surrounding conservation area through design element and 79% of the units having dual aspects.
- the landscaping would create a pedestrian environment with green corridors and defined play space, communal courtyard and green areas.
- other than specific provision of disable parking, the development would be car free.

- the area was PTAL Level 4 with TfL implementing improvements to bus services and an estimated additional 6 people would be using public transport, as a result of the proposal.
- improvements to cycle and pedestrian paths were proposed.

Councillor Okereke, Cabinet Member for Housing, and Councillor Danny Thorpe addressed the Planning Board, in support of the application.

In response to Members questions the applicant's representatives advised that modelling indicated an additional pedestrian crossing would be appropriate at the Kidbrooke Park Road junction which would be financially secured.

In considering the application before them, the Planning Board Members commented that they welcomed the proposal for social housing. The proposal appeared to be of a high quality on a suitable site. That Council Officers needed to continue to negotiate with TfL for public transport improvements and that the additional pedestrian crossing is installed quickly.

At the request of the Chair the Clerk for the meeting 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 and took the vote.

On the Planning Officers proposal to grant full planning permission Planning Board Members voted with 10 Members in favour, 0 against and 0 abstention.

Resolved unanimously –

That planning permission be granted for the construction of buildings to provide residential accommodation together with the provision of a nursery, associated public realm, play space, accessible parking spaces and the re-provision of a substation.

That the Board noted that the following description of the proposed development is provided by way of further explanation (not forming part of the formal description of development set out above) in order to assist Planning Board:

The construction of four buildings between 4-10 storeys to provide 117 residential units (100% social rent) (Use Class C3) together with the provision of a nursery (417 sqm) (Use Class D1), associated public realm, play space, accessible parking spaces and the re-provision of a substation)

That consent be granted subject to:

- i. The 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;
- ii. The conditions, Appendix 2 to the main report and addendum report, to be detailed in the notice of determination; and
- iii. The prior completion of a Directors' Agreement securing the heads of terms as set out in this report (Section 22)
- iv. To authorise 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 this report at Appendix 2 and the Addendum report, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice; and
 - b. finalise the detailed terms of the Directors' Agreement, as set out in *Section 22 of the main report; and*
 - c. consider, in the event that the Directors' Agreement is not completed within three (3) months of the date of the Planning Board resolution, whether permission should be refused on the grounds that the agreement has not been completed within the appropriate timescale, and that the proposals are unacceptable in the absence of the benefits which would have been secured, and if the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) considers it appropriate, to determine the application with reasons for refusal which will include the following:

In the absence of an agreement to secure financial and non-financial contributions including for Affordable Housing, Transport and Environmental Sustainability the development is contrary to policies , EA(c), EI, IM4, 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).

6. Greenwich Peninsula Masterplan and Plots 18.02 and 18.03, Greenwich. SE10 – Ref: 19/2733/O, 20/2000/NM, 20/2331/I106, 20/2172/I106

Councillor Nigel Fletcher advised he was the Council appointed representative Greenwich Theatre Trustee and it was noted that he could continue to participate in the consideration and determination of the application.

The Board noted the Planning Officer addendum report, published in advance of the meeting and accepted an illustrative presentation of the application for application reference 20/2000/NM, 20/2331/I106 and 20/2172/I106 and the detailed element of 19/2733/O from the Principal Planning Officer and an illustrative presentation of the Outline element of application reference 19/2733/O from the Senior Principal Planning Officer.

In response to Members questions the Planning Officers confirmed outline permission had previously been granted. Most of the buildings would see an increase in height from the proposals approved in 2015. The parameter plan set out the maximum height of the buildings in metres and any change to the numbers of floors would have to achieve residential floor to ceiling height requirements.

The applicant addressed the Board outlining the reason of the application within the context of the Peninsula Masterplan advising that the Mayor of London sought the moving of the movie studio from the Peninsula to Barking and Dagenham which, along with the removal of the Gasholder, had created an opportunity to re-evaluate the scheme, increasing the level of affordable housing and formalising a partnership with L&Q Housing Association, to provide high quality mixed tenure housing.

In addressing the Board, the Managing Director for L&Q London drew attention to the provision of 5,813 homes which would include a mix of shared ownership, London Living Rent and London Affordable Rent level homes. Engagement with the local community would be a key aspect of the scheme to provide employment and training opportunities and pupils from a local school had been engaged to produce a historic timeline to be displayed on the site hoardings.

The applicant's Architect responded to a Members question that the building heights proposed were comparable to those in the Lower Riverside area. The proposal would see an increase but in line with the guidelines of the 2019 application allowing for greater flexibility in building typologies. The

aspiration was to keep the building footprints compact to create light and space between buildings.

In respect of Members concern at the resulting increased density the applicant's Architect advised that the loss of the Movie Studio, had allowed for the creation of more open space and the creation of a central pedestrian spine and play streets by way of the provision of taller buildings.

A Member noted that there were a significant number of developments which were seeking new bus services to the North Greenwich transport hub as well as increased numbers of commuters, school children and residents, O2 event users, etc. utilising the transport infrastructure. That traffic, buses or cars, would be funnelled through one of 3 roads servicing the area and gridlock was already an issue if there was an incident in Blackwall Tunnel. In respect of these concerns they sought clarification on the proposed traffic management and infrastructure arrangement.

The applicants Transport Consultant advised that the number of bus stops and stands at the North Greenwich terminus would be increased to accommodate the new services and detailed transport modelling had been undertaken with TfL. Parking spaces were reduced across the Peninsula and extensive modelling had been undertaken to determine the actual impact and any required highway improvements. A contribution of circa £15m was being put forward to support the public transport infrastructure changes.

In considering the application before them, a Planning Board Member held concern at the increased pressure on the transport infrastructure and felt that greater clarity was needed on the contingencies proposed to avoid gridlock in the area.

A Member noted that the Council was encouraging people to walk, cycle and use public transport more than drive, and whilst appreciating the concern regarding potential congestion, there were a number of Public Transport options available to commute to Central London.

A Member commented that, whilst happy with the principle of the development they expressed disappointed that, whilst the loss of the Movie Studio had resulted in the creation of welcomed open spaces it had also resulted in an increase in building heights. That the proposal, with the involvement of L&Q and bringing forward more affordable homes and an additional primary school, at an early stage, was welcome.

A Member felt frustrated that, again, the Planning Board was bound by outline permission leaving them little latitude in their decisions and that if this was a new proposal it would not be supported. They noted the applicant spoke of building a new city with the unique geography of the river, however the Thames had become lost behind a wall of glass and now the green spaces around it were also being filled and the landmark building on the Peninsula, the O2, was no longer visible. They felt that a mini Manhattan was being built with taller and taller buildings and this application was another opportunity to increase heights even more. They noted that there would be a 30 storey building towering over an adjacent school and will overshadow Central Park, which was being reduced to a tiny strip down the middle of the Peninsula. They felt that they could not approve the proposal.

A Member felt that the concept of high rise buildings had been established and it was reasonable to seek more open space in exchange for an increased in height. That they were not swayed by concerns as potential congestion as they felt that the introduction of other transport systems would mitigate this potential issues and, whilst it was right to be concerned it was not grounds to obstruct consent. They noted that the Council had spent years securing a developer for this, heavily polluted, site and the Masterplan presented a new way of living and the provision of a new school would help cement unity of community.

Before moving to the vote of the Chair clarified that if recommendation D was approved it would form Part of the s106 agreement under recommendation A.

At the request of the Chair the Clerk for the meeting 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 and took the vote.

On the Planning Officers proposal to grant outline and detailed consent (Recommendation A) in respect of application Ref:19/2733/0 the Planning Board Members voted - 6 Members in favour, 2 against and 2 abstention.

On the Planning Officers proposal to grant Non-material amendment consent in respect of application Ref: 20/2000/NM the Planning Board Members voted - 6 Members in favour, 1 against and 3 abstention.

In the Planning Officers proposals to agree the modified s106 agreements, Ref: **20/2331/1106** and **20/2172/1106** the Planning Board Members voted - 6 Members in favour, 1 against and 3 abstention.

Resolved –

Hybrid Application (Outline and Detailed Part)

That conditional consent be granted for: outline planning permission with all matters reserved, for the demolition of buildings and mixed-use redevelopment up to a maximum of 737,100sqm comprising:

- up to 533,900sqm of residential development which could include:
 - i. up to 5,813 residential dwellings
 - ii. *up to 25,000sqm student accommodation (up to 500 rooms) and/or co-living units*
- up to 19,600sqm Class A1-A5 use (food and non-food retail, restaurants, bars and cafes);
- up to 68,700sqm Class B1 (a) (b) (c) (business);
- up to 24,200sqm Class C1 (hotel) for up to 350 rooms;
- up to 13,200 sqm Class D comprising D2 (Sport and Recreation), Class D1 (health care facilities/nursery/creche);
- up to 4,200sqm D1 (education facilities)
- up to 8,000sqm Theatre (Class Sui Generis);
residential and non-residential car parking, as well as a minimum of 2000 AEG parking spaces (for the O2), cycle parking; associated community facilities; public realm and open space; hard and soft landscaping; a new transport hub and associated facilities; realignment of the cultural route traversing the site (The Tide); highway and transport works and associated ancillary works (proposals to revise part of the approved Greenwich Peninsula 2015 Masterplan (15/0716/O).

AND

Detailed planning permission, for a residential development comprising 476 residential units, up to 100sqm (GEA) *A1/A2/A3/B1/D1/D2 floorspace plus ancillary car parking, access, landscaping and public realm works and associated infrastructure works.*

Subject to:

- i) The Conditions set out in Appendix 2 (as amended by Appendix 2 addendum) of the main report.
- ii) The prior completion of a consolidated 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 this report (see section 44 of the main report), modifications to planning obligations (and section 41 of the main report), any addendums, and the minutes of this Planning Board meeting.

- iii) 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
- iv) Members confirming in their decision that account has been taken of environmental information, as required by Regulation 26 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.
- v) A statement being placed on the statutory Register confirming the main reasons and consideration of which the Planning Board decision was based were those set out in the report of the Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills as required by Regulations 30 (1) (d.) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.
- vi) To authorise 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 this report (Appendix 2), its addendums 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 this report, its addendums and the minutes of this Planning Board meeting.
- vii) 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 towards Affordable Housing, Transport, Highways works, Education Provision, Employment and Training, Environmental Sustainability, Open Space Provision, Sport and Leisure Facilities, Community Facilities is contrary to policies H3, H(e), EA(c), EI, E(c), CH1, CH2, IM1, IM4, 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).

Non-Material Amendment - Section 96a (ref:20/2000/NM)

- (2) That the following non-material amendments to planning permission (ref: 15/0716/O) be granted,
- Condition 3 (Approved Drawings);
 - Condition 4 (Compliance with the Development Specification);
 - Condition 10 (Phasing);
 - Condition 14 (Reserved Matters Applications);
 - Condition 16 (Housing Mix);
 - Condition 30 (Flood Risk Assessment);
 - Condition 36 (Wastewater);
 - Condition 37 (Water);
 - Condition 51 (Parking);
 - Condition 60 (Lifetime Homes Standards and Wheelchair Housing);
 - Condition 69 (Environmental Noise);
 - Condition 73 (Boreholes);
 - Condition 82 (CEEQUAL);
 - Condition 90 (Wayfinding);
 - Condition 91 (Lighting);
 - Condition 104 (Noise Assessment);
 - Condition 105 (Victoria Deep Water Terminal); and
 - Condition 121 (Internal Noise and Lighting Assessments) Along with the Removal of:
 - Condition 6 (Control Parameters);
 - Condition 15 (Provision of Affordable Housing);
 - Condition 17 (Density);
 - Condition 57 (Greenwich Riverside Transit);
 - Condition 115 (Restrictions on Occupation of Parcels 15, 16, 17, 21 and 22; and
 - Condition 116 (Restrictions on Occupation of Parcel 18 (Parcel 01))

Modifications to Section 106 Agreements.

- (3) That modifications to the S106 Agreement be approved for:
- i) The '2015 Masterplan' (reference: 15/0716/O dated 08/12/2015) and

- ii) The legal agreements for 'Plot MO121' (reference: 13/2865/F dated 31/03/2014 as varied on 20/09/2016 and the original S.106 Agreement dated 23 February 2004)).

for the reasons set out within the body of this report (see section 41) and subject to the approval of the masterplan (19/2733/O), such modifications to be contained within the consolidated S106 Agreement. referred to at Resolution (1) above.

The meeting closed at 10:00pm

Chair