

ROYAL BOROUGH OF GREENWICH

PLANNING BOARD

3 NOVEMBER 2020 AT 6.30PM

MINUTE

PRESENT:

Members:

Councillor Stephen Brain (Chair); Councillors Norman Adams, Olu Babatola, Denise Hyland, Clive Mardner, Maureen O'Mara, Linda Perks, Geoffrey Brighty and Nigel Fletcher

Officers:

Assistant Director Planning & Building Control, Planning Manager (Major Developments), Planning Officer X2, Principal Planning Officer, Legal Officer and Committee Services Officer x2

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 Gary Dillon, Ian Hawking and Mehboob Khan.

Apologies for leaving the meeting early were received from Councillor Norman Adams and Olu Babatola.

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 – 57 Tuskar Street (former Sam Manners House) Greenwich, SE10 9UJ (Ref 20.1815.F)

Item 7 – Land bounded by Pettman Crescent, Nathan Way and Hadden Road, London, SE28 – Ref 194398O

Item 8 – Land at corner of Hadden Road & Griffin Manor Way and adjacent to Western Way & HMP Thameside, London, SE28 0DE – Ref 194370F

3. Declarations of Interest

Resolved –

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

4. Minutes

Resolved –

That the minute of the meeting of the Planning Board held on 2 June 2020 be agreed and signed as a true and accurate record.

5. 57 Tuskar Street (former Sam Manners House) Greenwich, SE10 9UJ (Ref 20.1815.F)

Planning Board Member noted the Planning Officers addendum report, circulated in advance of the meeting, and accepted an illustrative presentation of the application.

In response to Members' questions, the Planning Officer advised that the proposal consisted of a 4 story element ,to the south, decreasing to 3. Improvements to the public realm included planting 10 new trees and the creation of playscape. All the units would be wheelchair accessible with 3 fully adapted for occupation.

A representative for the East Greenwich Residents Association (EGRA) and the Greenwich Society (GS) advised that both groups, as well as a number of local residents, were not consulted on the application. The Council made no response to residents' complaints made during the demolition of the existing site. The external appearance was not in keeping with the area; the properties would be small with inadequate levels of outdoor amenities and an

overshadowed play area, which would see a private application refused. Better quality housing should be expected for Council Housing and should have a greater life expectancy than 60 years.

The EGRA/GS representative responded to Members that a private applicant would be expected to undertake better and ongoing consultation. The style of the development should harmonise with the surrounding area not one development some distance from the application.

A Trustee for the William Hatcliffe & Missus Smith, owner, and operator of the Alms House to the north of the site, advised that they broadly supported the application but were concerned at the potential loss of sunlight to the Alms House. The information in the report was not clear and, despite requests, no CGI projections of the sunlight impact had been provided and it was difficult to know the true impact on the Alms House.

The Chair requested that the information was provided to the speaker.

The Planning Board accepted addresses from 3 local residents who raised the following –

- No objection to much needed social housing but it should be of a higher standard than proposed.
- For ecological reasons, the new build needs a longer life span not the same as, the now demolished, Sam Manners House.
- The proposal is too high and would result in overlooking to existing residents who will lose their amenity of privacy.
- It was too close to existing residents with intrusive balconies, creating overlooking and loss of sunlight.
- The proposal should be set further back and step down to lower floors to avoid domination over surrounding residents.
- The proposal was too dense, creating a threefold increase in population on the former site with a detrimental impact on new and existing residents as well as loss of peaceable habitation due to increased noise levels.
- The design was not responsive to surrounding street property styles.
- The internal courtyard areas and gardens of the development would have no direct sunlight.
- There should be more outdoor space for new and existing residents.

The Development Control Manager (Major Projects) advised that Greenwich Council, as the local Planning Authority, had undertaken statutory planning consultation, including sending consultation letters to surrounding properties,

press notice publication and displaying site notices. In respect of overshadowing of the Alms House gardens, there was a diagram presented in the daylight/sunlight report incorporating the area and concluded there would be an imperceptible change, retaining 98% of the daylight it currently received. She confirmed that this information was in the report.

Councillor Chris Lloyd addressed the Planning Board as a Ward Councillor, in support of the application, noting that the application was compliant with both planning policy and planning law. It would provide a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bed houses reflecting the need of the area. He noted that, in the pre-application stage, he and Councillor Kirby, as the then Cabinet Member held a number of meetings and maintained constantly open lines of communication with objectors. There would be no impact on the sunlight to the residents of Tuskar Street. He accepted that the design of the proposal was a matter of taste but felt it added to the differentiated architectural mix in East Greenwich.

A Member sought clarification in respect of the comment raised that the Council was not exercising consistency, in terms of amenity space provision, with private applications. The Development Control Manager (Major Projects), advised that each scheme must be considered on its own merits and the context of the scheme. The scheme was fully compliant with the London Plan. She noted that the Royal Borough of Greenwich Core Strategy aimed for 50sq metres of outdoor amenity space per family unit however, not every scheme would meet every policy aim and that it was acceptable to approve a scheme that did not.

The Planning Board accepted an address from the applicant who advised that the scheme would deliver 100% affordable social housing with the Royal Borough of Greenwich as the landlord. The units would be Carbon Neutral and constructed on a high quality build modular basis, which would also cause less disruption to existing residents than conventional construction methods.

The applicant's architect advised that the design proposal had been carefully considered and would incorporate design elements, materials and colour pallets to reflect the existing styles to the south of the site, in response to Tuskar Street, and the mixed housing typography to the north and west. During the two public consultations comments were made supporting the design approach and that it supported and improved the surrounding areas. In respect of density, the applicant's architect advised that during the pre-application process the number of proposed units was reduced during and the occupancy levels were reduced. The projecting balconies, along Tuskar Street and Woodland Grove, had been moved to overlook the inner

courtyard, removing any potential overlooking to the street. Detailed daylight and sunlight assessments showed all habitable spaces received adequate light, noting that there were two rooms which would be below level. The scheme was compliant with daylight and sunlight requirements with little impact of neighbouring properties.

The applicant's landscape architect advised that all the apartments would have private amenity via balconies or private gardens, which were in line with the size of existing Tuskar Street gardens. There would be a communal garden space in addition to onsite play space which, supported by nearby parks would adequately meet requirements. The Council's Arboreal Team agreed the removal of 6 trees which would be replaced by 10 new trees and additional greening along Woodland Grove and Tuskar Street frontages. There was an extensive green area to the east of the site, providing outdoor amenity for Woodland Grove, which access could be provided to for new residents by way of a new gate. In respect of street light levels, the existing light levels would be improved, particularly along the pedestrian path link to Trafalgar Road and Woodland Grove.

The applicant's agent summed up the proposal, advising that the scheme was developed through consultation with residents as well as the Council's Urban Design Team and Planning Design Officers. Two public consultations were undertaken and concerns at the scale and overlooking were addressed in a redesign. He drew attention to the Planning Officers recommendations, following intensive inspection and work, and that there would not be an unacceptable impact, through scale or design, on the amenity of surrounding properties.

The applicant's landscape architect responded to Members that the town houses would have a total of 27sqmtrs private amenity space split between ground level rear garden, to be viewed in tandem with adjoining secure community space and upper floor terrace. Whilst the standard of 50sgmtrs amenity space for every property on every development would be the ideal, each site needed to be considered in context and on its own merit. He noted that the potential use of the additional amenity space for Woodland Grove was not referenced in the planning application to avoid being disingenuous as the space was for the use of residents of Woodland Grove, however, due to land boundary co-ownership it would be possible to allow gated access.

The applicant's architect confirmed to Members that the density had been reduced during the design process and, as an inner city site, was suitable for the proposed density. The level of greenspace and playspace amenities was considered of a suitable level for the density proposed.

The applicant clarified that the insurance scheme assured a minimum life span of 60 years for the modular build system and it was anticipated to be viable far longer than that. The cladding would be slices of real brick and the thermal performance would be better than that of normal brick build.

The Members of the Planning Board considered the application before them.

A Member noted the public speakers held one view on the consultation process and whilst the applicant presented a differing view. Whilst the applicant may have made some adjustments, in response to public comments, had the desired outcome been achieved. They expressed discomfort at the comments as part of the strong residents' representations and the applicant's response.

A Member shared similar concerns on the consultation process. They felt that, even as a reduced scheme, it was a potential overdevelopment of the site located much closer to the pavement area than the previous development, which had been set back to reduce its overall impact. They noted that it may be appropriate for the applicant to reconsider the elevation and overall setting in the general street scene, without creating too much adverse effect.

A third Member expressed concern with the consultation process and, that whilst it may not be a planning consideration, felt that the engagement and consultation with residents had not been good enough. They questioned why the daylight information was not be presented to the trustees of the Alms House upon their request. They considered that the provision of entirely social housing was of positive importance.

A Member commented that that there may have been a level of confusion around the consultation process, in that the two rounds of consultation conducted by the applicant were different to the required statutory consultation undertaken by the Planning Department. They encouraged the applicant to explore the possibility of creating access to the amenity space by Woodland Grove.

Councillor Perks noted that if Members were minded to reject the proposal, she would prefer that consideration be given to undertake a sight visit first.

A Member understood the concerns raised by residents and speakers in objection, who outlined their concerns well. However, the scheme was broadly in line with that previously on site, not a new multi-story tower block. If the Board were to reject the application it would need strong

defensible grounds. However, given the constraints of planning grounds there was not a strong case for rejection of the Planning Officers recommendations to approve the application.

It was noted that a proposal had been made for a site visit however, Councillor Perks clarified that it was a comment not a proposal.

Councillor Adamas formally proposed that the Planning Board considered undertaking a site visit, which was seconded by Councillor Mardner.

On behalf of and at the request of the Chair the Clerk called the vote on the proposal for a deferral on the decision in order to undertake a site visit with 5 Members' in favour, 4 against and 0 abstentions.

Resolved -

A decision on this application was deferred to a future meeting of the Board in order to undertake a site visit in order to gain a better understanding of the proposed application in relation to its understanding.

6. Eltham Hill, School, 122 Eltham Hill, Eltham, London, SE9 5EE - Ref 202302F

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation of the application responding to the Board Members that it was conditioned that the land be returned to previous use at the end of the temporary use period. However, at the end of the five year temporary use period, the need for the continued use for classrooms could be assessed.

The applicant addressed the Planning Board advising that the application was submitted for a five year temporary use, upon the advice of Planning Officers, and they would work with the Council in respect of any longer term need at the end of the five year temporary use period.

The Planning Board moved straight to the vote and 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. No Member indicated that they had experienced any loss of connectivity.

The Planning Officers recommendation to approve the application was put to the vote with 9 Members' in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

Resolved unanimously -

That full planning permission be granted for the construction of a single storey modular block containing four classrooms. Subject to the Conditions set out in Appendix 2 of the published report.

7. Land bounded by Pettman Crescent, Nathan Way and Hadden Road, London, SE28 - Ref I94398O

Following the late submission of additional comments from TfL, the Members of the Board felt they needed more time to consider the matters raised and their implications for the scheme, as such it was agreed that a decision on both item 7 and 8 be deferred.

Resolved -

That a decision on the application be deferred to a future meeting of the Planning Board.

8. Land at corner of Hadden Road & Griffin Manor Way and adjacent to Western Way & HMP Thameside, London, SE28 0DE - Ref I94370F

Following the late submission of additional comments from TfL, the Members of the Board felt they needed more time to consider the matters raised and their implications for the scheme, as such it was agreed that a decision on both item 7 and 8 be deferred.

Resolved -

That a decision on the application be deferred to a future meeting of the Planning Board.

The meeting closed at 8.28pm

Chair