

# ROYAL BOROUGH OF GREENWICH

## PLANNING BOARD

7 APRIL 2021 AT 6.30PM

### MINUTE

#### PRESENT:

##### Members:

Councillor Stephen Brain (Chair); Councillors Olu Babatola, Gary Dillon, Denise Hyland, Clive Mardner, Geoffrey Brighty and Nigel Fletcher

##### Officers:

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

#### Under Standing Orders:

At the commencement of the meeting (conducted remotely) the Chair announced the procedure which the Meeting of the Board would follow for considering the items before the Board.

#### Item

#### No.

#### 1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received for Councillors Norman Adams and Ian Hawking.

#### 2. Urgent Business

The Planning Board noted and accepted the Planning Officer's Addendum Reports, circulated in advance of the meeting, in relation to;

Item 5 – Garages Sites adjacent to 29-31 and 33-35, Pendrell Street, London, SE18 2PH - Ref: 20/3996/F

Item 6 – Land adjacent to 41-47 Charles Grinling Walk, Woolwich, SE18 5BD – Ref:20/3997/F

Item 7 – Development Site at Former 3, Tunnel Avenue, Greenwich, SE10 – Ref: 20/3588/F

### **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. Minute**

#### **Resolved –**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Board held on 17 November 2020 be agreed and signed as a true and accurate record.

### **5. Garages Sites adjacent to 29-31 and 33-35, Pendrell Street, London, SE18 2PH - Ref: 20/3996/F**

The Planning Board Members' noted the Addendum report, which had been circulated in advance of the commencement of the meeting and accepted an illustrative presentation of the application from the Planning Officer.

In response to Members' questions the Planning Officer advised that, as the development was of less than 10 units, there was no requirement for the provision of a wheelchair adapted unit, however, all the units were wheelchair accessible. That the creation of a designated disability parking space could be considered, as and when required.

The Planning Board accepted an address from three local residents, who expressed that;

- The parking assessment had not taken into account the daytime pressures on parking due to 5 local community centres and a school, the users of which parked in Pendrell Street and other local streets.
- The access road to the cul-de-sac/garage area was narrow and works vehicles would have to drive on the grass verges.
- Many residents felt that removal of the grass verges would improve access to the site and create additional resident parking and be safer for pedestrians, as they became slippery when it rained.

In response to Members questions the speakers confirmed that whilst no formal canvassing of local residents had been undertaken, there were a number in favour of the proposal to remove the verges to create more parking.

The Chair noted that the removal of the grass verge was not something that the Board could condition, but requested that the applicant investigated this possibility further, with the Councils Highways Department.

The applicants Head of Housing Delivery concurred that, whilst the verges did not form part of the application, the proposal was a sensible one and the applicant would look into the possibility of removal and additional parking.

The Planning Board accepted an address from the applicant's agent who recapped the proposal advising that the site had been deemed as suitable for residential developments. The design addressed the comments made by the Councils' Planning and Design Officer, in order to provide a contemporary development which respected the neighbouring properties.

He continued that the pitched roof would be integrated to provide a useable top floor. The rear upper floors were set back, achieving a separation distance of around 19 metres reducing the potential of overlooking to other properties. A daylight and sunlight study showed there would be a negligible impact on the light received by neighbouring properties which would remain within acceptable levels.

The applicant's agent advised that, whilst bus routes and amenities were within walking distance the area had a low PTAL rating of 2 and the proposal included four new parking spaces associated with the dwellings and a minimum of two cycle spaces, in accordance with the London Plan. A sweep path analysis showed that emergency and other services would be able to turn within the hammerhead area. Further, an overnight parking stress survey demonstrated there was sufficient on street parking capacity to accommodate any displaced parking, as a result of the proposals,

He advised that sustainable and energy efficient construction methods would be used, and the homes would meet a high reduction in CO2 emissions by way of high thermal efficiency, heat pumps, photovoltaic roof panels for each dwelling, led lighting and water saving technologies.

In response to Members Questions the applicants Head of Housing Delivery advised that if the wheelchair accessible bungalow would be 30% larger, if constructed as a fully adapted unit and the site would not accommodate it. However, the internal doors would allow a wheelchair to pass through and the provision of switches set at waist height and a wet room could be considered. He confirmed that if the unit was occupied by a disabled resident, designated disabled parking provision would be considered.

He confirmed that car parking spaces provided would not be allocated to any specific property and accepted that the five-bedroom homes would attract larger families and, given the poor transport links, the applicant could look into the potential of additional parking on Pendle Street, though this would be outside of the application.

The Board expressed concern that unallocated parking, in front of the houses, could lead to disagreements with neighbours.

The applicant's Senior Project Manager noted that street parking in front of many houses was unallocated, and residents may have to park elsewhere. It was also considered inappropriate to allocate the four spaces to the three new homes specifically and to make them available to all residents, in line with other parking provision in the area.

Before moving to the vote Members made the following comments;

A Member requested if it was possible to add an Informative to require the bungalow be fitted with a wet room and waist height switches, prior to occupation. Further, they expressed concern at the lack of designated disabled parking associated to the adaptive bungalow and felt that it should not be a case of 'as and when'.

A Member appreciated the design, that it blended with the surroundings and saw the creative use of space to accommodate a five-bedroom house. They were disappointed that the properties would not have at least one allocated parking space to each dwelling, but welcomed the applicants offer to undertake discussions, with the Council Highways Department, to explore every possible option for increasing the parking capacity in the area.

With the consent of the Chair, the Assistant Director, Building and Planning Control, addressed the Board advising it would not be possible to add an Informative or Condition in relation of any additional parking, as it related to land outside the boundary of the application site. However, the request and applicants offer to look into this further would be captured in the minute which would be sufficient to enable further investigations to be undertaken.

A Member expressed support of the application providing much needed social housing, noting that many people were waiting for adaptations and the Board's comments were given with the best of intentions to help meet the demand for adapted accommodation which helped keep people in their homes for longer. They agreed with a previous Members comments in respect of the parking situation.

A Member felt that residents had put forward constructive proposal for addressing parking issues and, whilst not material to the application, were assured that the applicant would pursue the proposals. They felt it was a good scheme, appropriate to the location and welcomed the comments made, by another Member, regarding the fitting of a wet room, waist high switches and designated disabled parking bay.

At the request of and on behalf of the Chair, the Committee Officer 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 7 Members' in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

### **Resolved Unanimously –**

That planning permission be granted for the erection of two, three storey houses (2 x 5 bed) in a semi-detached pair and one bungalow (1 x 2 bed) with associated landscaping and parking (use class C3).

That Consent be granted subject to:

- (i) The Conditions set out in Appendix 2 of the main report and the addendum report.
- (ii) The authorisation of the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in this report and its addendums, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

## **6. Land adjacent to 41-47 Charles Grinling Walk, Woolwich, SE18 5BD – Ref:20/3997/F**

The Planning Board Members' noted the Addendum report, which had been circulated in advance of the commencement of the meeting and accepted an illustrative presentation of the application from the Planning Officer.

In response to Members' questions the Planning Officer confirmed that the proposal was located within a CPZ (Controlled parking Zone). Whilst new residents would normally be restricted from purchasing CPZ permits, the Highways Department had not requested such a condition be put on this application.

As there were no public speakers to this item, the Board moved to accept the applicant's presentation.

The applicant's agent gave the background to and re-iterated the application, advising that the site was occupied by unused garages, was overgrown and used for anti-social behaviour.

The design addressed the observations of the Council's Planning and Design Officers made at the pre application consultation stage. A modern architectural approach had been adopted, including window proportions, bay and dormer windows, door canopies and Juliet balconies. Two contrasting shades of brick reflected and complement the surrounding buildings. The mansard roof profile reduced the height, bulk and massing and a daylight and sunlight study demonstrated the proposal would have no impact on the receivable light to neighbouring properties.

He noted that the proposal was located in an area with good public transport accessibility, with local bus and train services and local facilities all within walking distance. The proposal would meet local planning requirements and the London Plan requirements to reduce CO2 emissions.

The applicant's Senior Project Manager clarified that no parking would be provided as part of the development.

The Committee moved straight to the vote and at the request of and on behalf of the Chair, the Committee Officer 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 7 Members' in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

### **Resolved unanimously -**

That planning permission be granted for the erection of two, three storey dwelling houses (Use Class C3) (2 x 5 bed) in a semi-detached pair with associated landscaping.

That consent be granted subject to:

- (i) The Conditions set out in Appendix 2 of the main report and the addendum report.
- (ii) The authorisation of the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the

recommended conditions as set out in this report and its addendums, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

**7. Development Site at Former 3, Tunnel Avenue, Greenwich, SE10 – Ref: 20/3588/F**

The Planning Board Members' noted the Officer addendum report, which had been circulated in advance of the commencement of the meeting and accepted an illustrative presentation of the application from the Planning Officer.

The Planning Officer responded to Members' that the proposal would fall below the internal space standards, as required for dwellings. However, the units' size was acceptable for the proposed C1 (*hotel, boarding or guest house or hostel*) use as short term lets, not exceeding 90 days, whereas student accommodation would rent out the rooms for a year. As the permitted development use as C1 was conditioned, any proposed change to residential accommodation would need planning consent.

The Planning Officer advised that the applicant would be putting in measures to ensure that the development was as Covid safe as possible, noting that such health & safety aspects were not a planning consideration. The applicant wished to avoid the property laying vacant, as prior to Covid-19, the proposed use was as student accommodation however, as domestic and foreign students were mainly remote learning at home, in line with Government guidance and they were seeking to maintain use of the building until it is practical to revert back to providing student accommodation.

The Planning Officer confirmed that if the applicant came back for further change of use or extension to the temporary consent, the application would need to be assessed, at that time, on its merits. Currently there is a great deal of uncertainty in the student accommodation sector and the Officers view was that the currently proposal before Members was acceptable.

The applicants Chartered Town Planner noted that consent had been granted in 2019 for the construction of a 61-bed purpose-built student accommodation block, which had been completed. The Covid-19 pandemic and related restrictions had resulted in no demand for the accommodation, as and whilst there was confidence that the student accommodation market would recover, there was uncertainty as to when this would be.

Further, the proposed temporary change of a use was sought with the intention to return the units back to use as student accommodation as soon as practical. In the meantime, in order to find a viable use for the building and to avoid it remaining vacant and maintain a business, the rooms would be let out on a daily or weekly basis, for a maximum of 90 consecutive days.

In response to a Members' question the applicants Chartered Town Planner confirmed that the same controls, to avoid anti-social-behaviour by residents would be in place as if the building was being used as student accommodation and in line with most hotels. He confirmed that a concierge desk would be in operation 24hours a day.

Before moving to the vote, a Member commented that they felt that it was a well explained, reasonable proposal. It was a pragmatic approach to have flexibility in the, currently, uncertain climate, and would be supporting the officer recommendation for approval.

At the request of and on behalf of the Chair, the Committee Officer 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 Officer's recommendation to approve the application was put to the vote with 7 Members' in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

### **Resolved unanimously –**

That temporary planning permission be granted for change of use for a period of no more than 2 years from student accommodation to 61 room serviced apartment block (Use Class C1).

That consent be granted subject to:

- (i) Conditions set out in Appendix 2 of the report and addendum report;
- (ii) 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 this report (Section 17), any addendums and the minutes of this Planning Board meeting;
- (iii) 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) and its addendums, 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 (Section 24) and its addendums.
- (iv) 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 the development as car free the development fails to mitigate its impact on local services, amenities and infrastructure contrary to policies H3, IM1 and EA(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).

The meeting closed at 08:10pm

---

Chair