

<b>Planning Board</b>	<b>Agenda Item: 4</b>
<b>19 January 2021</b>	<b>Reference No: 20/2323/F</b>

**Applicant:** Greenwich Builds  
**Agent:** DP9 Ltd

<b>Site Address:</b> Land adjoining Halsbrook Road / Highbrook Road / Rochester Way, Kidbrooke, SE3	<b>Ward:</b> Kidbrooke with Hornfair <b>Application Type:</b> Full Planning Permission
--	--

### **Third Addendum**

#### **1.0 Introduction**

1.1 This third addendum report (“the third addendum”) should be read in conjunction with the main report dated 15th December 2020 (“the main report”), the first addendum report dated 15th December 2020 (“the first addendum”), the second addendum report dated 15th December 2020 (“the second addendum”) and the following appendices published in conjunction with the main report:

- Appendix 1 – Drawing numbers
- Appendix 2 – Conditions and Informatives
- Appendix 3 – National, regional, and local planning policies and Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents.

1.2 This addendum provides further clarification on matters relating to the proposed crossing on Rochester Way, highways matters and alternative plans submitted by local residents.

#### **2.0 Highways and proposed pedestrian crossing on Rochester Way**

2.1 £72,000 would be secured for a pedestrian crossing as shown in the below figure. A crossing will be selected based upon modelling traffic in the area which will be carried out by the Royal Borough of Greenwich’s highways team. When completed an appropriate crossing will be selected based upon the evidenced findings. The funding secured is sufficient for a range of crossing types.

2.2 Modelling so far indicates that traffic flows are low and there is not an increased danger to pedestrians. 3 informal crossings and a speed camera are also located within the application site on Rochester Way which has the impact of slowing traffic.



**Figure 1 Existing and proposed crossing on Rochester Way**

2.3 Officers are therefore satisfied that the most appropriate crossing in this location will be selected based upon further modelling and that pedestrians are not an increased risk from traffic in this area.

### **3.0 Alternative Plans**

3.1 Local residents have produced alternative plans for the application site which at the request of members at the planning board held on 15/12/2020 officers have assessed in the below section.

3.2 These plans have not been formally submitted by the applicant for determination by the Local Planning Authority and should not be considered as amendments to the current application. Members are asked to consider the scheme detailed in the main report and not the alternative plans submitted by local residents.

#### Halsbrook Road

3.3 The resident's proposal includes increased car parking on the northern elevation and a long blank frontage to the west addressing Halsbrook Road. This would be detrimental to the intent of creating a pedestrian-friendly link across the neighbourhood by reducing the width of the pavement and introducing more vehicles. The proposal would also fail to replicate the

existing street pattern by creating large areas of blank frontage and increased set back from Highbrook Road.

- 3.4 The residents' alternative proposal also includes a terrace of 3b6p houses with rear gardens backing onto Rochester Way. This would read as a sequence of rear-gardens walls, creating an incongruous frontage on Rochester Way, with a rather low level of perceived security for those overexposed rear-gardens. It would fail in the task of enhancing Rochester Way as the appealing boulevard of the neighbourhood.
- 3.5 The current proposal also creates a more inviting access to the pedestrian path across the Halsbrook site. The house with pitched roof would act as a gentle marker and create an active frontage, where the residents' approach would result into a less legible, engaging and activated access.
- 3.6 The impact on the properties on Annesmere Gardens as part of the current scheme is considered to be acceptable and so there is no benefit to increasing the separation distance whilst bringing the flank elevations of the 3b6p houses closer to the front elevations of the 2b4p houses which would increase sense of enclosure for these properties.
- 3.7 The inclusion of an additional amenity space results in the loss of 3 family sized social units. Given that 4626sqm of playspace is proposed as part of the current application this would not be an acceptable loss.
- 3.8 In terms of highways, it is possible that itinerant parking could occur in Halsbrook Road partially on the new footway adjacent the site. This in turn would reduce the carriageway space defeating the object of the revised option and result in an obstruction to pedestrians.
- 3.9 Bournbrook Road
- 3.10 The residents' alternative layout is strongly discouraged in design terms.
- 3.11 The residents' proposal would design the car parking at the prominent centre of the site, creating a fracture between the designed houses and the green open space at their front.
- 3.12 The access and U-turn lane to the car-parking bays would take additional space away from that central green open-space. The car-parking would have a negative impact on the spatial quality and perceived safety of the pedestrian pathways and cycle lane across and along the site.

- 3.13 Highways officers have also stated that given that Highbrook Road and Bournbrook Road are currently traffic calmed and there is a 90 degree bend at the proposed site, vehicle speed is not expected to be high. The highway network is not known to have a safety issue.
- 3.14 A new access on to Rochester Way is not supported as a suitable alternative can be made to the network via lesser road in the hierarchy. The access would interrupt the existing cycle lane on Rochester Way and in addition the access would join Rochester Way near the right turn pocket into Briset Road.

#### Ridgebrook Road

- 3.15 The residents' alternative layout is not considered as an improvement when compared to the submitted scheme.
- 3.16 The repositioned green open-space is discouraged. It would create an over-dominating and repetitive terrace of 21 dwellings on Rochester Way, compromising the balanced rhythm of alternated open-spaces, terraces and markers designed in the submitted scheme.
- 3.17 The narrow pathway between the terraces would read as an unwelcoming and unsafe route approaching from Rochester Way, surrounded by passive flanks and garden walls on its northern part.
- 3.18 The repositioned green open space to the west would receive less passive surveillance and read as an unsafe and unappealing space. It would be lined by car parking on both its southern and western side, buildings' flanks to the east and Rochester Way to the north. It would likely read as a pedestrian access to the car-parking and a space for anti-social behaviour.
- 3.19 The accesses to car-parking from Rochester Way were investigated at the outset of the design process and considered unpractical, mainly due to the differences in level across the site and cutting across the existing cycle route.
- 3.20 The alternative proposal creates additional vehicular access points on to Rochester Way. From a road safety point of view it is always preferable to create such connections to roads that are the lowest in network hierarchy.
- 3.21 It is noted there is a level difference between Rochester Way and Ridgebrook Road and if access were to be from Rochester Way it would likely create a steep ramp to the parking area. The length of the ramp would

therefore need to be extended but would reduce the number of car parking spaces within the podium as a result of the length increase. This could result in increased parking demand on street.

- 3.22 The alternative access proposal to access the podium from Rochester Way could affect an existing mature tree along Rochester Way. Direct access from Rochester Way is therefore not supported.

#### Conclusion on alternative plans

- 3.23 The alternative plans are not considered to be an improvement to the current application and would result in less affordable housing, compromised play spaces and unwelcoming, poorly overlooked pedestrian environments. In townscape terms long monotonous terraces are proposed, together with a layout which significantly departs from the character of the area.
- 3.24 The alternative proposal also results in increased vehicular conflict with the cycle lane on Rochester Way with a strong likelihood for the removal of several mature trees on Rochester Way.
- 3.25 Officers are satisfied that the scheme assessed in the main report maximises affordable housing and playspace and is of a high quality design which would complement the existing townscape.

## **4.0 Conclusion**

- 4.1 The proposal is considered acceptable and consideration on all other elements in the main report and addendums remain unchanged.
- 4.2 Accordingly, it is recommended that permission is granted for application reference 20/2323/F in line with Section I of the Main Report.

Report Author: Hoa Vong  
Senior Principal Planning Officer (Major Developments)  
Tel No. 020 8942 2620  
Email: [hoa.vong@royalgreenwich.gov.uk](mailto:hoa.vong@royalgreenwich.gov.uk)

Reporting to: Victoria Geoghegan  
Assistant Director Planning and Building Control  
Directorate of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills  
Tel No. 020 8921 4296  
Email: [victoria.geoghegan@royalgreenwich.gov.uk](mailto:victoria.geoghegan@royalgreenwich.gov.uk)