

# ROYAL BOROUGH OF GREENWICH

## PLANNING BOARD

17 FEBRUARY 2020 AT 6.30PM

### MINUTES

#### **PRESENT:**

##### **Members:**

Councillor Sarah Merrill (Chair); Councillors Norman Adams, Linda Bird, Gary Dillon, Adel Khaireh, Clive Mardner, Linda Perks, Geoffrey Brighty and Nigel Fletcher

##### **Officers:**

Planning Manager (Major Developments), Senior Principal Planning Officer, Principal Planning Officer, Planning Officer, Counsel and Corporate Governance Officer

At the commencement of the meeting, the Chair announced the procedure which would be followed for considering the items before the Board. The Chair confirmed the names of members of the public who had registered to speak on the items and clarified that only those members of the public included on the register would be called to address the Planning Board. The Chair advised that all attendees were welcome to film, record, blog or tweet during the meeting so long as this did not disturb proceedings and flash photography was not permitted. The Chair advised that Board Members would be using electronic devices to access the agenda, reports and documents published and submitted for consideration at the meeting.

The Chair varied the order of business and took Items 8 and 9 after Item 6.

#### **Item No.**

##### **I. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received for Councillors Olu Babatola, Peter Brooks and Angela Cornforth

## **2. Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business for consideration.

## **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 minutes of the meeting of the Planning Board held on 17 December 2019 be agreed and signed as a true and accurate record.

## **5. Land at Junction with Burrage Road and Vincent Road, Woolwich, London. SE18**

The Principal Planning Officer gave an illustrated presentation, summarising the report and drawing the Members attention to an addendum report, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting.

In response to questions from the Board, the Principal Planning Officer explained how the play area would be accessed. He indicated how the blended rent was determined. It was explained that the building's height was justified because it was in a transition area on the boundary of the town centre; the proposal did relate in terms of bulk and scale to Plumcroft Primary School. He confirmed that it was a car free development, and there was a Controlled Parking Zone in Burrage Road; there would be provision for blue badge parking.

The Board was addressed by a representative of Speak Out Woolwich. The development overall was welcomed. It was felt though the design was bulky, dull and unimaginative.

The Board was addressed by a resident. Concerns were expressed with regard to the access to the play area, it was felt that by making one block the thoroughfare that block would become vulnerable to crime. It was queried if an agreement could not be reached with Plumcroft Primary School. It was questioned why there could not be a 'green wall' facing the school, and whether the units would get sufficient levels of light. It was felt that parking should have been provided on site.

The agent for the applicant addressed the Board. He stated that there had been extensive consultation with regard to the amenity space. To provide access through both blocks would mean loss of units. It was noted that design was subjective. They were not able to provide off-site play provision but they were making a contribution to such provision.

In response to questions from the Board, the architect for the applicant clarified that the thoroughfare through to the amenity area would not provide access to Block A itself, as there would be a security door. 20 homes would have access through the route. He confirmed that providing access through Block B as well would have meant the loss of a bed.

In response to questions from the Board, a representative of the applicant stated that there was to be no cladding, there would be grey brick<sup>1</sup>. There had been a dialogue with the School about accessing their play area, but it was for the planning authority to determine where the contribution to off-site play area went. The access through one block only had been agreed with Planning Officers. It was stated that a living 'green wall' would be very expensive and the proposal could not support it. He indicated that the rent would be a percentage of the market rent of the time. He said that the number of 3 bed units had been increased but that to do so further would not make the current proposal work financially.

The Assistant Director Regeneration addressed the Board. He indicated that the Council had set up Meridian Home Start to help tackle the borough's housing needs. He explained that what was sought was the cheapest family mix acceptable from a housing perspective.

---

<sup>1</sup> Subsequent to the meeting, it was established by Officers that the sixth storey element proposed is grey lightweight cladding panels.

In response to questions from the Board, the Assistant Director Regeneration commented that Meridian's constitution required its housing to have some level of rent.

The Planning Manager (Major Developments) advised that to increase the family units would require an increase in space. He stated that Planning Officers considered the mix acceptable, and that Housing Officers were happy with the proposal.

There was a discussion of the matter.

Members accepted the height and design of the proposal. Members questioned the affordable housing definition; it was felt that blended rent would not reduce the Council's housing waiting list. It was felt a living 'green wall' should be explored; as S106 could mitigate the worst affect of a development, could that not include the cost of such a wall. It was felt access to the School's play area should be considered.

The Planning Manager (Major Developments) advised that the applicant had considered a 'green wall', but it meant a maintenance cost to the tenants. The applicant had discussed access with the School, other opportunities had also been identified for play area contributions, and discussions were still ongoing.

Members requested that Members receive information in relation to living walls / green walls so that they could understand the issues of viability of such walls in future, and that the use of S106 be reviewed as it should be used to mitigate the worst effects in the immediate area of a development

**Action: DRES (Planning)**

The Chair put the matter to the vote, and with 8 votes in favour and 1 abstention it was

**Resolved -**

Resolved to grant planning permission for the construction of a part 3, part 4, part 5, and part 6 storey residential building accommodating 46 affordable homes (14 x 1 bed apartments, 21 x 2 bedroom apartments, 11 x 3 bed homes), incorporating secure refuse storage, and cycle

storage for 88 cycles, a substation, amenity space, and associated landscaping.

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 the report (see section 27.0), as amended by the addendum report, and the minutes of this Planning Board meeting.
- ii. 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 the report (Appendix 2), and addendum report 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.
- iii. That in the event that the Section 106 Agreement is not completed within three (3) months of the date of this Planning Board meeting, agreed 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, Child Play Space, Employment and Training, Environmental Sustainability, Public Realm Improvements and Highway Works the development is contrary to policies H3, H5, H(e), EI, IMI, IM(b), 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).

- iv. The conditions set out in Appendix 2 of the main report, with the additions and amendments as set out in section 3 of the Addendum report.

## **6. Garages to the rear of, 2 Southspring, Avery Hill, DA15 8DX**

The Planning Officer gave an illustrated presentation, summarising the report.

In response to questions for the Board, the Planning Officer clarified that as it was a back lane development the proposed flat roof though different in character from properties in the area was acceptable.

The Board was addressed by the resident of 40 Greenhithe Close. He raised an issue of right of access to his garage, which would no longer be possible if the development went ahead as proposed.

The Planning Officer stated it was their understanding that whilst there had been planning permission for an outbuilding the garage door was unauthorised, and that there was no evidence of right of way to it.

The resident of 40 Greenhithe Close disputed the matter, stating the proposal would build on his land, and that it was not a right of way issue.

Counsel advised the Board that if there were no right to access, and the proposal was granted, then the applicant could build to the boundary. If the application was misadvertised then the resident of 40 Greenhithe Close would have recourse to legal action.

Members considered that clarity was needed with regard to the access issue as it was a relevant amenity concern.

The Chair put the proposal to defer the item to the vote and it was unanimously

### **Resolved –**

That the item be deferred to seek clarification over the land boundary / right of access issue as that pertains to Policy DH(b) Protection of Amenity for Adjacent Occupiers

## **7. Garages rear of 45 To 73, The Underwood, Eltham, SE9 3EP**

The Planning Officer gave an illustrated presentation, summarising the report.

The Board was addressed by a resident of The Underwood. He expressed concerns that the proposal would lead to parking problems, extra traffic and noise. It was suggested that families might have more than one car.

In response to questions from the Board, the Planning Officer replied that no increase of on-street parking was envisaged based on the parking survey. No more parking could be added to the site. The site was not in a Controlled Parking Zone.

The architect for the applicant addressed the Board. He clarified that parking had been discussed with Highways Officers, and that 1 for 1 was the highest parking provision under the London Plan.

Members discussed the matter. It was felt that the provision of parking spaces addressed the parking issues.

The Chair put the matter to the vote and it was unanimously

### **Resolved -**

That planning permission be granted for the demolition of existing garages and construction of two storey terrace containing eight dwellings (7 x 2 bed + 1 x 3 bed wheelchair accessible) and associated landscaping, bin and cycle store, eight off street parking spaces and one blue badge parking space adjacent to The Underwood.

Subject to;

- i. The conditions in appendix 2, to be detailed in the notice of determination; and
- 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 the report, where the

Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

## **8. Garages Adjacent To 103, Strongbow Crescent, Eltham, SE9 IDW**

The Senior Principal Planning Officer gave an illustrated presentation, summarising the report

In response to questions from the Board, the Senior Principal Planning Officer replied that there had been no testing to see if emergency vehicles could enter the site, but there was sufficient access through Strongbow Crescent. He clarified the type of materials that would be used.

The Board was addressed by the representative of the Strongbow Tenants Action Group. He explained their objections were with regard to air quality, which due to the site's proximity to the A2 was felt to be unacceptable for family units, impact on parking, the properties would suffer from noise, and it was felt the design was out of keeping with the area.

In response to questions from the Chair, the representative of the Strongbow Tenants Action Group acknowledged that existing residents in that area had children but said the proximity to the A2 meant it was not suitable for any new families to move there.

The Board was addressed by a neighbouring resident of Strongbow Crescent. He said the site was subject to flash flooding, and there was inadequate drainage; he suggested approval be deferred until the problem was resolved. He said the development would impede access for pedestrians and cyclists. He felt that the rear boundary should be all brick and not have a timber part.

The Board was addressed by a resident of Strongbow Crescent. He commented on the design, which he felt looked like a shipping container. He queried why yellow stock brick, rather than grey brick, could not be used, he also queried whether the properties would be triple glazed, and whether the tree screening would be deciduous or coniferous.

The project manager for the applicant addressed the Board with regard to the comments that had been made. He said to deal with air quality mechanical ventilation was to be used. Parking had been determined on a standard survey of area. The properties would be triple glazed. Sustainable drainage would be put in. It was believed the site could be accessed by an ambulance but not a fire engine, but fire hoses would be able to reach. They were happy to have an all brick rear boundary wall.

In response to questions from the Board the project manager replied that the existing access for pedestrians and cyclists would not be changed.

In discussing the matter Members considered that the applicant had addressed the concerns that had been raised.

The Chair put the matter to the vote and it was unanimously

### **Resolved –**

That planning permission be granted for the demolition of existing garages and construction 2 x 2 bedroom dwellinghouses (Use Class C3) together with associated landscaping, amenity space, refuse and cycle stores

Subject to;

- i. The conditions in appendix 2, to be detailed in the notice of determination; and
- 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 the report, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

## **9. Garages adjacent to 50 Strongbow Road, Eltham, London, SE9 IDT**

The Senior Principal Planning Officer gave an illustrated presentation, summarising the report

The Board was addressed by a resident of Strongbow Crescent. He queried how the green roof would be maintained. He sought clarification as to the boundary treatment, and the parking. He indicated that the garage roofs were asbestos which did not seem to be considered.

The project manager for the applicant addressed the Board with regard to the comments that had been made. He stated that the green roof would be maintained by the Council. The boundary treatment would be the same as what currently existed. There would be no provision for parking. He confirmed that the applicant was aware of the asbestos and it would be dealt with.

The resident of Strongbow Crescent queried the on-street parking. The Planning Manager (Major Developments) and the Senior Principal Planning Officer explained that the reinstatement of the kerb would allow parking by two cars but only existing residents could apply for the parking, as it was in a Controlled Parking Zone, not new residents.

In discussing the matter Members considered the parking arrangements in relation to the new residents.

The Chair put the matter to the vote and with 6 votes in favour and 3 abstentions it was

### **Resolved -**

That planning permission be granted for the demolition of existing garages and construction of 2 x 3 bedroom dwellinghouses (Use Class C3) together with associated landscaping, amenity space, refuse and cycle stores.

Subject to;

- i. The conditions in appendix 2, to be detailed in the notice of determination; and ii.
- 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 the report, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice

NB. Councillor Brighty left the meeting after this item.

The meeting closed at 9.14pm

---

Chair