

ROYAL BOROUGH OF GREENWICH

PLANNING BOARD

1 DECEMBER 2020 AT 6.30PM

MINUTE

PRESENT:

Members:

Councillor Stephen Brain (Chair); Councillors Norman Adams (Items 1-6 & 8), Olu Babatola (Items 1-6 & 8), Denise Hyland, Mehboob Khan (Items 1-5), Clive Mardner, Maureen O'Mara, Linda Perks, Geoffrey Brighty and Nigel Fletcher (Items 1-6 & 8),

Officers:

Assistant Director Planning & Building Control, Planning Manager (Major Developments), Planning Officer, Senior Principal Planner's x2, Solicitor for Legal Services and Corporate Governance Officer's x2.

Under standing orders:

Councillor Chris Lloyd – Ward Councillor and Councillor Sarah Merrill – Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth

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.

Item

No.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received for Councillors Gary Dillon and Ian Hawking.

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 6 – Land bounded by Pettman Crescent, Nathan Way and Hadden Road, London, SE28 and public submissions, circulated in advance of the meeting, in relation to item 5, 6 and 8.

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 19 May 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

The Planning Board noted the public submissions, supplied in advance of the meeting and accepted an illustrative presentation from the Planning Officer.

The representative from the Greenwich Society addressed the Planning Board supporting the application in principle and welcoming the financial and environmental benefit of the modular build. However, concern remained at the dominant appearance over the 2 story Victorian houses to the north and south and that the pale grey brickwork would be unattractive. 8 family homes were proposed, and the Council should pursue more family sized homes.

The representative for the trustees of the Hatcliffe Alms Houses advised that concerns were still held at the impact of the sun and daylight to the communal north facing residents' garden. As two requests for information on this had not been responded to and in the absence of clear information, they maintained their objection.

The Planning Board accepted addresses from two residents, who, whilst supporting the principal of new Council housing, raised the following

- The grey brick would be unsightly.
- Too many dwellings were proposed resulting in overdevelopment and a high level of density.
- One unit would encroach onto a public footpath
- The applicant should redesign the application to one that was not an overdevelopment of the site and created no loss of light or privacy to neighbours.

- It is not an inner city or Urban area and the proposal was not fitting for an area bordering the World Heritage Site.
- Unacceptable loss of skyline and daylight, particularly to 38-44 Tusker Street. The report indicated, on balance, this was acceptable, but it is not acceptable to the affected residents.
- The Hatcliffe Arms house are part of vista, contrary to the report.
- The concerns and views of the directly impacted residents were not being taken into account and were not addressed in the officer's report.
- Other applications with insufficient amenity space had been refused and if approved the Board would not be acting consistently

In response to Members one of the speakers state an additional 8th town house would cross over a pavement, outside the boundary of the former Sam Manners House and would lead to a loss of light to the rear of the Hatcliffe Alms Houses'. At the request of Member', the Planning Officer displayed the illustration, showing the ground plan and confirmed that sufficient space was retained on the footpath.

Councillor Chris Lloyd, Ward Councillor, addressed the Planning Board in support of the application noting the mix of units reflected the need of people other than those with more than one child. The site was surrounded by mixed housing style, from Victorian to 2000's, and the architect had sought to use brickwork and colour palette that matched elements of its surroundings. He welcomed the 50 year building guarantee and urged that the application be approved.

The applicant advised that they did not wish to make a presentation but were in attendance to respond to Members questions, advising that

- It was not possible to get a perfect mix of housing size on all sites and the proposal formed part of the wider housing delivery programme across the borough.
- All the units are wheelchair accessible and could be fully adapted, if required. 10% were adapted for immediate habitation .
- The proposal was within the same boundary of the former Sam Manners House with plenty of pavement width in the location raised.
- Detailed consideration had gone into determining the material mix, with white brick on the upper level and grey brick on the ground to 1st floor. This reflected the white render used on numerous properties in Woodland Grove around Mell Street.

In considering the application before them a Members noted the proposal would see a reduction in impact on the skyline from the former Sam Manners

House which should also have a beneficial impact on the light to adjacent streets.

After considering the previous and current presentations a Member felt that they would have had more concerns if the proposal had been vastly different from what was previously on site. Whilst the build style was modern it appeared to be a quality design which was appropriate to the area with design aspects in keeping with the adjacent streets.

Two Members expressed that they had shared concern at any encroachment onto the pavement but having undertaken a site visit were satisfied that the entire development would be within the site boundary and sufficiently set back with small surrounding gardens.

A Member considered that the internal unit space was quite small but would be adequate.

A Member expressed concern that information had not been supplied to the Almshouse Trustees but was satisfied that the Officers report indicated that there would be no adverse loss of light and the proposal was an acceptable development.

A Member felt that the area was now very much an urban area and the proposal reflected the extensive range of housing stock and colour palette used in Woodland Crescent and Woodlands Grove.

The Board noted that the applicant had proposed installing a gate to the East of the development to allow access to play space and though not within the power of the Board to condition this, the Board encouraged the applicant to implement this proposal.

At the request of and on behalf of the chair the Clerk sought confirmation from all Members' that they had maintained zoom connection 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 grant planning permission, as set out in the report was put to the vote with 10 Members in favour 0 against and 0 abstentions.

Resolved unanimously-

That planning permission be granted for the redevelopment of the site comprising the construction of residential accommodation (Use Class C3) together with associated landscaping, playspace, refuse and cycle storage and the creation of one blue badge parking space on Tuskar Street.

Note: 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 scheme would provide 32 units, with a unit mix of 8 x 1-bed, 16 x 2-bed, 8 x 3-bed. The development would have a maximum height of 15m.

That consent be granted subject to:

- i. The conditions set out at Appendix 2 of the main report and addendums to be detailed in the notice of determination; and
- ii. the prior completion of a Directors' Agreement securing the heads of terms as set out in Section 24 of the main report.

That the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control be authorised to:

- a. make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in Appendix 2 of the main report and 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 Directors' Agreement, as set out in Section 24 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, Car Club Provision and CPZ Amendments the development is contrary to Policies 3.11 and 3.13 of the London Plan (adopted March 2016) and Policies H3, EA(c), 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 . Land bounded by Pettman Crescent, Nathan Way and Hadden Road, London, SE28 – Ref: 19/4398/O

The Planning Board noted the public submissions and Planning Addendum report, supplied in advance of the meeting and that this application was linked with and to be considered in conjunction with **Item 8 - Land at corner of Hadden Road & Griffin Manor Way and adjacent to Western Way & HMP Thameside, London, SE28 0DE – Ref 19.4370.F**. Members accepted a single illustrative presentation from the Senior Principal Planner, in respect of both applications.

A Member noted that the Board previously deferred the application due to the late submission of comments by TfL and felt the information presented appeared to indicate the recommendation of the applications was finely balanced.

The Assistant Director Planning and Building Control advised that schemes rarely complied 100% with all policies and requirements but the proposals were considered to present an opportunity for transformative growth to area. It would provide a 40% affordable housing at a 70/30 split and deliver a GLA Housing Zone Scheme. Officers considered that, on balance, the scheme would create greater positive benefits than negative and recommended the application for approval.

The Assistant Director Planning and Building Control advised Members that the scheme had been viability tested and would deliver 40% affordable housing up front via a growth model. If the nongrowth model was applied there would be 0% affordable housing on site provision offer.

The Senior Principal Planner responded to Members that the privacy film would be fitted to windows overlooking the prison and would not impede light into the units but would prohibit views to the prison and was supported by HMP Services. Of the 3 blocks along the boundary to prison, 2 would be formed of affordable rent units and the larger central block (*block 4*) would be mixed tenure, including private sales. A contribution of £1m towards bus service improvements had been agreed with TfL .

A representative for the Positive Plumstead Project, addressed the Board, broadly in support of the application but still held reservations relating to funding and the impact of the development on local infrastructure. Better access across the Ridgeway would be essential to the project to enable residents' access to the Plumstead and Woolwich train stations. The development would increase road traffic, both through construction and occupation and exacerbate issues at the Pettman Road gyratory with no financial contributions or proposals in place appear to mitigate this. The £5m

to support the design a strategy would enable the applicant to build on their own land and it was unclear how the £2.2m towards the power station would be used. It was felt that these monies could be better spent improving facilities for Plumstead residents now, as this development would put strain on existing strained roads, schools, nurseries and medical provisions particular at the Plumstead Public Realm money was insufficient.

The Planning Board accepted addresses from two local residents who expressed

- concern the 17 storey gateway tower would set a precedent leading to 20 and 25 storey blocks and an overdevelopment of the site,
- the gateway tower would overwhelm the adjacent 2 and 3 storey properties in Plumstead High Street.
- That it was vital that the Neolithic structures found next to the site which pre-date all other in the British Isles, should be properly monitored and the applicant should be conditioned to provide good access to finds for the local community and schools.
- There were no improvements proposed to the narrow entrance to Plumstead rail station which would require proper access to accommodate the increase in passenger use.
- There was no clear commitment to opening the Plumstead bus garages underpass.
- There was a lack of clarity as to how existing residents were supported by the application, in either the short or long term and concerns remained at the increased pressure to community and health services with little to no mitigation.

The Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth, Councillor Sarah Merrill addressed the Planning Board accepting there were issues to be resolved but considered this not to be a contentious application that, on balance, officers had recommended be consented. The development would bring public green spaces, affordable housing, commercial and industrial space and investment into the power station whilst supporting the Council's carbon Neutral strategy.

Planning Board Members sought to put a number of questions to Councillor Merrill who felt that, given the quasi-judicial nature of Planning Board it would be more appropriate for Planning Officers to respond.

The Assistant Director Planning and Building Control advised that funds would be available through the s106 agreement and CIL, to mitigate the impact of planning developments and it would be for the Council to allocate CIL funds in the Borough. She advised that CIL monies could be directed to

improve local provision, including through Neighbourhood CIL fund bids. There were a number of potential areas and sites for new primary schools in the wider Thamesmead area. TfL had requested a larger financial contribution but had agreed the £1m bus contribution. The development was also close to rail services and Crossrail and DLR in Woolwich, which were a short bus journey away. The GLA Opportunity Planning Framework strategy also set out the details for a bus rapid service and DLR Station extension to North Thamesmead.

The Planning Board accepted an address from the representatives for the applicant; Berkley Homes and Peabody trust who advised that Peabody was a significant landowner in West Thamesmead forming a partnership with Berkley Homes to bring forward the development focusing on regeneration, the environment and the local community. The development would deliver the objectives of the Abbey Wood & Thamesmead Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) and the GLA Housing Zone and form part of the Peabody Trust West Thamesmead Strategic Masterplan and Investment Strategy to deliver an Industrial Masterplan over the next 20 years.

The applicant's Architect stated the scheme would create a unique place making opportunity, forming a gateway to West Thamesmead on a brownfield site whilst creating sustainable connectivity to surrounding residential areas through improved pedestrian and cycle paths. The development would see a variety of building heights, as well a broad green streets and design aspect reflecting the Edwardian design of the local PowerStation and Plumstead Library.

The applicant's Landscape Architect advised high quality landscaping would be provided including a 2.7 acres park with play space to be delivered in the first phase, by 2025, in addition to private courtyards and amenity space. 250 new trees would be planted with an increase of 45% net biodiversity gain; Green roofs , green streets and innovative drainage systems.

The Divisional Managing Director for Berkley Homes felt that the proposal would be a catalyst of change to the West Thamesmead area offering exemplar place making, high quality homes with facilities for the whole community. If consent were granted, the proposal would secure a sustainable, carbon neutral development with significant investment and benefits to the Borough and local community.

In response to Members questions the applications team responded

- There would be only one tall building, being the 17 floor block marking the gateway to the site, close to Plumstead Station

- 28% of units, 1 bed and studio apartments, would be single aspect facing East or West with good light. 30% of units would be single aspect with bays.
- All core lift corridors would have natural daylight with the two longest corridors having additional lighting and 6 flats either side of the lift.
- The window film to be used in flats overlooking the prison, when looked through at one angle appeared transparent but from another angle appeared obscured, with virtually no impact on light.
- An estate management ensuring the public realm and estate management would be maintained in perpetuity was a key aspect of the scheme.

In considering the application a Member noted that both the Ministry of Justice and TfL were satisfied with the proposal which, being on a brownfield site, would not encroach on or overlook existing housing. The 40% up front affordable housing was welcomed and on balance supported the proposal.

A Member considered this was a complex application and welcomed the uses of Mansion Block's, which were suitable for a high density development. They shared residents concern at the height of gateway block accepting that the Board's decision could not be taken as setting a precedent and hoped it would not. They felt that the concerns around infrastructure provision, not just transport, had not been suitably addressed and the site may not be appropriate for such a significant development. Whilst the affordable housing level was welcomed, they considered that the overdevelopment, height of the gateway tower and the number of units within sufficient infrastructure support remained and they could not support the applications on this basis.

A Member expressed disappointed at the proportion of 3 bed and affordable housing to the entire scheme noting that as the viability process would result in no affordable units, this appeared to be the only option to bring forward affordable housing. They considered that the Council should look at bringing forward the funding of infrastructure provision for health services, schools and the Plumstead Station as soon as possible and, whilst holding a number of concerns, on balance were in favour of the development.

Three further Members expressed concerns at the impact on existing residents and existing infrastructure, particularly health and schooling provision with a Member noting that buildings alone did not create thriving communities and a proper and robust review of the required infrastructure provision was needed. One of these Members felt that they could not support the application due to the issues with infrastructure provision.

A Member note that appeared be no space for a school to be built in the future. They noted there was an existing tall building behind the Plumstead Train Station and had no problem with the proposed gateway block. Whilst supporting the application, they still held reservations regarding health and school provision though felt that the architect had created an appealing design for a difficult site.

A Member advised that the Health Authority was moving to the creation of larger health hubs and investment was being put into the Gallions Reach Health Centre rather than developing new local health centre. They shared concerns regarding schooling provision but felt that there were no strong grounds to refuse the application.

At the request of and on behalf 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 grant planning permission, as set out in the report was put to the vote with 5 Members in favour; 3 against and 0 abstentions.

Resolved -

That the part detailed application (with no matters reserved) be granted for development to the east of Pettman Crescent (Plots 2, 3, 4, 7 and 8) which comprise the demolition of structures, site clearance and groundworks; Erection of buildings to include residential and ancillary residential uses (Class C3); Flexible use floorspace for: a. retail (Class A1), café/restaurant (Class A3) and drinking establishment (Class A4) uses; and/or b. Offices (Class B1a)); and/or c. Non-residential institutions (Class D1) and community use (Class D2). New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and associated highway works; Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and service parking at surface and lower ground floor level; Provision of public open space, amenity and play space and landscaping; and Installation of plant and energy centres.

That the part outline application (all matters reserved except for access) be granted for works to Plots 1, 5, 6 and 9 which comprise: Erection of buildings to include residential uses (Class C3); Employment floorspace (Class B1c and/or Class B8) with associated communal and staff facilities; A primary substation; Flexible 'walk-to' use floorspace for: a. retail (Class A1) and café/restaurant (Class A3); and/or b. Non-residential institutions (Class D1).

Provision of onsite cycle, vehicle and service parking; Provision of public open space, amenity and play space and landscaping; and new pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and associated highway works.

That conditional planning consent be granted 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 main report (see section 26), addendums, and the minute of this Planning Board meeting.
- ii. 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;
- iii. 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.
- iv. A statement being placed on the statutory Register confirming the main reasons and consideration of which the Planning Board decision was based as required by Regulation 29 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017;
- v. Authorisation for the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to:
 - make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in Appendix 2 to the main report, its addendums and the minute of the Planning Board meeting, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice; and
 - 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 the main report, its addendums and the minute of the Planning Board meeting.
- vi. 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 nonfinancial contributions including for affordable housing, health infrastructure, transport and highway works, public transport enhancements, public realm improvements, employment and training,

delivery of the Plumstead Power Station project, environmental sustainability, open space and community facilities the development would contrary to policies H3, H5, H(e), EA4, EA(c), OSI, EI, CH(a), IM1, IM4, IM(a) and IM(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (Adopted July 2014) and the Planning Obligations (s106) Guidance SPD (adopted July 2015).

vii Conditions set out in Appendix 2 of the main report and addendum.

**7. Garages adjacent to 50 Strongbow Road, Eltham, London, SE9 1DT
- Ref: 20/2756/F**

The Planning Board accepted an illustrative presentation from the Senior Principal Planning Officer.

A representative from the Strongbow Tenants Action Group addressed the Planning Board noting that the parking assessment was undertaken at night rather than daytime and weekends. That Strongbow Road and Strongbow Crescent experience particular parking pressure due to their proximity to high street and Eltham train station. The CPZ that this sits in is large than adjacent ones and it was felt a specific zone for the immediate area around Eltham station was required. The proposal would go against the Council Strategy seeking the reduction in car use.

The applicant advised the Board they did not wish to make a presentation and responded to Members questions advising that there had been debate at the Planning Board Meeting in February as to why the proposal was car free given the number of family units and it was, subsequently considered that re-instatement of the footpath would provide 2 new car parking spaces within the CPZ which residents should be allowed to apply for.

The Assistant Director, Planning and Building Control advised that, from a planning perspective, any conditions imposed must be reasonable. The area does not suffer from car parking stress and it was considered there was capacity for on street parking, therefore it could be considered unreasonable to insist on conditioning the development be car free.

At the request of and on behalf 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 grant consent for minor material amendments, as set out in the report was put to the vote with 6 Members in favour; 0 against and 1 abstentions.

Resolved –

That consent be granted for minor material amendments' in connection with the planning permission 19/4289/F, dated 25/02/2020 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 to allow the removal of Condition 17 (Controlled parking zone permit restriction).

That conditional planning permission be granted subject to:

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

8. Land at corner of Hadden Road & Griffin Manor Way and adjacent to Western Way & HMP Thameside, London, SE28 0DE – Ref 19.4370.F

The Planning Board noted that this application was to be considered in conjunction with **Item 6 - Land bounded by Pettman Crescent, Nathan Way and Hadden Road, London, SE28 – Ref: 19/4398/O** and accepted a single illustrative presentation from the Senior Principal Planning Officer relating to both applications

At the request of and on behalf of the chair confirmation was sought 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 grant planning permission, as set out in the report was put to the vote with 6 Members in favour; 2 against and 0 abstentions.

Resolved –

Resolved to grant planning permission for the provision of a new vehicular access route into HMP Thameside from Western Way and associated highways and landscaping works.

That conditional planning permission be granted subject to:

- i. to the conditions set out in appendix 2 of the main report, addendums, and the minute of the Planning Board meeting.
 - ii. 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.
 - iii. A statement being placed on the statutory Register confirming the main reasons and consideration of which the Planning Board decision was based as required by Regulation 29 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017;
- (v) To authorise the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out at Appendix 2 of the main report, its addendums and the minute of the Planning Board meeting, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

The meeting closed at 10.10pm

Chair