

ROYAL BOROUGH OF GREENWICH

PLANNING BOARD

TUESDAY, 21 MAY 2024 AT 6.30 PM

MINUTES

Present:

Councillors Councillor Gary Dillon (Chair), Olu Babatola, David Gardner, Maisie Richards Cottell and Pat Greenwell

Under Standing Orders:

Councillor Rowshan Hannan – Ward Councillor
Councillor Dave Sullivan – Ward Councillor

Officers:

Assistant Director Planning and Building Control, Planning Manager (Major Developments), Planning Officers x2, Legal Advisor and Committee Services Officers.

At the commencement of the meeting, the Chair announced the procedure which would be followed for considering the item(s) before the Board and confirmed the names of those who had registered to speak, clarifying that only those included on the register would be called to address the Planning Board.

Item No.

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Majella Anning, Sandra Bauer, Peter Baker, Clare Burke-McDonald, and Danny Thorpe.

2 Urgent Business

The Planning Board accepted the Planning Officers' addendum report's, circulated in advance of the meeting, in relation to -

- Item 5 – Enderby Place, Telcon Way, Greenwich, London, SE10 0AG Ref: 23/3911/F
- Item 6 – Kidbrooke Village, Phase 5, Building A & B and South Cator Park, Kidbrooke, London, SE3 9YG - Ref: 23/3976/F

The Planning Board also accepted the applicant's submissions in respect of Items 5 and 6 and public submission to Item 6.

3 Declarations of Interest

Resolved -

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

4 Minute of previous meeting(s)

Resolved -

That the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Board held on the 5 March 2024, 19 March 2024 and 16 April 2024, be agreed upon and signed as a true and accurate record.

5 Enderby Place, Telcon Way, Greenwich, London, SE10 0AG - Ref: 23/3911/F

Planning Board Members noted the Applicants submission and Planning Officers addendum report, circulated in advance of the meeting. They accepted an illustrative presentation of the application from the Planning Officer.

The planning Officer confirmed the Strategy Objectives Document was yet to be adopted by the Council. The lower ground podium area addressed flood concerns and housed utilities. Whilst the Cruise Liner Terminal would not be built, the 35-floor tower was still considered to be in line with the tall elements of Morden Wharf, forming a cohesive a cluster.

The comments of the Urban Design and Conservation Officers were explained and it was accepted there would be a degree of harm to the Greenwich World Heritage Site (GWHS), which, on balance of the developments benefits, was considered acceptable. The Senior Principal Planning Officer Major Developments added there was no policy or guidance

on the cumulative impact of tall buildings on World Heritage Sites. The planning test was if a development would cause substantial or less than substantial harm, if less than substantial harm this had to be balanced against the benefits of the scheme.

The planning Officer confirmed Telcon Way was a private road. The Thames Clipper won't increase the PTAL level but bus improvements had the potential too. The applicant had agreed a financial contribution towards Public Transport and to improve cycle and pedestrian routes, across the site and to the Thames Riverbank.

In respect of overshadowing the Planning Officer set out the negligent impact on sun and daylight levels to adjacent properties. The Senior Principal Planning Officer Major Developments explained developments in the Borough had been approved with sunlight at similar levels of 48% with the lowest being 45.6%, on the Peninsula.

The Planning Officer confirmed the Education Team had expressed no concerns on school provision and funds had been secured from applicant towards improved active travel route. The pollution level along school routes could not be mitigated by the applicant alone and various routes and mitigations were being considered that would minimise pedestrians exposure to road pollution.

The Planning Board accepted an address from Councillor Rowshan Hannan, Ward Councillor, who read a statement from the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site Coordinator setting out their concerns at the cumulative effect of tall buildings on the Greenwich World Heritage Site (GWHS), the buffer zone and wider setting. The idea of building heights "stepping down" to mitigate the impact was being undermined by the proposal which would have visual prominence, creating a "table topping" effect with the Morden Wharf Tower.

Councillor Hannan expressed her concern that the cumulative impact could lead to the stripping of World Heritage Status, like Liverpool. Whilst there were positives to the proposal the tall block should be lower to reduce the impact on the GWHS and conservation areas. She noted taller buildings created greater levels of CO₂, due to mechanical ventilation, lifts, tumble dryers etc., contrary to the Councils carbon neutral objectives. The commercial units should not be used for 'last mile' delivery services.

In response to Members questions, Councillor Hannan felt that the applicant had not properly or fully considered the impact on the GWHS and Conservation areas.

The Planning Board accepted addresses from a resident and representatives for the East Greenwich Residents Association (EGRA) and the Greenwich Society, who speaking in objection raised that there would be only 12.5 metres separation distance between the new development and existing Morden Warf blocks.

EGRA set out they considered there was insufficient public health amenities to meet current demand. There were also insufficient public transport and TfL had criticized the delivery and service plan. As a car free development there would be issues with deliveries and visitors parking and people attending concerts at the O2 already created gridlocked. There was no road crossings between the site and North Greenwich transport hub.

That the lack solar panels and other carbon neutral innovations did not support the Councils Carbon Net 0 policy and residents would have to use pumped water, mechanical ventilation, and tumble dryers. The rubbish disposal and recycle facilities were unambitious and not future proof. That the 36-floor Morden Wharf tall building was to be the exception. The proposed 35-floor tower block would negatively affect the existing tenant's amenities of daylight and overlooking and would overshadow the public amenity of the Thames path. That it was not integral to the scheme which would not fail if the height was reduced with the units distributed over the entire development.

Extreme concern was expressed at the damage by the 35-floor tower as it would be the closest building to the Greenwich World Heritage Site and would be extremely intrusive on views from the General Wolf statue in Greenwich Park and Greenwich Town Centre. It would also be intrusive to the East Greenwich community and conservation area, dwarfing the late Victorian and early Edwardian houses. It was questioned if the applicant had consulted the United Nations body responsible for World Heritage Sites, noting the removal of WHS status on similar grounds at other locations.

Speakers considered that, a high-density development with such a negative impact on the Councils Heritage assets and neighbours' amenities needed to provide a greater substantial benefit for the local community than proposed.

In response to Members Questions the resident advised that there should be a minimum of 18 metres between the existing and new blocks, not 12.5 metres. The Planning Officer clarified that the separation distance would be 16 Metres.

The Planning Board accepted addresses from a representative for the Alcatel Submarine Networks manufacturing site adjacent to the proposed development site which also owned, the private road Telcon Way, which was the only access route to the proposed development site.

They questioned if the utilities provision's, such as water, electricity, and sewage would be capable to cope with the additional loading and flood conditions. Potential power interruptions to Alcatel during the installation of water, electricity, and sewerage services along Telcon Way, would be unacceptable.

The use of Telcon Way, during construction could cause significant disruption to business activities which required unimpeded 24-hour access for deliveries and employees and result in increased traffic and damage to the road surface which would need to be paid for by the developers.

There was concern whether Telcon Way and the junction would be able to safely cope with the large volume of new pedestrians, particularly given the lack of parking provision for residents' visitors and deliveries. There was insufficient public transport to the area and Telcon Way could not be treated as a de facto parking area for residents and their visitors. This would also increase security risks and cost for Alcatel in managing parking restrictions along Telcon Way.

The 35-storey tower, twice the height of buildings adjacent to the Alcatel site, would create shadowing and impact opportunities for the implementation of energy saving, solar projects on the Alcatel site.

In response to Members questions, the Alcatel representative advised that they were unable to say if or when Alcatel was consulted on the development. There were over 500 employees accessing the site daily, and immense disruption was recently caused by Thames Water digging up the road. Telcon Way would be the main and only access to the proposed development.

24-hour security patrols were already undertaken and they had seen a rise in disruption and levels of crime. They were engaged in discussion regarding

solar projects covering the second storey roof space and, potentially, the car parking space, in order to move decarbonization and attaining Net Zero Carbon.

A Member noted the path of the sun, in relation to the location of the Alcatel site and there was unlikely to be any light shadow from Morden or Enderby until late in the evening. Further, that there were solar panels that were effective in daylight and did not require direct sunlight.

It was noted that Alcatel originally owned the site and questioned what form or use Alcatel anticipated seeing it being used for when sold. The Alcatel representative advised that they had not been involved in this and were unable to provide an answer.

The Planning Board accepted an address from the applicant's Head of Planning and Designer, who advised they had listened to the stakeholders and considered the neighbouring relationships. The development met the council 35% affordable housing requirement and 65% of the site would be public space, including play areas and communities benefit such as the café space and the riverside garden public space along the river front. A financial contribution in excess of £7m was being provided for improvements to Public Transport, healthcare, education, and the public realm.

The applicants Agent addressed some of the points raised by speakers and Members advising the reason for the higher river frontage (compared to the extant consent), was to address changes in flood defence requirements. The maisonettes were all family sized and part of the low-cost rent tenure mix, noting that 77% of the overall development would be four person units.

There may be some slight overshadowing of the Thames Path first thing in the morning only noting that the BREAM guidance on day and sunlight impact was designed for use of two storey housing situations, whereas the development was in an urban location, identified for tall buildings.

A financial commitment would be made to TFL towards improved services in the area and for improved pedestrian routes between the site and the schools. A range of play spaces for children in of all ages would be integrated within the development and the commercial aspect could not be used as last mile business as this was a different use class than that being applied for. A Construction Management Plan was conditioned and would address any potential impacts on Telcon Way.

They set out that there was no expectation of a reduction in height of the 36-floor Morden Wharf tower. The site was 1.5 kilometres from the General Wolf Statue and the World Heritage Site Executive and Historic England had raised no concerns that a tipping point was being reached. The extant scheme allowed for three tall towers which would have impacted the GWHS views.

The site had had been identified for redevelopment and fell within the Greenwich Peninsula opportunity area. The development would have two clusters of massing with a gap through the middle of the site. The Council, GLA, public, and other stakeholders had been consulted on the proposal.

The applicant's Agent considered the development provided high quality, energy efficient homes across a variety of sizes, and tenures with public realm improvements, including a new community café scheme and allotments. A range of environmental improvements included reduction in carbon, tree planting with a 31% biodiversity net gain and substantial S106 and CIL financial contributions towards the delivery of local infrastructure.

In response to Members questions, the applicant team, including Heritage Consultant stated the development was policy compliant with national policy offering 35% affordable housing of which only 14 x 1-beds would form part off. Each block would have its own waste storage/recycle bins the in the basement podium, in line with common practice.

Each floor of the 25 -story block was a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bed units and it would not be easy to remove floors to reduce the overall height. The requirement for the 35-floor block be lower than the Morden Wharf block, which may have been a landmark for the Cruise Liner Terminal, when proposed 9 years ago, however, the GLA now required the maximization of density of urban sites. It was noted that planning regulations required each application be judged on its own merits

It was felt the effects on the GWHS were subjective, noting the UNESCO World Heritage authority and Heritage England had deferred consideration of the proposal to the Councils Planning Officers, who had identified that there was less than substantial harm and the benefits would outweigh the harm. If the GWHS was close to a tipping point it was felt that they would have directly objected.

Consideration had yet to be given to marketing, but there was no intention to target international sales and they would be looking to promote a

functioning community. That there were a number of positives to the proposal including it being car free, the financial contribution toward Public Transport improvements, public green spaces, play facilities for up to 18 year old's and improvements to the Thames path

In consideration of the application before them a Member took a different view from Officers in respect of the impact of the development on the GWHS, Conservation assets and the benefit balance. They expressed concerned at the 35-story tower being so close to the GWHS, noting the Councils Core Policy DH2 (Tall Buildings) and DH3 (Heritage Assets) and felt it would be visually intrusive and have an adverse impact. The one floor step down from Morden Wharf would be unnoticeable. The low Public Transport PTAL level did not support a development of this scale and they would not support the application and hoped that the applicant would work with the World Heritage Officer to lessen the intrusion.

A Member accepted the need for housing but felt the mix of unit sizes was not right, with too many 1-bed units. They felt that the impact of a 35-storey block close to the GWHS and would have a high impact and would not be supporting the application.

A Member accepted that the height of the tallest element was of concern but felt that, in considering the impact on residents requiring housing, that the balance was in favour of supporting the application.

A Member expressed that the prior justification for a tall tower as landmark to the planned Cruise Liner Terminal, no longer applied and on balance of the impact of the density on public transport, Telcon Way along with the intrusion on the GWHS and East Greenwich Conservation area, the balance was not in favour of the development and they would not be supporting the application.

The Chair noted that Members main objections related to the height of the tallest building with two Members confirming their main concerns were the impact on the GWHS and Conservation Areas and it was suggested that the applicant revisited the proposed height of the tallest element and sought the applicant and agent's thought on such a proposal before he moved to the vote.

The applicant and agent noted the work undertaken to achieve the proposal before the Board but it may be possible to look at re-distribution of units to lower the tallest element by two floors.

The Chair put the proposal to defer the matter in order to allow the applicant the opportunity to revisit the height of the tallest tower to the vote with

5 Members in favour

0 Members against

0 Members abstaining

Resolved

- That determination of the application be deferred in order to allow the applicant to address concerns raised in respect of the height of the tallest element of the proposal.

The Board adjourned at 8.55pm, reconvening at 9.04pm.

6 Kidbrooke Village, Phase 5, Building A & B and South Cator Park, Kidbrooke, London, SE3 9YG - Ref: 23/3976/F

Planning Board Members noted a public submission and that of the applicant and an addendum report was produced by Planning Officers which were circulated in advance of the meeting. They accepted an illustrative presentation of the application from the Planning Officer.

The planning Officer confirmed the onsite trees had been assessed by and an arborist, were of mixed variety and quality, which the Council's Tree Officer was aware of. The replacement trees would be semi mature and any which died within 5 years would be replaced. Further, it was confirmed that where the residential units were proposed, was not designated Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and the principle of development in this location had been established by the existing permission. The developer had also agreed to make a financial payment in line with that requested by the NHS. Any further road or cycle path improvements would be captured by the s106 agreement.

Planning Board accepted an address from 2 residents who, speaking in objection to the proposal raised that the felling of 86 mature trees did not support a healthy air quality or the Councils' climate change objectives. That the buildings should be moved back in order to save all the trees.

The objectors also felt that the Kidbrooke Village development was overdeveloped and had seen an increase of 30%, on the approved plans. There was insufficient infrastructure and amenities, such as Doctors surgery's, schools, etc., to support a further 10,000 people in a relatively small area. Train services from Kidbrooke Station to central London had

been reduced. Alton Road was full of parked cars and congested, by parents taking children to the only primary school, rated high level, in the area.

That the design style was different to the existing development and needed to look more organic and be of a lower height. Consent would make it difficult for the Planning Board to refuse amendments to the plan for the Blackheath Quarter. The affordable housing offer would not be truly affordable to residents of the Borough on an average income.

In response to questions from Members, the speakers stated there was at least one Oak tree on site and several of the trees were substantially mature trees. Whilst there were other schools in the area, they needed uplifting.

Planning Board accepted an address from two representatives from Thomas Tallis School who read a letter from the parent of a child at the school, which raised concerns that the felling of mature trees would add to emissions posing a health for children. Students felt the area should be retained as common land and not be developed.

They said that Berkeley Homes had not contacted Thomas Tallis school about the development. The new trees would not be a satisfactory exchange, for established trees capable of surviving dry weather. They felt the removal of green spaces contradicted the London Plan and the Councils' Greener Greenwich Strategy and no replacement was proposed for loss of wildlife habitats.

The poor public transport, including overcrowded busses was leaving children struggling to get on them, in the morning and road safety accidents had affected the children.

In response to Members questions the two speakers confirmed that they were teachers and one was the Community Gardner at Thomas Tallis School, and the Head Teacher had approved their attendance. They were only made aware of the proposal on the preceding Wednesday. That there were several play spaces on Kidbrooke Village and the development area should be a communal area, as an extension of the park, open to all children. Thomas Tallis ran arboriculture and horticultural courses for pupils, using the Cator area, as well as the Wetland park.

Planning Board accepted an address from Ward Councillor David Sullivan, who supported the application, noting the small number of objectors speaking on the application and that the area was identified for development as part of

the 2006 Master Plan. That investigation work, with the GLA, was ongoing to mitigate traffic issues and improving cyclists and pedestrians safety.

Councillor Sullivan noted that the trees had been left neglected for 50 years and had been assessed by the Council's Tree Officer and he was not aware of any Oak trees in the area. He noted that the trees could have been removed anytime in the past 12-15 years as part of the existing permissions.

Planning Board accepted an address from the applicant's representative who addressed the points raised, advising 9,000 consultation letters were distributed by the developer and having checked could confirm Thomas Tallis was within this consultation area.

The trees to be felled had been graded as of poor or ailing condition and the one Oak Tree in the area was not on the site of the proposal. one Oak Tree in the area was not on the site of the proposed dwellings. Where possible the removed trees would be repurposed as natural furniture, border trails, street pathways, general wildlife habitats and allowing some to rot in in the parkland environment. A mix of round 260 semi-mature native species trees would be planted, each around six to eight metres minimum height. in enriched soil and covered by a five-year protected loss program, by conditon. Further, they noted that re-planted immature trees had a longer life expectancy than re-planted mature trees. The effectiveness of the tree canopy and the crown cover had also been evaluated by specialists and, whilst it will take time, the crown cover would exceed that currently existing.

Green streets would be created forming a buffer for pedestrians and residents facing onto the road from the road. In addition to street greening the proposed podium gardens, green roofs, and enhancements to the park, including shrub areas and ponds, would provide a quality range of biodiversity gains. The applicant already had a close working relationships with the Friends of the Park and London Wildlife Trust and would be happy to develop similar relationships with Thomas Tallis.

It was noted the proposal was on the area identified by extant planning consent, and it was not possible to relocate the buildings further East as it would then sit on MOL.

The proposal would maintain 35% affordable housing across the masterplan and the split of the proposed uplift affordable housing would be 70%/30% affordable and shared ownership. Some windows would be orientated to support privacy and some homes close to ground level would be slightly

elevated to give a greater sense of security. Grey water storage was discussed at it was confirmed that the proposal features two SuDs which would allow rainwater to permeate. The applicant noted that the situation with Kidbrooke Park Road was outside of the applicants' control due to this being a TfL road.

Members moved to consider the application and it was noted that the area was always designated for development and extant planning consent existed for the site and this application increased the affordable housing.

The mitigation's proposed, particularly on transport and move to car free, balanced the development in favour of support. The amount and the quality of green space would be better than when it formed part of the previous Ferrier Estate. The applicants commitment to work with Thomas Tallis School was welcomed and it was requested that any trees that could be saved, were.

The Chair put the recommendation to grant planning consent to the vote with

5 Members in favour

0 Members against

0 Members abstaining

Resolved unanimously

- That full planning permission be granted for the erection of residential units, publicly accessible open space and associated access, car parking, cycle parking and landscaping, erection of a new pavilion building within the park.
- That consent subject to:
 - (i) 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;
 - (ii) The satisfactory completion of a Section 106 (S106) Legal Agreement (obligations set out in Section 23 of the main report); and
 - (iii) Conditions set out in Appendix 2 of the main report and the addendum.
- That the Assistant Director, Planning & Building Control, be authorised to:
 - (i) Make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in Appendix 2 of the main report and the addendum and the minutes of the Planning Board meeting,

where the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) considers it appropriate, before issuing the final decision notice

- (ii) Finalise the detailed terms of the section 106 agreement (including appended documents) and form of the planning obligations as set out in Section 23 of the main report and the addendum and the minutes of this Planning Board meeting

- (iii) Consider, in the event that the Section 106 Agreement is not completed within three (3) months of the date of this Planning Board resolution, whether consent 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 recommended planning obligations; 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 a legal agreement to secure the necessary obligations regarding Affordable Housing, Wheel Chair units, Transportation, Healthcare, Telecommunication and radio signals, Play space, Employment and Training, and Sustainability, the development would fail to mitigate its impact on local housing supply, amenities and infrastructure, environmental sustainability and open space contrary to policies H1, H4, H5, H6, SI 2, SI 5, and S4 of the London Plan (2021) and H3, H5, H(e), and EI of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (Adopted July 2014), and the Planning Obligations (s106) Guidance SPD (July 2015).

The meeting closed at 10.28 pm

Chair