

ROYAL BOROUGH OF GREENWICH

PLANNING BOARD

19 MARCH 2024 AT 6.30PM

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Members:

Councillor Gary Dillon (Chair); Councillors Majella Anning, Sandra Bauer, Clare Burke-McDonald, David Gardner, and Pat Greenwell

Officers:

Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control, Senior Principal Planning Officer Major Developments, Planning Officer's x 2, Legal Advisor and Committee Services Officer.

Also in Attendance –

Clare Jones - Council's independent viability consultant from BPS Surveyors.

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 Olu Babalola, Peter Baker, Maisie Richards Cottell, and Danny Thorpe.

2. Urgent Business

The Planning Board accepted the Planning Officers' Addendum Report, circulated in advance of the meeting, in relation to -
Item 6 - 10 Orangery Lane, Eltham, London, SE9 1HN – Ref: 22/2202/F

Item's 7&8 Combined - Land bounded by Nathan Way, Pettman Crescent and Hadden Road, and intersected by Western Way, London SE28 – Ref: 23/3851/NM and Ref: 23/3862/R

The Planning Board also accepted independent submissions in respect of Items 4 and 6, and applicants submission in respect of Item 6.

The Chair advised that he was amending the running order of the Agenda, taking the combined Items 7 and 8 first, followed by items 4, 5 and 6 in that order.

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. Land including the former Community Building at Richmount Gardens, London SE3 9AE – Ref: 23/0890/F

Planning Board noted the public submissions in relation to this application and accepted an illustrative presentation from the Senior Principal Planning Officer Major Developments.

In response to Members questions the Senior Principal Planning Officer Major Developments confirmed the community centre was closed and had not been in use for some years. A shared community hub had been established nearby in Kidbrooke with 6 community rooms available for hire. No nursery provision was being displaced and two nearby nurseries had spaces with no waiting list. The Early Years Team no objection or concern re nursery provision in the area.

She advised the two trees to be removed were not covered by tree protection orders; two large trees would be retained and protected during construction; 655 m² of open space would be retained and the road would be retained as two-way traffic. The ridge height of the new build was to accommodate solar panels.

Planning Board accepted addresses from 7 residents and the representative of the Blackheath Society, speaking in objection.

In generally they confirmed they had no objection to the principal of the development of affordable housing, but felt the proposal remained inappropriate for the site.

A number of speakers noted the Cul-De-Sac was of post war design specific to reflect a community around a village green which, uniquely had a community centre containing valuable artwork. That the Planning and Council Policies supporting the housing proposal were in conflict with the Council's responsibility to protect and preserve the special characteristics of the Conservation Area and removal of the community centre, Mural, and substantial loss of public green space would be harmful. That the loss of these amenities would cause substantial harm to the residents mental and physical wellbeing.

That the green space was well used by young and elder residents alike, particularly elderly people who could not walk far. There were no other parks or play space, specifically for under 5s in area, that did not require crossing main roads. That the purpose built, well used, and maintained enclosed playground for 1-5's would be removed.

It was noted that the community building was closed by the Council 5 years ago, following repair work and without consultation with the local community and refused to respond to requests from people seeking its use. Whilst it required a level of refurbishment, the building remains a community asset that should be made available for community use as a possible nursery, for community events or as a foodbank. The community building had been used to provide childcare, which remained in shortage in the area. The nearest nursery care, SEN children facilities or general community use was in Kidbrooke and was insufficient in size for SEN childcare, or too far or dangerous, over a main road, for younger children to access on their own; some adults would also be uncomfortable access it at night. The community building would serve residents better by being made available to them.

In respect of the William Mitchell mural located within the building it was noted it was designed for the Community Centre and residents to see, in situ. That, if the development was agreed, it needed to be re-located should not be destroyed or stored, out of public sight, in a cupboard. If the proposal was agreed, it was considered that the proposed Condition 17 was insufficient to adequately protect the mural and a local, publicly accessible site should be identified and the mural moved and adequately protected prior to any work commencing on site.

It was felt there was insufficient space on for 6 houses which would result in and overdevelopment of the site, overcrowding, increased noise issues and increased pressure on utilities, including water pressure. The new homes were not a high-quality design that was sympathetic to their setting and would be dominant. Existing residents were not being protected with 3 houses suffering some loss of privacy as a result. It was felt the area was being overdeveloped and additional housing should be spread around the Borough, not grouped in the Kidbrooke area.

A speaker questioned the accuracy of the parking assessment as, whilst the road was two lanes, and not one way, the parking along one side reduced it to one narrow lane. There was inadequate parking for existing residents and 3 additional parking bays would cause additional pressure and a danger for children using the retained play area and green.

Speakers felt that if this was a private contractor seeking to develop on a small communal green in a Conservation Area, it would be recommended for refusal. The loss of the community centre and green space was not a minor but a significant loss which would damage rather than enhance the special character of Richmount Gardens. Social housing was important but not at any cost and if the Councils designation of Conservation Areas had meaning and support, it should be refused.

In response to Members questions the respective speakers agreed there was a need for housing but there were larger, undeveloped spaces in the vicinity that could provide more housing whilst retaining the green.

The community building had been well used and was refurbished in 2017 as a result of Councillor Hyland securing funding as a 'valuable resource'. The Council then told the nursery to leave and closed the community building with no consultation with residents. Some speakers expressed confidence that there would be capacity among residents to ensure it could be run and operate as a community facility again, providing a location for a foodbank and residents who could not access the Kidbrooke community facilities.

The existing, dedicated under 5's play area was installed around 10 years ago, was regularly maintained and well used, noting no replacement was proposed. The existing home's view of the green and play area, to monitor their children, would be lost.

That on two occasions Council refuse trucks got stuck on the green, one for 2 days; a smaller refuse cart was now used.

There were numerous accidents and near or actual collisions in the road. It was accepted that, if used as a community centre, there may be an increase in car numbers, but it would only be for the duration of the event. Similarly additional noise levels would only be for the duration of use

A speaker felt that the applicant had not properly involved existing residents and taken objections to the original 3 story proposal as completion of the consultation process.

A speaker advised that the William Mitchell mural was an intrinsic part of the building. Discussions had been undertaken with the Twentieth Century Society as to its preservation as it should be seen, as conceived and intended, as art for the common man. That post war artwork in the Borough rare and deserving of proper appreciation and preservation, as intended, in situ. They noted that, even with the previous use of the building as a nursery, it was in good condition and it would be possible to preserve it on site.

Planning Board accepted an address from the applicant's team who set out the application and consultation process, noting the application had generated a significant level of scrutiny. The proposal was redesigned to responded to feedback and was more responsive to the existing environment and would provide 6 3-bed high quality, sustainable social houses.

The community building had been vacant since 2018 and the proposal to use the site for social housing was agreed the Cabinet in 2020. The proposal to demolish the community building was given a lot of consideration but it was not viable to refurbish it; it was not a statutory listed building. There would be no shortfall in nursery provision or community function rooms. The William Mitchell mural would be protected.

The green was not designated as a village green or protected open space and did not fall in an area of green space deficiency. It was for members to considered and balance the loss of an unused community building against the provision of 100% affordable housing.

In response to Members questions the applicant's team confirmed that Conservation Areas were not being targeted and a further 22 sites, around the Borough had been designated for development of social housing. Each site would accommodate an average of 4 to 5 properties and there was a requirement to ensure viability for each site.

The community building was a 1950's build of moderate value. The pre-school moved out around 2016 and following management issues and the collapse of the Tenants and Residents Association the building was closed. The Councils Tenancy Engagement Team had given consideration offering it at a peppercorn rate to community groups but this was not taken up by any group. Soft marketing of the building was tested but as it was not in a central location and no designated parking there was no interest. A quantity surveyor had assessed the current condition of the community building and considered it was not fit for use, requiring repairs to the roof, new toilets and refurbishment of the office and kitchen areas. If it were to be used as a nursery, there would be further costs to meet legal requirements. The applicant refuted that the Council had deliberately left the building to fall into disrepair.

The applicant had spoken to Optivio, who managed the Kidbrooke Village Community Hub and received assurances that it would be available to Catoer Estate residents to use for residents group meetings, parties, etc.

In respect of the William Mitchell mural the applicant's representatives confirmed it was important it was protected and relocated to a locally, publicly accessible location but it would not be possible to retain it on site.

There would be a reduction in green space, with the retained area enhanced for the benefit of existing and new residents; there would be re-provision of the play space to an equal quality.

The applicant's representatives confirmed that the principal of removing the 3 proposed parking spaces could be accommodated in consultation with Planning. Submission of a construction management plan was conditioned and the London Fire Brigade had submitted no objections.

Planning Board accepted an address from Councillor Aidan Smith, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, who considered it was a good application, amended in line with resident's comments. That the community building was closed 8 years ago and not viable with alternative facilities available. He set out the demand for social housing and urged that the proposal be supported.

Planning Board moved to determination with a Member expressing that they understood the need for social housing and supported its development, but not at the cost of the amenities of the people who have lived there for many years.

It was a difficult decision as, even discounting the loss of the community building, there would be a loss of 64% of public green space, destroying the village atmosphere it had created. There were already adverse issues with parking and utility and emergency vehicle access.

Another Member also expressed the difficulty of the decision which was finely balanced. They felt that they could support the application if it was possible to strengthen the conditions and additional informative, requesting that

- It be conditioned that no additional parking spaces be provided, to retain more green space.
- The conditions relating to the mural be strengthened including a requirement to enter into proper consultation with the Twentieth Century Society and local residents and the Blackheath Society before work was started and the houses not occupied until a suitable appropriate venue had been found it.
- An informative that the applicant entered into an agreement with Optivio in respect of residents of the Kidbrooke Village Hall community facilities.

A Member expressed they had not realised the architectural heritage significance of Richmond Gardens and accepted its similarity to a village green to build a cohesive community. Further, a senior Member of the Council had described the community building as a valued community asset, securing £17,000 for improvements, just before it was closed. That they carefully considered all the information provided and the speakers addressed, noting the resident enthusiasm and commitment to resurrect the community use.

They continued it was vital that as much green space as possible was retained, and the alternative brownfield sites which could accommodate the six houses, be considered. That in terms of loss of green space, loss of community facilities, loss of the sense of community and safe play area would be a substantial loss to the residents, noting once built on the green would be lost. Whilst cognisant of the desperate need for social housing they felt that, on balance, they could not support the proposal.

A Member noted the Borough was fortunate to have a lot of green space, in the 1950's and built a number of estates based on flats and houses around a substantial green. Unfortunately, those green spaces had run out and these smaller schemes allow the Council to protect larger parks for the use of everybody. The Council was in the difficult position of having to increase housing stock to accommodate an ever-growing demand and it was a difficult choice but, on balance would support the application.

At the consent of the Chair the Assistant Director Planning and Building Control advised the Planning Board that it would be possible to impose a condition to remove the proposed 3 parking spaces with replacement by additional green space.

That, in respect of the William Mitchell mural, she drew Members attention to condition 17 requiring the removal and safe storage prior to demolition, consultation requirements and the dwellings shall not be occupied until it is installed in its new location. Noting the informative regarding consultation engagement with local resident and stakeholders, including the Twentieth Century Society.

That it was not possible to place conditions on Optivo, as a third-party private company. However, an informative could be added requiring the application to approach Optivo to negotiate some access to their community centre.

The chair put the recommendation to grant planning consent, in line with the Planning Officers recommendation with inclusion of the additional condition, in relation to car parking and informative to approach Optiv approval with
3 Members in favour
2 Members against
0 Members abstaining

Resolved -

- That full planning permission be **granted** for the demolition of former community building and construction of 6x3-bed houses with associated parking, soft landscaping, and children's play area.
- That the granting of planning permission be subject to:
 - The conditions (Appendix 2) to be detailed in the notice of determination.
 - The additional condition that the car parking shown on the plans be removed and replaced with soft landscaping.
 - The Additional Informative that the applicant liaise with Optivo to negotiate access for use of The Village Hall community centre.
 - the prior completion of a replacement Directors' Agreement securing the heads of terms set out in this report (Section 27).

- 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 this report (Appendix 2), where the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.
 - (ii) finalise the replacement Directors' Agreement securing the heads of terms, as set out in this report (Section 22).
 - (iii) consider, in the event that the Directors' Agreement has not been completed within three (3) months of the date of the 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 contributions and other community benefits; 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 Directors' Agreement to secure financial contributions and other community benefits, including for Affordable Housing, Play Space, Transport, Environmental Sustainability the development would be contrary to policies H4, T4, T6, T5, S4, SI2 and SI4 of the London Plan (2021) and policies H3, H5, EI, IM4, H(e) 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).

NB – planning Board briefing adjourned at 9.37pm, reconvening at 9.45pm

5. 21-23 Pound Place, Eltham, London. SE9 5DN – Ref: 20/2639/F

Planning Board accepted an illustrative presentation from the Planning Officer who, in response to Members questions, advised the applicants financial viability assessment had been subjected to two independent viability tests both concluding that the scheme was unviable and could not provide any affordable housing. The applicant had offered to make an in lieu financial offer.

The Planning Officer confirmed that entrances would be via Masseter Place and Pound Place, with no access on Elm Terrace. The buildings wall to wall separation distance, across Elm Terrace would be about 9 metre and the

proposal would be angled so as to remove direct line of sight overlooking to existing neighbours, as well as using privacy screening to balconies.

The Planning Committee officer advised the planning system sought to incentivise the release of land and buildings for redevelopment, which was built into the viability as existing use super value plus. Although it was not possible to deliver on site affordable housing applicant had agreed a commuted £360,000 towards the off-site provision of affordable housing within the Borough and set out how this sum was calculated.

The Senior Principal Planning Officer Major Developments added Registered Providers often did not want to take on individual affordable units and, there had been previous applications which had had to seek amendment to change on site provision to payment in lieu. If a development could, viably, offer only one or two affordable units, it was often more beneficial, to accept payment in lieu which could be more effectively utilised to bring forward 100% affordable developments.

The Council's independent viability consultant advised they concurred with the viability statement that the scheme was in substantial financial deficit, setting out the technicalities of the development cost factors and revenue aspiration mechanisms used to come to this assessment.

The Senior Principal Planning Officer Major Developments assured the Board that there would be both early and late-stage reviews.

The Planning Officer confirmed that as 19 Messeter Place fronted onto a wide road and was set back, combined with the distance from the south facing flats, the development would cause no unacceptable loss of privacy. Further, the day and sunlight assessment showed that, compared to the existing situation, there would be no unacceptable impact and the use of obscure glazing and privacy balconies would alleviate any possible privacy issues.

Planning Board accepted addresses from two public speakers who accepted the principle of the requirement for new housing but felt the proposal was not in keeping with surroundings and should be no higher than the 2-3 stories of the buildings in the area, in line with the Heritage impact statement. The upper floor corrugated cladding was out of keeping.

Residents held concern at the lack of car parking spaces for new residents or visitors, and the impact 36 new flats would have on roads with existing issues of congestion. The reopening of Pound Place would help ease the traffic flow and issues in the area, particularly once the development is in use.

That whilst a more sustainable use of the site and address the anti-social behaviour, illegal activities and security incidents around the former stack buildings was welcomed any improvement should be not at any cost.

In response to Members question one of the speakers felt the building would create the feeling of enclosure, as though residents were walking through and living in a canyon.

The Chair advised that the Planning Board Members had recently visited Messeter Place and were aware of the traffic issues.

Planning Board accepted an address from the applicant's agent who before moving to any presentation, responded to the points raised. He noted a similar financial viability precedent contribution in relation to 71 to 79 Sandy Hill application that came before members in 2021 and gave assurance that the viability review mechanism would be adhered to.

That it was correct that Registered Providers did not want to take on small schemes of 3 or 4 units due to maintenance issues and felt the financial contribution would be better utilised by the Greenwich Builds programme to provide 100% affordable schemes. Further, that aside from the s106 contribution, it was possible a Registered Provider may pick up the entirely affordable scheme.

The provision of commercial units at ground floor arose during the pre-application stage, in line with Council policies. Any issues and concern arising of overlooking and loss of privacy to both new and existing resident was addressed by way of obscure glazing to lower mid height aspects, and privacy screening to balconies. The development would harmonise with residential properties to the east and south of the site, noting that it was an urban location.

The applicant's agent felt that the amendments made, following consultation, had resulted in a development which would be a good addition to the street scene, resolve the issues of anti-social behaviour, that had become associated with the existing building, whilst providing much needed housing.

In response to Members questions the applicant's agent advised that the overall height of the building could be reduced by removal of the communal winter garden on the roof, but the difference in height between the lift overrun and top of the winter garden was only around 500 millimetres.

The Senior Principal Planning Officer Major Developments advised that the winter garden was substantially set back from either side of the building. Further, removal would have no impact on the daylight and sunlight levels achieved by neighbouring properties.

The applicant's agent advised that due to the schemes deficit there had been no discussions with the Council to take on the units, as a Registered Provider. In respect of why the applicant would start a development that was predicted to make a loss of £1.3million the applicant's agent explained the viability position which accepted a developer's profit built into the scheme, making a deficit. He noted that the value of the site had decreased since 2017 and the alternative was to leave the site as it currently was until a profitable return could be made.

Members raised a number of questions in relation to the profit margin of the development and justification of the deficit and off-site affordable housing payment. Council's independent viability consultant confirmed that 17% was considered a reasonable profit; in reality this development was achieving 8% - 9%, therefore less than considered reasonable. There would be no planning case to justify an affordable housing contribution.

The Applicant's agent responded to Members that whilst residential units were of more valuable than commercial space it would adversely impact the viability to change Commercial areas to residential units, as build costs for residential units was higher than commercial; also, it would not result in the ability to offer any affordable housing. There would be unacceptable issues of privacy for ground floor residents from Messeter Place as the units would be single aspect only.

Members moved to determine the application with one Member expressing puzzlement as to why the scheme was designed, knowing that it would fail to deliver on the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) affordable housing level and be unable to achieve at least 10% affordability.

It was felt it would set a bad precedent to approve a development of 36 units without any affordable units. And whilst the building design was good it was too high.

It was felt that there was a need for a new building on the site, which was attracting fly-tipping and anti-social and illegal activity, to the detriment of existing residents lives. The proposal would be a good use of the site and an

improvement for, both business and residential amenity in Eltham Town Centre.

A Member felt that the proposal was appropriate for the site and complimented the Orangery rebuilding.

The Chair advised that he had received legal advice that refusing on affordable housing grounds would be a weak reason for refusal, given the viability evidence in respect of the development.

The Chair put the recommendation to grant full planning permission to the vote with

4 Members in favour

0 Members against

4 Members abstaining

Resolved -

- That full Planning Permission be **granted** for the demolition of existing building and construction of a building comprising ground floor commercial uses (Use class E) and residential units (use class C3) above, associated landscaping works, cycle parking, disabled car parking and other works incidental to the proposed development.
- That the granting of planning permission be subject to:
 - (i) The Conditions set out in Appendix 2 and any addendums.
 - (ii) The satisfactory completion of a Section 106 (S106) Legal Agreement (obligations set out in Section 26); and
- 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 the report (Appendix 2), its addendums and the minutes of this 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 this report (Section 26), its addendums 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, sustainable transport, employment and training and carbon off-setting, the development would fail to mitigate its impact on local services, amenities and infrastructure, environmental sustainability the development would be contrary to policies H4, T4, T6, T5, S4, SI2 and SI4 of the London Plan (2021) and policies H3, H5, EI, IM4, H(e) 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. 10 Orangery Lane, Eltham, London, SE9 1HN – Ref: 22/2202/F

Planning Board noted the applicants additional submission and accepted the Planning Officers addendum report and that they had sufficient information within the report that there was no requirement for an officers presentation with Councillor Gardner proposing and Councillor Greenwell seconding that Planning Board moved straight to determination.

The Chair put the recommendation to grant planning consent, in line with the Planning Officers recommendation to the vote with
4 Members in favour
0 Members against
2 Abstaining

Resolved –

- That full planning permission be granted for the redevelopment of the site and construction of a five storey building plus basement for hotel use (Use Class C1), seven residential dwellings (Use Class C3), a flexible commercial unit for use as a workspace (Use Class E g(i), E g(ii), E g(iii)),

retail or cafe uses (Use Class E(a) and E(b)) and associated servicing, cycle / accessible parking, refuse and recycling storage, plant, communal amenity space, with hard and soft landscaping (including improvements to the public realm).

- That the granting of planning permission be subject to:
 - (iii) The satisfactory completion of a Section 106 (S106) Legal Agreement (obligations set out in Section 25); and
 - (iv) The Conditions set out in Appendix 2 and any addendums.
- That the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) be authorised to:
 - (iv) Make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in the report (Appendix 2), its addendums and the minutes of this Planning Board meeting, where the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) considers it appropriate, before issuing the final decision notice.
 - (v) Finalise the detailed terms of the section 106 agreement (including appended documents) and form of the planning obligations as set out in this report (Section 25), its addendums and the minutes of this Planning Board meeting.
 - (vi) 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 transport and highway works, cycling infrastructure, public realm improvements, employment and training and sustainability the development would fail to mitigate its impact on local services, amenities and infrastructure, environmental sustainability and open space contrary to policies SI 2, SI 3, T2, T4, T9 and DFI of the London Plan (2021) and EA(c), EI, CH(a), IM1, IM4, IM(a), IM(b) and IM(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies

(Adopted July 2014), and the Planning Obligations (s106) Guidance SPD (July 2015).

7. Land bounded by Nathan Way, Pettman Crescent and Hadden Road, and intersected by Western Way, London SE28 – Ref: 23/3851/NM

Planning Board noted the Planning Officers combined addendum report and illustrative presentation on Item 7 - application 23/3851/NM and Item 8 – application 23/3862/R.

In response to Members questions the Planning Officer advised that houses would be delivered on other plots but was unable to advise on the number remaining in this aspect as a result of the reconfiguration. The increase in heights would be less than 2 stories and within the overall maximum permitted height. The reconfiguration was driven by the applicant fitting an additional lift, to meet new fire regulations, whilst retaining the proposed number of units. There were no policy objections to the proposal.

The applicant's representatives addressed the Planning Board advising that there would be a loss of two 3-bed houses due to potential overlooking from adjacent properties. The podium garden areas would be increased by 15%.

The Chair put the recommendation to grant approval, in line with the Officers recommendation, to the vote with
6 Members in favour
0 Members against
0 Members abstaining

Resolved -

- That it be accepted that the proposed Section 96a application, as detailed in the report be considered to be non-material in nature.
- That it be agreed the proposed changes to the parameter plans (detailed under Conditions 2, and 14) of 22/3782/MA are non-material amendments.
- That it be accepted that the proposed changes to the wording of conditions 2, 14, 18, 25, 26 and 27 of planning permission 22/3782/MA are in themselves non-material amendments.
- That this non-material amendment application be approved.

8. Land bounded by Nathan Way, Pettman Crescent and Hadden Road, and intersected by Western Way, London SE28 – Ref: 23/3862/R

Planning Board noted the Planning Officers combined addendum report and illustrative presentation on Item 7 - application 23/3851/NM and Item 8 – application 23/3862/R.

Members debated this application in conjunction with Item 7. See *Item 7 for minute text*.

The Chair put the recommendation to grant approval, in line with the Officers recommendation, to the vote with
6 Members in favour
0 Members against
0 Members abstaining

Resolved –

- That a reserved matters application (appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale) be approved for Plot 9 pursuant to Condition 15 of permission ref. 22/3782/MA dated 17 March 2023 comprising the construction of 326 residential units and commercial floorspace with associated parking and private and public open space. ES submitted to the planning authority at the time of the previous application.

The meeting closed at 11:03 pm

Chair