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

Item No.

1  Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received for Councillor Linda Perks.

Apologies for lateness were received for Councillor Angela Cornforth.
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 5 - Greenwich Police Station – Ref: 19/1409/F
Item 6 - Blocks A & D Phase 3, Kidbrooke Village – Ref: 19/2329/MA

The Chair advised that she was changing the running order of the Agenda and would be taking Item 6 as the first item of business.

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 meetings’ of the Planning Board held on 2 July 2019, 16 July 2019 and 30 July 2019 be agreed and signed as true and accurate records.

5 Greenwich Police Station, 31 Royal Hill and Under-Croft Space within Swanne House, Gloucester Circus, SE10 - Ref: 19/1409/F

The Planning Board received an illustrative presentation on the proposal from the Principal Planning Officer who drew Members attention to the addendum report, circulated in advance of the meeting.

A Member sought clarification as to the possibility of reconfiguring the tenure offer to increase the number of London Affordable Rent units; to which the Principal Planning Officer advised that the applicant had proposed 29% affordable rent units and there were no alternative proposal for consideration before Members at this meeting.

A Member questioned how the proposal compared to existing buildings, sitting in a mainly terrace area and the impact of encroachment onto the Burney Street pavement.
The Principal Planning Officer responded that the two adjacent blocks; Swann House and Maribor House, were five floors high and it was considered that the proposal would not be out of character, at six floors. The change in typography occurred further along Royal Hill.

With regards to any encroachment on Burney Street, he confirmed that this had also been raised as a public concern but the elevation protuberance of the proposal was considered less than substantial, of an appropriate design and any encroachment onto Burney Street was considered acceptable with little or no negative impact on the footway.

The Planning Board accepted an address from the representative for the Greenwich Society who advised that the Society had a number of concerns and whilst they had met with the developers, submitted representations and letters, none of the concerns the Society raised appear to have been considered. He noted that the CABE Design Council letter, appended to the report, shared many of their concerns.

He continued that the Greenwich Society felt that the proposal was bulky; an overdevelopment of the site and not sensitive to the surrounding building context. That at 280 units per hectare development would exceed density guidelines, the provision of affordable housing and the number of family units were below the Councils required levels.

He noted that the proposed height had been reduced from seven to six floors, but it was felt this would still be a dominant building of monolithic design, overshadowing the street scene and encroaching onto the pavement. That it would not be subordinate to the two adjoining listed buildings; the Borough Halls and old Town Hall, and would not form a ‘book end’ to a house at the far end of Burney Street along which most of the terraced houses were set back between four and seven metres, with green space front areas. It was felt that the implication that the development would also form a gateway to the conservation area was misleading and there was no need for a gateway to create a vista and urged the Board to reject the application.

The Assistant Director Planning and Building Control advised the Planning Board Members’ that the scheme had been revised since the CABE DRP Panel’s pre-application report and that the issues raised had been satisfactorily addressed. This was covered in the officer’s report
The Planning Board accepted an address from an owner-occupant resident of Swann House who objected to the proposal on the basis of loss of amenity including overlooking, and invasion of privacy; health implications and that the building would be out of scale for the site.

She advised that her family were concerned at the scale of the proposal which would have an adverse impact on their home and quality of life. They would lose light to the kitchen and communal walkway, and a reduction of their view from 108 degrees to 90 degrees. The proposed building would be against and above their balcony, resulting in the loss of view, light and creating overlooking from residents of the new building onto her balcony, bathroom window and her son’s bedroom. The bins would also be directly below their balcony. The height and massing would be intrusive resulting in a loss of light and open space.

She continued that, under previous applications for the development of the site, they were advised that they would lose their private car parking space and leaseholder right to a space but would be provided with a sole use garage, however they had been advised they would now be provided with a space, without assurance of sole use. Further, her son was autistic and her husband’s job, as a police motorcycle office, was very stressful and they were concerned at the impact on their health, wellbeing and safety during demolition and construction as well as long term, as a result of pollution, building noise and vibration as well as loss of privacy and encroachment.

In response to Members questions she confirmed that they were the only owner-occupants in Swann House. Low-Guardian residents had also recently taken up occupation.

The Principal Planning Officer responded to a Planning Board Member that Swann House and the former Police Station were, at one time, under single ownership but are now owned by two separate companies. He confirmed that a separate planning application was being submitted in respect of Swann House, which was owned by the Malons Group.

The Assistant Director Planning and Building Control advised the Planning Board that the application for Swann House had not yet been determined and was not a material consideration in respect of the decision before them. The application would come before the Board at a later date when the scheme was ready.
The Planning Board accepted an address from a local resident who echoed the comments of the Greenwich Society adding that he felt that the proposal was massively out of scale to the area and not sympathetic to the area including Swann House and Maribor House. He felt that the height and scale would turn Royal Hill into a canyon and a gorge was not a gateway and the current open vista entrance would be lost.

The Planning Board accepted an address from the Greenwich Environmental Forum representative who felt that it was an overdevelopment of the site which was out of sympathy with the adjacent listed buildings. It had an alien form which would not align with the other buildings which had emerged in the historical setting. She felt that the Police Station was not a beautiful building but was of a design of its period and the developer was proposing a building which was not suitable for, or of a high enough standard for, the area.

She continued that Computer Generated Images (CGI) were inaccurate, as the site was sloped, not flat. She hoped that the ecology aspect would be given attention with the creation of a visual green link between Burney Street and Gloucester Circus. Noting that an application was to be submitted for Swann House she felt that the Planning Board should look at the two applications together as they would combine to create a major change to the geography of the area.

Members noted the point of the combined impact of the development of Swann House and the former Police Station and asked for clarification on the possibility of considering the applications in conjunction.

The Chair advised that this would not be possible and to do so could put the Council at risk of a legal challenge.

The Assistant Director, Planning and Building Control clarified by adding that the two buildings were in separate ownership and separate applications had been submitted for the respective sites; since there was no policy requirement for the two sites do be dealt with as a comprehensive development it would not be possible to delay determination of the planning application in front of Planning Board for this reason.

The Business Development Co-Ordinator for the GCDA (Greenwich Co-operative Development Agency) addressed the Planning Board, in support of the application which would provide the opportunity to create a vibrant area for community events and engagement.
In response to Members questions the GCDA Business Development Co-
ordinator confirmed that they had negotiated space in the development.

The Planning Board was addressed by the applicant’s planning consultant from
Q Square who stated that following the consultation process a number of
changes were made to the proposal, including a reduction in height, number
of units, massing and colour of building material. The redesign had also
eliminated the possibility of overlooking to homes in Swann House.

He continued that they had worked with the Council’s Conservation Officers
and Planning Officers to create a development which would sit within the
context of its surroundings. New community facilities would be provided at
ground level with an area designed with GCDA in mind, improvements to the
Burney Street Open Space, via s106 funds and improvements to the paving
along Royal Hill and Burney Street. The development would deliver a good
standard of housing, 29% affordable with all residents having access to the
shared garden.

A Member asked if the applicant would consider re-configuring the affordable
element to offer more units at London Affordable Rent, accepting that this
could result in a reduction of intermediate shared ownership units and a
reduction in the overall amount of affordable housing on site.

The applicant’s planning consultant advised that a Registered Provider had
been engaged to manage the affordable and intermediate offer, which were
grouped together and it was felt that the application was the best proposal.

The Principal Planning Officer responded to Members questions that the
Council’s policy was for 35% affordable housing, though the viability shows
that the 29% offered is acceptable.

The applicant’s planning consultant replied to Members questions that they
had taken consideration of the CABE Design Councils comments and made a
number of significant changes including reducing the height and internal
configuration of the core. The rear elevation, facing Swann House, had been
amended with views angled away from Swann House, to remove overlooking.
He confirmed that Historic England and the Council’s Conservation Officer
had been consulted on the revised submission.

In respect of the London Affordable Rent levels, one beds would be £155 pw;
two beds £164 pw and three beds £175 pw, which equated to Social Rent
levels. He confirmed that the Mayors density guidance was 700 units per
hectare with the development being 752 units per hectare. The density
guidance allowed for greater density taking into account design, the quality of
the proposed scheme and benefits such as housing quality.

The applicant’s planning consultant advised that, with regards to the
affordable housing level, the application had been assessed by the Council’s
independent viability assessor and the Council’s Planning and Housing
Officers. He confirmed that if the level of London Affordable Rent unit were
increased it would require a reduction in the level of intermediate Shared
Ownership Units. He confirmed that he would speak with the applicant to
consider the possibility of re-aligning the level of London Affordable Rent.

The applicant’s architect, from Formation Architects, responded to Members’
questions, confirming that the design took into account that the building
occupied a large area at the threshold of the Historic Town Centre and
residential area and that the design was intended to compliment the
neighbouring Town Hall, incorporating a number of design elements, such as
the window framing and building lines; rather than the Georgian and Victorian
terraces.

The Chair proposed the Motion that a decision on the application be
defered in order to allow the applicant to consider increasing the number of
London Affordable Rent units. If this was possible, that the revised proposals
would be viability assessed and considered at the earliest Planning Board
Meeting following assessment by the Council’s viability consultants.
Councillor Bird second the Motion.

The Chair put the proposal to defer the application, as per the Motion, to the
Planning Board with 7 Members for, 7 against and 3 abstentions.

N.B As Councillor Cornforth was not in attendance for the entirety of the
presentations, in relation to this application, she did not participate in the vote.

Resolved -

That a decision on this application be deferred on the following basis;

The Planning Board requested that the applicant reviews the proposed
affordable housing offer to increase the number of London Affordable Rent
units, accepting that this would decrease the number of Intermediate/Shared
Ownership units and the amount of on-site affordable housing provision
overall.
That the Planning Board would re-consider the application at the soonest meeting after any viability assessment of the proposal have been undertaken.

6 Blocks A and D, Phase 3, Kidbrooke Village, Kidbrooke, SE3 - Ref: 19/2329/MA

The Planning Board received an illustrative presentation on the proposal from the Principal Planning Officer who set out the proposed Minor Material Amendments and drew Members attention to the addendum report, circulated in advance of the meeting.

In response to Members’ questions the Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the canopy to the main entrance to the crèche was being changed from glazing to a solid material for health & safety reasons. Further, that a new secondary entrance to the crèche would be installed.

He confirmed that revised landscaping included hard landscaping and was considered to be of a better design than that or the original proposal.

The Chair proposed to move directly to making a determination, which was agreed, and the Chair put the Planning Officer’s recommendation to grant consent for the minor amendments, as outlined in the main report, appendices and addendum report to the vote with 10 members’ in favour; 0 Members’ against and 0 Members’ abstained.

Resolved unanimously –

That the application for a minor material amendment planning permission be approved as set out below:

Application submitted under section 73 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 for a minor material amendment to Planning Permission 18/0358/MA dated 13th of August 2019 for the 'Demolition of existing buildings and construction of 1,238 residential units (an increase of 255 residential units over and above the 2013 consent figure of 983 dwellings) (Use Class C3) together with 1,957m2 retail / commercial (Use Class A1), 1,305m2 of retail / commercial (Use Class A1-A5), 345m2 restaurant (Use Class A3), 5,713m2 of community (Use Class D1), a 2,696m2 supermarket (Use Class A1), a public square, publicly accessible open space and associated access, servicing, car parking, cycle parking and landscaping' for an amendment to condition 1 to amend the approved plans in order to allow for:
Block A
- Increase in the area of the ground floor leisure space from 772m$^2$ to 1,306m$^2$ (GEA).
- Rationalisation of commercial floorspace at ground floor comprising the reduction in the size of commercial unit 2 and the provision of a new smaller commercial unit.
- External alterations to the building comprising the creation of a new single door entrance to the new smaller commercial unit.

Block D
- Reconfiguration of community / healthcare space and resulting changes to retail space.
- Amendments to landscaping.
- New gas meter room and car park ventilation relocated on the west elevation at ground floor.
- Minor elevational changes to brick facade, including corbelling locations for health and safety, change of balcony balustrade material, and podium parapet detail amended to match Block A.
- Crèche canopy entrance changed from glazing to solid, repositioning of non-residential entrance doors, repositioning of mullions and transforms, removal of chamfered brickwork to window reveal, and glass balustrades on balconies changed to metal railings.
- Brick work amendments including brick colour from buff to brown, addition to corbelled brickwork sections on the east elevation, and removal of corbelled brickwork in certain locations.
- Amendments to building heights (Range from -465mm to +65mm).
- Amendment to Condition 7
- Amendment to Condition 8

Subject to:
(i) The satisfactory completion of a Deed of Variation to the Section 106 (S106) Legal Agreement dated 13 August 2019; and
(ii) Conditions set out in Appendix 2 of the report.

The meeting closed at 8.00 pm

___________________________
Chair