

Committee	STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE	
Report Title	MINUTES	
Ward		
Contributors		
Class	PART 1	Date: 17 July 2018

MINUTES

To approve the minutes of the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee held on the 3rd April 2018.

MINUTES of the meeting of the STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE held in Rooms 1 and 2, Civic Suite, CATFORD SE6 on Tuesday 3rd April 2018 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors: De Ryk (Chair), Bonavia, Curran, Hall, Coughlin and Reid.

APOLOGIES: Councillors: Paschoud (Vice-Chair), Clarke, Amrani, and Onikosi.

OFFICERS: Emma Talbot - Head of Planning, Michael Forrester – Major & Strategic Projects Manager, Paula Young - Legal Services, Simon Moss – Service Group Manager for Highways and Transport and Alison Bradshaw - Planning Committee Co-ordinator.

1. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Cllr Bonavia declared an interest as a Blackheath Councillor, member of the Blackheath Society and Lewisham Station Users Group. Cllr De Ryk declared an interest as both a Blackheath Councillor and member of the Blackheath Society. Both councillors stated that these interests were non-controlling and therefore not prejudicial to the planning application being considered at the meeting.

2. MINUTES

Councillor De Ryk (Chair), asked if Members agreed that the Minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee meeting held on 20th March 2018 were a true and accurate record. Members agreed and the minutes were signed by the Chair.

3. FORMER TESCO'S CAR PARK, 209 CONNINGTON ROAD, LONDON SE13 7LH

Emma Talbot stated that the planning application had come before the Strategic Planning Committee in December 2017 but was deferred; with the reasons for the deferral set out in the committee report. She then presented an overview of the scheme and planning context.

She reminded members that after a deferral, this strategic planning committee is for members to consider how the applicant has responded to the reasons for deferral. It is not an opportunity for members to revisit other aspects of the scheme and is for members to consider the applicant's response to the reasons for deferral.

Michael Forrester took members through the revised scheme; explaining the affordable housing mix revised offer of 16 social rent, 27 affordable rent and 30 discount market sale units. The developer had held a local meeting with residents on 4 January 2018, which officers consider is an appropriate level of public consultation. The applicant has made approaches to GLA for grant funding, but have been told that none is currently available.

Officers consider that the applicant has addressed the reasons for referral.

Cllr Bonavia queried why there was no change in the affordable housing provision, particularly as other Lewisham Town Centre developments had increased provision. Officers explained that the Housing Infrastructure Funding (HIF) was promoted by the Government to unlock housing where there is significant infrastructure that could not be provided unless funded. This scheme does not meet the HIF requirements and that officers have had the scheme independently verified by a viability consultant who found the scheme to be delivering the maximum level of affordable housing.

Cllr Coughlin expressed surprise that schools and NHS provision would not be seriously stretched by this development. Officers explained that Para 4.56 of the committee reported reviewed both school and GP provision within the area and this was considered appropriate. As the application is an EIA development, officers consider the scheme's impact and the accumulated impact. It is recognised that being a high-density, town centre scheme that the accommodation is not suitable for large numbers of families. Officers are working with CCG to review provision of health care and increasing capacity across the area.

Cllr Bonavia, expressed concerns about Lewisham station's capacity, entrance and exit, with platform 4 (closed for 8 years). Simon Moss explained that LBL will continue to lobby for the opening of platform 4. Timing is one of the uncertainties for the different proposals for the station at different scales. Internal capacity in the station is a key issue along with station access from the north.

James Moody (Meyer Homes) presented an overview of the revisions of the scheme that are intended to address the reasons for refusal. Laura Bradley, the landscape architect, explained that the sequence of spaces with wide footpaths will help to define Silk Square at the heart of scheme near the river and station. Aim to connect this space with Conington Green, provide incidental play spaces, integrated planting and stepped terraces.

Julian Barrett, EPR architects, explained that the Island building will be set in Silk Square. As the tallest building in Lewisham town centre, the inclusion of a viewing platform at the top of the building will benefit residents. He explained that S.106 contributions will be made to improve station access and that they had made a commitment to clear up the Silk Mills bridge area. Construction to start in 2019 and fully completed in 2022. 1st affordable unit will be available in 2021.

Cllr Curran stated that "Island Gardens" already exists and the scheme should be renamed to avoid confusion. He queried the location of the bus stops and expressed concern that building was too tall. He also requested a serious review of the walking routes as people will take the shortest route through the bushes. He raised concerns that the station will be over capacity, particularly around the station entrance, and asked whether a planning condition could prevent development until the station is improved.

Cllr De Ryk raised a number of concerns around the viewing platform, particularly the need for an appointment and that the platform would only be open for 2 hour slots, 10 days per year. She stated that if the developer was genuinely keen that people will want to use the platform, that a sustainable strategy for provision of the facility would be required and suggested a need for a ground floor strategy at the bottom to draw people to the building. She asked that the strategy included how the developer was going to embed the viewing platform into the community and make people want to come.

Cllr Curran suggested making the viewing platform open around the year and maybe including a café which would make the space more open and commercially viable.

Cllr Bonavia suggested that as the tallest building in Lewisham, it must be attractive, well designed and a vibrant space.

Mr Moody stated that they were discussing how to open up the viewing platform for more than 10 days per year and make it commercially viable. He agreed that steps were needed to work through how to make this a reality.

Cllr De Ryk reminded the committee that if they were not happy with the height of the building then the application should be refused. Cllr Coughlin, stated that we should not be considering the application on the basis of the viewing platform.

Cllr Bonavia, stated that because of the housing crisis we are very keen to push every application so check that the affordable housing percentage is the best that can be achieved. The % of London Living Rent or affordable rent units is too low, and therefore there was a need to make a good case to demonstrate that the public benefits of the scheme are high.

Mr Moody stated that they had worked hard to provide affordable rents, a registered housing provider and grant funding. Viability consultants had extensively reviewed the build costs, CIL and S106 contributions and river contributions.

Nick Patton on behalf of the Blackheath Society welcomed the idea of the scheme to redevelop an underused site. However, he stated that he did not think the reasons for deferral had been addressed and that it was not clear there was a public benefit with the proposal. He continued that the station overcrowding was getting worse at peak times and that the number of bus stops had been reduced in the area.

Endorsed comments to be made by Geoffrey Turley.

Geoffrey Turley, on behalf of the Ladywell Society endorsed Mr Patton's comments. He raised concerns about the opening up the river in accordance with LTC5. Michael Forrester explained that this planning application did not include the naturalisation of the river which would require a fresh planning application for this work. Mr Turley requested that the planning application for the river works is made in 1 year and completed within 3 years so that delivery of the river works is concurrent with delivery of the scheme.

Mr Walsh, a local resident stated that he was unaware of this planning committee until a few days ago. He raised concerns that the distances between his home, river and the development had been incorrectly measured and his house incorrectly classed as non-residential. He stated that his property would be overshadowed by the development and would lack privacy. He stated that he had not been consulted about the viewing platform and that the tower would be out of keeping with the area. The light levels in his house would be reduced below the minimum living standards in the kitchen, living area and bedroom.

Cllr Hall asked the objectors for their views on the level of public consultation. The amenity societies were initially impressed but were not convinced that the reasons for deferral had been successfully addressed. Mr Walsh did not agree that Meyer Homes have taken resident consultation seriously with just one hour meeting, which they did not attend.

The points raised by members and objectors were addressed by Emma Talbot. She re-stated that members should only be considering the scheme in front of them tonight in it's totality, including the height of the building. She stated that officers were satisfied that the hard landscaping was high quality and short cuts would not be taken. The site was located within the Lewisham Town Centre local plan. She explained that naturalisation of the river

was not appropriate at this time as the applicant owns one half of the river channel, whilst Tesco owns the other. Half a concrete channel removal would destabilise the river. However, half the cost of the future river works would be secured through the S.106 and would be delivered when the Tesco site came forward. She confirmed that the Environment Agency were in agreement with this approach.

Emma Talbot confirmed that all measurements, including daylight and sunlight were correct and set out in the committee report. Officers were confident that these had been properly considered.

Cllr De Ryk stated she was very confident that distances had been correctly referred to between the development and the existing property.

Emma Talbot explained that the consultation had been undertaken in accordance with our Statement of Community Involvement and that officers are confident that everyone that has commented on the scheme had been written to. Further consultation had been undertaken on the changes before the committee tonight.

The request for the river application to be made within 12 months was not for the planning committee to suggest. The long time scale for the river works was recognised because a third party was involved in the project.

Cllr De Ryk queried what would happen to the river works if the Tesco site did not come forward. Emma Talbot explained that there was a Ravensbourne River strategy and that we would look at the river changes if we had ownership and control of both sides of the channel. She confirmed that S.106 money was available from the Police Station scheme for general public realm improvements. There was concern from Members that this may not be enough to secure river works and that this did not amount to public benefit to justify the tall building.

Emma Talbot explained that the cleaning of the bridge and other areas would need to be a planning obligation. The management and use strategy of the viewing platform could be controlled by a properly worded planning condition.

Inherent uncertainty makes it very difficult to plan a resolution of transport issues. Rail service capacity will keep pace with development. There is a pipe line of projects set out in the committee report, particularly for the DLR.

The Mayor of London has highlighted Lewisham has one of four priority hubs, with the Bakerloo line extension. This scheme has made an appropriate contribution to mitigate any resultant increase in capacity issues. Station access is a key issue, including ramp to platform 4.

Councillor Curran moved a motion to refuse the application. It was seconded by Councillor Hall.

Members voted as follows for motion of refusal:

FOR: Councillors De Ryk (Chair), Bonavia, Curran, Hall, Coughlin and Reid AGAINST: None.

Standing orders suspended at 21.58

Reasons for refusal

Skyline, overbearing and concern about going over the datum level. Contrary to CS18 and LTC18. Applicant failed to make a case that the public benefit outweighs those public

concerns including reference to river. Affordability- clarify that the public benefit is the level of access to the viewing platform for the wider public and rivers works.

Access to platform 4 around access and capacity to enter the station, could be linked to LTC5 specific policy. This scheme on its own would cause over capacity issues, although TfL had not raised any concerns.

Two reasons for refusal. Members were happy that officers can make changes to the wording, email them to members and issue the DN.

The meeting ended at 10:04pm.