

MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 3 September 2019 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors John Paschoud (Chair), Leo Gibbons (Vice-Chair), Paul Bell, Tom Copley, Joani Reid, James-J Walsh and Aisling Gallagher.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Liam Curran and Councillor Olurotimi Ogunbadewa.

ALSO PRESENT:

Service Group Manager, Major Projects Team Leader, Planning Officer, and Senior Committee Manager.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Horatio Waller – External Legal Representative

At the start of the meeting, the Chair, Councillor John Paschoud, announced the procedure for considering the planning application. The Chair advised that after officers' presentation of the report, persons registered to speak would be given 20 minutes each, and Members of the Committee might ask questions to clarify issues. It was stated that attendees filming, recording, blogging or tweeting during the meeting should do so without disturbing the proceedings, or use flash photography. The Chair asked that anyone recording the proceedings should direct cameras Members of the Committee.

1. **Declarations of Interests**

The meeting noted declaration of personal interest by Councillor Tom Copley as a Member of the Greater London Authority.

2. **Minutes**

Approved.

3. **1 SILVER ROAD, LONDON, SE13 7BQ**

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation to the report, recommending to the Committee to approve the recommendation and grant full planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings situated on a site at 1 Silver Road, London, SE13 7BQ. It was stated that details in the Addendum Report circulated at the meeting consisted of minor amendments to the main report.

The Committee noted the report, and the addendum. It was recognised that a similar application was considered at Planning Committee A on 27 September 2018 for which a decision was resolved to refuse permission for non-compliance with Building Research Establishment (BRE) standards, and on the basis that the bulk and mass of buildings to be constructed would be excessive. The applicant,

following the resolution to refuse withdrew the planning application. An amended application was not being considered by Strategic Planning Committee.

The meeting proceeded with the agents acting for the applicant echoing statements that the proposal under consideration was a resubmission. It was stated that after the previous scheme was refused, the applicant held meetings with the Council's planning officers, and engaged extensively with residents and other interested parties, including officials at the Greater London Authority (GLA) and Transport for London (TfL). Thus, views expressed by key stakeholders were taken on board during the revision to and deliver improvements. The agents suggested that the Committee should approve the recommendation in the report, as the revisions were compliant with the relevant planning guidelines.

The agents continued with their submission, highlighting to the Committee that the proposed site consisted of unused buildings that were in disrepair, and detracting from the quality of the environment. It was stated that the applicant was seeking to bring into existence a residential community to occupy contextualised dwellings of 106 private units and 35 affordable homes. It was stated that commercial spaces for flexible uses would also be delivered on the proposed site. Thus, the proposal would enhance the street scene, the public realm, and biodiversity in the area, with an opportunity for increased footfall into Lewisham's Town Centre in light of plans to implement way-finding pedestrianised signs, with access to the Ravensbourne River.

In response to questions raised, the agents confirmed to the Committee that the residential elements of the scheme would face toward the Ravensbourne River, and the commercial elements would be sited towards the railway line. It was stated that the landscape would inevitably become attractive as the trees and shrubs to be planted develop over time. Furthermore, differences in appearance between private and social units would be minimal because the quality of materials and design for each single block would be tenure blind. The agents also clarified that the public realm in private and affordable areas of the proposed development would not be better to each other, but would be different. The Committee was further advised that the private roof terraces and podium gardens to be constructed would be accessible to both social and private occupants, with access between floor areas by all residents.

The agents continued with their response, clarifying to the Committee that all disabled units to be delivered would have access to the car park area. It was stated that out of the 8 allocated wheelchair accessible car parking spaces, 3 bays would be issued to potential occupants in the private units, and the remainder to those in social units. However, the proposed registered housing provider would be in charge of the issuing of parking permits once the development becomes operational.

The Committee made further enquiry and received confirmation by the agents that play areas at ground floor level would be accessible to all children. However, the alternative off-site location at Hilly Fields Park would particularly be appropriate for older children.

The meeting was also addressed by five individuals who expressed an objection to the proposal, advising that they were representing residents in their neighbourhoods. It was stated that residents were opposed to the application because the developer had not adequately addressed concerns their concerns, and that by the GLA and Members who had rejected the previous scheme. In particular, residents felt that there was not much differences in dimensions when compared to the previous scheme. Thus, the height, bulk and mass on the proposed drawing plans continued to represent an overdevelopment. It was stated that the developer's contribution to local employment was also insignificant when set against potential commercial profits. Furthermore, the reduction in affordable housing provision was unacceptable, and the Committee should recommend that the issue be explored further, in particular that residents preferred development that would deliver council-owned homes for local people.

It was the view of the representatives that concerns about overlooking resulting in intrusion of privacy to gardens in residential dwellings, adverse impact on health and living conditions as a result of dust pollution, noise vibration by high goods vehicles, and distortions by towering cranes during construction work remained. The Committee was advised that residents were also disappointed that concerns about the local infrastructure in relation to demands for parking, school places, and General Practitioners' services had also not been adequately addressed. It was also pointed out that there was potential for traffic congestion, and delays for access by emergency vehicles' into what would become a densely-populated area.

In their closing remarks, the representatives informed the Committee that residents were requesting that it should reject the project, as the applicant had failed to apply appropriate revisions to the earlier scheme. The representatives commented that the applicant's actions in that regard was an indication that the proposal remained contrary to the London Plan, and the Council's Core Planning Strategic Plan and its aspirations in the Ravensbourne Corridor Improvement Plan.

In light of further enquiries, the Officers confirmed to the Committee that objections by the GLA had been withdrawn in light of revisions to the earlier scheme, and there were none in principle by officials at Transport for London, subject appropriate conditions. It was acknowledged that the levels of daylight and sunlight to habitable rooms in existing properties would be reduced. However, achieving BRE standards was not mandatory, and the revisions to the plans were considered acceptable for a development in an urban setting, and represented an improvement from the previously withdrawn scheme. Officers also drew attention to the recommendation in the Addendum Report, reiterating to the Committee that following a resolution by Members at the meeting in view, the application would be referred to the GLA for Stage 2.

The Officers continued with their response, advising the Committee that there should be no reason why the management of the parking bays, and the erection of post boxes on doors of residential units should not be covered by a Section 106 Agreement.

The Committee further received clarification by the Officers that the offer of 25% affordable housing was the maximum viable for an appropriate mix across the range of sizes of homes to be delivered. It was stated that in the event of a financial loss upon implementation of the scheme, the proportion of affordable units would be not reduced, however, there was a potential for an increase if additional profits were realised by the developer.

In considering submissions made at the meeting, some Members commented that it came with no surprise that the proposal attracted a significant number of objections on a wide range of issues. The Members echoed concerns expressed earlier on by residents' representatives that the scale, height and bulk was almost identical to the previous scheme. It was stated that the community gardens proposed were inadequate, and provision for play for older children at an off-site location was unacceptable. The Members were also of a view that the proposed buildings would encroach onto pedestrianised footpaths, and the narrow roads in the area would be inadequate to support increased level of traffic movements. Thus, they would not be supporting the proposal.

Other Members expressed support for the proposal, commenting that the recommendation in the report should be considered on planning merits to which significant weight had been given. In particular, there was confirmation that concerns would be mitigated by planning conditions and obligations. The Members stated that they were therefore satisfied that material concerns had been addressed in light of the totality of planning rules, and that on balance, the proposal was consistent with national policy. The Members suggested that requirements should be in place to ensure the adequacy and the management of parking arrangements on the proposed site, and that there should be letter boxes on each residential units.

Members voted on the recommendation in the report with a result of 2 against and 4 in favour of the proposal.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That full planning permission be GRANTED for the Demolition of existing buildings (Axion House), 1 Silver Road, SE13 and the construction of buildings ranging between 5 to 16 storeys in height, to provide **141** residential units, and flexible B1/A1/A3/D2 commercial uses, associated landscaping works, vehicular access, cycle and car parking.

subject to:

- referral of the application and this Report and any other required documents to the Mayor for London (Greater London Authority) under Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 (Category 1C (1.(c)) of the Schedule of the Order) and;
- the prior completion of a Legal Agreement pursuant to Section 106 of the 1990 Act (and other appropriate powers) to secure the PLANNING OBLIGATIONS detailed in Section 10.

And to authorise:

- the Director of Law to negotiate and complete a legal agreement to cover among other things the matters.
- the Director of Planning to issue the planning permission and impose conditions (and informatives).
- the Director of Planning to make changes to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions, informatives, planning obligations or reasons for the decision) prior to the decision being actioned, provided that the Director of Planning is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the Committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by Committee.

And further requirements as follows:

- To formulate a Section 106 Agreement, requiring a Parking Management Plan to be submitted by the developer in relation to disabled and charging bays, and how these would be managed.
- To formulate a condition requiring letter boxes to be erected on the doors of each residential unit.

The meeting closed at 10pm

Chair