

# MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Thursday, 2 September 2021 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors John Paschoud (Chair), Leo Gibbons (Vice-Chair), Suzannah Clarke, Aisling Gallagher, Olurotimi Ogunbadewa, Rachel Onikosi, Stephen Penfold and James-J Walsh

ALSO PRESENT:

Apologies for absence were received from Kevin Bonavia and Councillor Andre Bourne

**OFFICERS:** Planning Officer (Officer), Head of Development Management (HDM), Committee Officers x 2 (1 in person and 1 remotely).

**LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE:** Paula Young, Senior Lawyer, Legal Services

## Item No.

### 1 Declarations of Interest

None.

Prior to the Planning Officers presentations, the HDM provided the Committee with a brief supporting commentary, regarding item 3 on the meeting's Agenda, as outlined in the officer's report.

### 2 Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Strategic Planning Committee held on 29 June 2021 and the Strategic Planning Committee held on 13 July 2021 be agreed and signed as a correct record.

### 3 Former Tesco's Car Park, 209 Conington Road, SE13

The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant of planning permission for

- An application submitted under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) in connection with planning permission (LBL reference 'DC/17/101621' dated 22/01/2020 as varied by Application 'DC/21/121696' dated 11/05/2021) for 'Construction of three buildings to provide residential dwellings (use class C3) and commercial/ community/ office/ leisure space (Use Class A1/A2/A3/ B1/ D1/ D2) with associated access, servicing, car and cycle parking, landscaping and public realm works at the former

car parks, Tesco Store, 209 Conington Road SE13 (revised plans) to vary Conditions 2 (Approved Plans), 12 (Site Contamination), 13 (Remediation Strategy), 18 (Combined Heat and Power Networks), 19 (CHP Abatement), 20 (External Materials / Detail Design), 25 (Living Roofs), 26 (Hard Landscaping Details), 27 (Soft Landscaping), 29 (Bird, Bat Boxes and other Ecology Features), 37 (Retention of Amenity Spaces) and 47 (Approved Quantum) for minor amendments to residential mix, internal layouts, elevational treatment, the introduction of an additional storey (at level 34) to Block B1, a reduction in floor to floor heights to 3metres, a reduction in heights of all three buildings, landscape and access changes.

The committee noted the report and that the main issues were:

- Principle of development
- Layout, Scale and design
- Housing - mix, tenure and standard of accommodation
- Neighbour amenity
- Transport
- Energy and Sustainability
- Flood risk
- Ecology
- Waste
- Planning Obligations

Following the presentation Members questions related to the background to the application, noise, amendments, report addendum, tenure, materials,

The Officer provided Members with background information to the application under current consideration, as outlined in the officer report. The Officer confirmed that the current proposal, applied an engineering solution to the developments ceilings/floors to reduce their height.

The Officer assured the Committee the applicant would incorporate the required noise mitigation measures when building the development. The Committee were advised the measures would be compliant with building control regulations.

Members were advised by the Officer that no definition existed in planning policy that differentiated between minor and substantive amendments. Local authorities applied their judgement on such matters. The Committee were reminded of the pre application stage of applications, where local authorities also made an assessment, showing that scrutiny was applied throughout.

The Officer acknowledged that some objections to the application were not included in an addendum provided to the Officer's report. It was advised this was due to the same objections being noted in the

Officer's report.

The Officer confirmed that access to portions of the development would be restricted. Building 1 of the development would allow full access, whilst building 2 would allow partial access.

The applicant, addressed the Committee advising they were not the original developer of the scheme. Members were provided with a history of the scheme. The applicant emphasised their close engagement with the local authority and the Blackheath Society. The Committee were assured that the majority of the amendments to the proposal, addressed floor height reduction, building functionality and health and safety. On these matters, the applicant advised they were working closely with their engineers. Members were assured that the materials with regard to the developments construction and landscaping would be of the 'highest quality'.

Following Member's enquiries related to noise, rental terms, floor/ceiling density, Blackheath Society, consultation responses, amendments and heating.

The applicant outlined the mitigation measures to address noise, in addition to noting the density of the concrete to be used.

Members were advised the tenure could be adapted, to meet the criteria set by the London Plan Policy. The applicant also noted the benefits of the proposal, such as: amenity space, cleaning and maintenance.

The applicant confirmed it had met with the Blackheath Society. It was advised that intentions for the scheme were clarified. The proposed reductions, were viewed by the society as a positive step. The applicant acknowledged the objections to the proposal, but maintained they were not relevant to the application under consideration.

The applicant advised the Committee no 'mock up' of the scheme, was available. By referring to the Officers' presentation slides, the applicant confirmed the amendments to the application, had been made. Members were advised that the heating system would meet environmental standards, in accordance to planning policy, within the London Plan.

A representative from the Blackheath Society addressed the Committee. The representative thanked the applicant, for consulting with the society, with regard to the current application under consideration. The representative advised Members, that the society were not trying to stop the proposal, but rather had concerns regarding: materials, viability and tenure. Attention was drawn to the cladding proposed for the development. The representative also stated that with the amendments to the scheme, there was no evidence of the effect they would have on the developments viability. The representative also noted the reduction in the number of 3 bedroom units in favour of 1 and 2 bed units.

Questions were raised by Members relating to tenure, planning policy, materials, viability and developer contributions.

The representative explained it was felt the amendments to the tenure of the scheme would be reflected in 'profit-sharing'.

It was advised the London planning policy was intended to maximise the benefits to the borough. It was felt instead, there would be a negative impact.

Members were advised by the Officer that a condition could be agreed with the applicant, for samples of materials to be made available for onsite inspection. It could also be agreed that materials to be used on the scheme, would be reviewed by: planning officers, urban design officers and design 'champions', ensuring a high level of scrutiny had been applied.

The Officer provided clarification regarding the mechanisms of the viability assessment process, as outlined in the Officer's report. Members were assured that the applicant had agreed with Network Rail a contribution of £469,600 towards the development of Lewisham station.

During the course of the meeting, a Member commented that in order for the proposal to achieve viability, they were not adverse to the use of cheaper materials, *as long* as they remained of the highest quality. Several Members agreed with this opinion.

The majority of the Members felt the development was beneficial to the local community.

Members agreed the recommendation in the report with a result of 7 in favour of the proposal and, 1 against.

The Committee

## **RESOLVED**

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

GRANT planning permission for an application submitted under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) in connection with planning permission (LBL reference 'DC/17/101621' dated 22/01/2020 as varied by Application 'DC/21/121696' dated 11/05/2021) for 'Construction of three buildings to provide residential dwellings (use class C3) and commercial/ community/ office/ leisure space (Use Class A1/A2/A3/ B1/ D1/ D2) with associated access, servicing, car and cycle parking, landscaping and public realm works at the former car parks, Tesco Store, 209 Conington Road SE13 (revised plans)' to vary Conditions 2 (Approved Plans), 12 (Site Contamination), 13 (Remediation Strategy), 18 (Combined Heat and Power Networks), 19 (CHP Abatement), 20 (External Materials / Detail Design), 25 (Living Roofs), 26 (Hard Landscaping Details), 27 (Soft

Landscaping), 29 (Bird, Bat Boxes and other Ecology Features), 37 (Retention of Amenity Spaces) and 47 (Approved Quantum) for minor amendments to residential mix, internal layouts, elevational treatment, the introduction of an additional storey (at level 34) to Block B1, a reduction in floor to floor heights to 3metres, a reduction in heights of all three buildings, landscape and access changes.

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report.

The meeting closed at 8.41pm.

Chair

---