

MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 15 December 2021 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors John Paschoud (Chair), Leo Gibbons (Vice-Chair), Kevin Bonavia, Olurotimi Ogunbadewa, Rachel Onikosi and James-J Walsh

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Andre Bourne - under Standing Orders

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Suzannah Clarke, Aisling Gallagher and Councillor Stephen Penfold

OFFICER(S) ALSO JOINING THE MEETING VIRTUALLY: Planning Officers, Paula Young, Senior Lawyer, Legal Services

Clerk: Committee Officers.

Item No.

1 **Declarations of Interest**

None

2 **Minutes**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee meetings held on 2 September 2021 be agreed.

3 **Land on the corner of Briant and Besson Street, London, SE14**

The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant of planning permission for the comprehensive redevelopment of Land at the corner of Briant and Besson Street, SE14, including demolition of existing structures to deliver a mixed use development comprising:

- 324 residential units (Use Class C3), flexible retail and commercial floor space (Use Class A1/A3/B1), a Pharmacy (Use Class A1), a GP surgery (Use Class D1) and community space

(Use Class D2) in buildings ranging from 3 to 12 storeys, provision of disabled car parking, cycle parking and servicing facilities, landscaping and other associated works.

Prior to the presentation the Planning Officer advised members of an error at paragraph 949 in the officer report. Members were advised that this currently reads as “moderate to high degree of less than substantial harm to the Hatcham Conservation Area”. This should read as a “moderate” degree of harm to be consistent with the “moderate degree of harm” reported throughout the report

The Committee noted the report.

Following the Officers presentation, no questions were addressed to the Officer, by Members.

The agent addressed the Committee and described the application site. The agent discussed: history of the joint venture and its’ intentions, potential income, tenure, employment, facilities provided, CIL section 106 contributions, technical issues, planning policy, consultation, community benefits, noise impact and assessment, daylight and sunlight assessment, heritage assets and mitigation measures implemented to manage any concerns raised.

Following the address, no questions were put to the agent by Members.

A representative from the Telegraph Hill Society who was also representing the Hatcham Conservation Society addressed the Committee with objections. The representative discussed: the reduction in greenspace, parking, heritage, New Cross Gate Centre, materials, height, position of proposed tower blocks, privacy, public benefit, harms created, conservation area. The Committee was asked to oppose the proposal, not the concept.

A local resident addressed the Committee with objections. The resident discussed: history of the area, local impact on school capacity and neighbours, light loss, loss of sunlight, loss of privacy, negative impact on schools, general practitioner services (GP), parking, air pollution near schools, mitigation measures proposed by developer. The resident felt if the proposal was approved, it would set a precedent.

Following the address from the Telegraph Hill Society and resident, there were no questions from Members.

During the applications consideration, Members raised concerns regarding: increase in cars, GP capacity, noise, a view of the development from another perspective, materials to be used and impact on New Cross Road frontage.

The Officer provided assurances to the issues raised regard cars and GP capacity, as outlined in the Officer's report.

The Officer assured Members of mitigation measures that would be implemented to minimise noise issues. The Committee were advised of mitigation measures that would be implemented prior to occupation of the development, such as an independent noise assessment. It was stated that the Independent Noise Assessment had found that the applicants' noise assessment report was satisfactory and no further mitigation measures over those identified in the applicant's noise assessment were required.

The Officer advised Members that there was no other views of the development, from a different perspective.

Members were advised it would be possible to add informatives to the planning permission with regard to concerns related to materials used. The Officer advised the Committee that the local authority's conservation officer had been consulted on the proposed 12 storey tower blocks. Members were advised that the issues raised, with regard to the tower blocks, would be addressed by condition. The Officer also informed the Committee of a similar application, which entailed a proposal for 10 storey tower block that had been approved. The Officer stated that officers were satisfied that the proposal was compliant with planning policy and BRE guidelines as set out in the Officers report and that the proposal would enhance the heritage. Members requested that an informative be added, that required the developer to consider the importance of the heritage and history associated with the application site when drawing up the detailed designs. The Officer agreed that such an informative, would be added to the agreement made with the applicant.

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and

RESOLVED - unanimously

That it be noted that the Committee agreed:

- **That Recommendation A be agreed as follows:**
To authorise officers to negotiate and complete a legal agreement under Section 106 of the 1990 Act (and other appropriate powers) to cover the principal matters outlined in Section 11 “Legal Agreement” including such other amendments as considered appropriate to ensure the acceptable implementation of the development.

- **That Recommendation B be agreed as follows:**
Subject to completion of a satisfactory legal agreement, authorise the Head of Planning to **GRANT PERMISSION** subject to conditions, including those set out in the officer’s report and with such amendments as are considered appropriate to ensure the acceptable implementation of the development.
 - Subject to an additional informative requiring that the developer take into account the history and heritage significance of the application site and area, when finalising the detailed design for the development

The meeting closed at 8.36 pm.

Chair
