

# MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Thursday, 27 January 2022 at 7.30 pm

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

IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors John Paschoud (Chair), Leo Gibbons (ViceChair), Kevin Bonavia, Suzannah Clarke, Olurotimi Ogunbadewa and James-J Walsh.

MEMBER(S) UNDER STANDING ORDERS ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:  
Councillor Brenda Dacres, Ward: New Cross.

MEMBER(S) OF THE COMMITTEE ALSO JOINING THE MEETING  
VIRTUALLY: Rachel Onikosi

MEMBER(S) UNDER STANDING ORDERS ALSO JOINING THE  
MEETING VIRTUALLY: N/A

NB: Those Councillors listed as joining virtually were not in attendance for the purposes of the meeting being quorate, any decisions taken, or to satisfy the requirements of s85 Local Government Act 1972.

OFFICER(S) ALSO JOINING THE MEETING VIRTUALLY: Planning Officers, Joy Ukadike, Senior Planning Lawyer.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Andre Bourne, Aisling Gallagher and Councillor Stephen Penfold

Clerk: Committee Officers.

Apologies were received on behalf of Councillors: Andre Bourne, Aisling Gallagher and Stephen Penfold.

## Item No.

### **1**      **Declarations of Interest**

None

### **2**      **Minutes**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee meetings held on 15 December 2021 be agreed.

### **3 Land At Surrey Canal Road, Stockholm Road, Bolina Road And Rollins Street, London SE15 AND SE16**

The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant of planning permission for the hybrid planning application for the redevelopment of land at Surrey Canal Road, Stockholm Road, Bolina Road and Rollins Street, London SE15 and SE16 comprising:

- FULL planning application for Phase 1 comprising the demolition of existing buildings at Orion Business Centre and construction of residential dwellings together with auditorium, meeting rooms, offices, and restaurant/ café floorspace (Sui Generis and Class E) within a podium, with associated vehicular and cycle parking, public realm, amenity space, landscaping and infrastructure; and OUTLINE planning application for demolition of existing buildings (with the exception of Guild House and part of Rollins House which are to be retained) and construction of up to 400,000sqm of floorspace, comprising residential floorspace (Class C3), business floorspace, leisure floorspace, retail, food and drink floorspace and non-residential institution floorspace (Class E), learning and non-residential institutions (Class F1), pubs and takeaways (Sui Generis) together with associated basements, vehicular and cycle parking, public realm, amenity space, landscaping, highway works and infrastructure (scale, layout, landscaping, access and appearance reserved).

The Committee noted the report.

Following the Officers presentation, comments and questions addressed to the Officer, by Members related to: design, infrastructure, transport, biodiversity and tenure.

The Officer assured Members there had been an 18 month preapplication consultation with the applicant, to secure the highest design quality. After which, the applicant submitted a detailed Phase 1 design, providing information on items such as window design. The Officer also advised the Committee that it had been conditioned with the developer that: a full storey high sample of the scheme would be available for inspection, repeated design reviews would be conducted and it was clarified there would be retention of the scheme architects for ongoing development purposes. Following the Officers presentation, Members questions related to design, transport, infrastructure, biodiversity, tenure, service charge. Members were informed that Transport for London (TfL), had been authorised to construct an over ground station, that tied in with Phase 1 of the development, due by 2024. If the station was not ready by then, TfL had agreed to provide funds for a bus route. The Officer advised the Committee that to support the local infrastructure a stadium management

plan would be in place, in order to conflict between the various auditoriums.

Members were assured by the Officer the development would increase biodiversity, as outlined in the Officer's report.

The Committee were advised that the affordable housing was located in Tower B, because housing providers preferred the arrangement, for housing management purposes. The Officer informed Members that the design of the development sought to ensure that the affordable block was tenure neutral and that the standard of accommodation was commensurate to that of the private units.

Councillor Brenda Dacres spoke under Standing Orders. The Councillor sought assurances regarding: consumer protection in relation to air quality, heating source initiatives and fire safety. The Officer confirmed noted the concerns regarding air quality and clarified the policy framework on this area, as outlined in the Officer's report.

It was confirmed that the developer had been in consultation with the London Fire Brigade (LFB). It was noted that LFB had not raised any objections to the development. However, the Officer advised Members that the London Fire Brigade had advised that the current fire hydrant provision was not within 90m of at least one proposed inlet location. Members were advised that the applicant responded and advised that Phases 2-5 had been submitted in outline and that this was a matter for the reserved matters stage, when final building layout and access points would be designed. It was advised that where existing hydrant provision was not within the 90m required distance, it was agreed that the developer would install additional fire mains, in co-ordination with the Fire Brigade.

The agent addressed the Committee and described the application site and proposed benefits to the local community.

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

Two residents addressed the Committee. One resident was involved in the basketball industry, the other in the football industry. Both supported the development and cited its benefit to the sports field. Both residents also commented on the beneficial impact they felt the development would have on the local community.

Following the address from residents, there were no questions from Members to the residents.

Members questions directed to the agent and officers, related to: the ENVAC system, site visits, affordable housing, meteorological concerns, safety, commercial aspect,

The Officer advised the Members that the scheme had been designed to accommodate an ENVAC system, an underground vacuum waste collection system. This would reduce HGV travel around the site by having a single point for waste collection. This would result in reduced heavy good traffic

and congestion around the site and as a result would improve air quality and noise quality.

The Officer advised the Committee that site visits could be agreed with the applicant and officers, as an ongoing process during and after the construction of the development.

The agent reiterated the Officer's earlier advice that all units were tenure neutral and located together due to preference by housing providers. The agent assured the Members that all amenities, design, materials, internal and external communal areas were all tenure neutral. The agent advised the applicant would be willing to provide assurances of this, to the local authority. The agent maintained that harmony would be consistent throughout the development design, as there was one developer working continuously on the scheme. This would ensure the continuity of the vision for the scheme.

The agent advised the Committee, that they had been instructed by the applicant since 2004. The agent gave Members assurances that mitigation measures would be employed, to deal with extreme weather, air pollution and night safety. The agent assured the Committee the local police would take charge of night safety. The agent described the process of consultation that gave the development its name 'New Bermondsey'. The agent also described the mitigation measures that would be put in place to attract the demographic of the area, avoid the scheme becoming desolate over time and ensure there would be no conflicts between the developments various end-users.

A resident addressed the Committee, with objections. The resident discussed: history of Rollins House (RH), lack of consultation, negative intentions for RH by the developer and alleged: threatening actions by the developer i.e. posters in the community advising residents of compulsory purchases of their homes, to make way for the development; that a freeholder who wanted to develop their land, had been overlooked by the local authority in favour of the applicant. The resident requested that the freeholders land be made exempt from the developer's plans. Or that he be allowed to enter compensation discussions with the local authority regarding the situation.

The Chair advised the resident of the complaint's process procedure the freeholder he referred to, could take up with the local authority, on the matter described.

Councillor Brenda Dacres spoke again, under Standing Orders. The Councillor discussed: affordable housing, Rollins House, regeneration of the Winslade Estate, youth facilities, Millwall Community Trust, consultation regarding Bridge Meadows Park; its redevelopment; the dependence of the local community on its open spaces and parks. The Councillor concluded that she and her fellow Ward councillors welcomed the application.

During the applications consideration, Members raised concerns regarding the design of the scheme describing it as 'bland' and 'not attractive'.

A Member also advised that with regard to consultation, residents could sign up on the local authorities planning website for email alerts regarding applications in their area.

Another noted the requirement for an air quality assessment. The agent confirmed an assessment would be submitted to the local authority to be reviewed by its' environmental protection officer, whose recommendations would be noted, to ensure air quality conditions were acceptable. Several Members asked for assurance that Rollins House would not be subjected to damage or demolition. Officers agreed that this request could be conditioned with the applicant, with wording delegated to planning officers.

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and

**RESOLVED - unanimously**

**That Recommendation A be agreed as follows:**

To agree the proposals and refer the application, this report and any other required documents to the Mayor of London (Greater London Authority) under the terms of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008.

**That Recommendation B be agreed as follows:**

Subject to no direction being received from the Mayor of London, authorise the Head of Law to complete a legal agreement under Section 106 of the 1990 Act (and other appropriate powers) to cover the principal matters as set out in this report, including other such amendments as considered appropriate to ensure the acceptable implementation of the development.

**That Recommendation C be agreed as follows:**

Subject to completion of a satisfactory legal agreement, authorise the Head of Planning to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to conditions including those set out below and such amendments as considered appropriate to ensure the acceptable implementation of the development.

- Subject to an additional informative requiring that the developer agrees not to damage or demolish the original part of Rollins House and gives consideration for its historical quality when considering the design for Phase 2.

The meeting closed at 9.31 pm.

Chair

---