

Committee	STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE	
Report Title	MINUTES	
Ward		
Contributors		
Class	PART 1	Date: 12 DECEMBER 2017

MINUTES

To approve the minutes of the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee held on the 18th October 2017.

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

MINUTES of the STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE meeting held in Rooms 1 and 2, Civic Suite, CATFORD SE6 on Wednesday 18 October 2017 7:30pm.

Present

Councillors: Paschoud (Vice Chair), Amrani, Coughlin, Reid & Clarke

Apologies: Councillors De Ryk (Chair), Curran, Hall, Bonavia & Onikosi

Officers: Emma Talbot – Head of Planning, Michael Forrester – Planning Officer, Paula Young - Legal Services, Graham Harrington – Planning Consultant and Alison Bradshaw - Planning Committee Co-ordinator.

1. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interests.

0972. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee meetings held on the 27 September 2017 were approved.

3. LEWISHAM RETAIL PARK, LOAMPIT VALE, LONDON, SE13 7SN (DC/16/097629)

The meeting began at 19:30. Head of Planning presented the proposal and explained that the scheme ranged in height from 2, 5, 7 – 24 storeys.

Councillor Coughlin asked for clarification of the 70% figure of housing at social rented level. Emma Talbot explained that the housing would be delivered by registered providers at social renting rent levels. 70% of these units would be at social rent and 30% shared ownership.

Councillor Reid asked if the Renaissance Tower was supposed to be the highest building in Lewisham Town Centre. Emma Talbot clarified that no building had been designated as the highest building.

Councillor Amrani requested the number of affordable housing units and confirmation that the current businesses would have available space in the new scheme. The affordable housing units were confirmed at 96 dwellings and that spaces would be made available for current businesses if they those chose to relocate back in the scheme. Clarification was also sought that precautions were in place to reduce fire risk. Emma Talbot explained that this was a building control issue rather than planning, but an informative could be placed on the decision notice if members were minded.

Councillor Coughlin queried whether parking would be available in the proposed scheme. Emma Talbot explained that the scheme has limited parking, due to its accessibility to public transport but had some commercial parking and accessible parking for wheelchair users. The S.106 Heads of Terms Agreement would state that this is a car free scheme. Councillor Coughlin also requested clarification on the transport issues for the proposed scheme. Emma Talbot stated that TfL has been involved in the design of the scheme and had requested a “set back” for the bus route to be included. The current scheme does not preclude future Bakerloo Line Extension plans. She also stated that the planning service is satisfied that reasonable transport mitigations are in place.

Emma Talbot explained to members that a six year permission would be granted for this scheme, due to land assembly issues.

Councillor Clarke asked whether the proposed public parking would support the commercial units as she did not want to see empty units due to restricted parking. Emma Talbot explained that there was an overall reduction in retail space, but employment opportunities are expect to be increased and that the scheme has been designed to offer maximum flexibility for commercial tenants.

Councillor Reid asked what transport improvements had been delivered in the area. Emma Talbot explained that bus, DLR and longer trains have been delivered in the last 14 years, plus significant improvements in walking and cycling routes. The planning service are meeting Network Rail every few weeks and she would investigate whether any further train extensions would be provided in the short term. It was noted that the London Bridge improvement works were still ongoing.

Then followed a presentation by the applicants represented by Greg Westover (Legal and General – Applicant), Adam Darby, (Assael Architecture) and Mark Gibney (GVA – Planning Agent).

Councillor Clarke asked the applicant team whether small local businesses would be able to afford the commercial space. The applicant team explained that two current businesses had expressed an interest in staying.

Councillor Coughlin asked for further information on the registered providers. The applicant team explained that they had spoken to three of the most active registered providers in the borough, but no agreement can be made yet as there was a long way to go with the development. They confirmed that the 70/30 split of social rented units is embedded in the legal agreement.

Councillor Reid requested information about how the 70% social rent was being funded. The applicant team explained that they had not made an application for GLA grant as this would make the scheme less viable. Councillor Amrani queried why the scheme would need an extended planning permission. The applicant team explained that this was because they were still negotiating with private land owners and may need to request the assistance of the Council to arrange CPOs. The team also explained that the term “brick cladding” meant a brick skin around the building and that room sizes were in agreement with the national technical standards.

Sarah Knapton, a resident in Lewisham Gateway, Daniel Grutters, and Oliver De-Sales, both residents in Renaissance, spoke in opposition to the proposal. Ms Knapton stated that the advertising and consultation for the scheme had been inadequate as this was undertaken before the building next door had been completed and occupied. The proposed development would significantly overlook and block the light to the Gateway development. Mr Gutters stated the proposed scheme did not meet the borough's affordable homes targets and exceeded the maximum density policy. He also stated that the new development would increase current transport capacity issues and that the retail units in Renaissance were currently empty, except for a supermarket and an estate agent selling to the overseas market. He also stated that 80% of the properties would be investment properties, increasing the transport issues. Mr De-Sales expressed concern that the new development would be full of rental properties and would have no vibrant retail space. He was also concerned about the impact on already packed train platforms. He had objections to the massing and height of the building, loss of view, the low social housing provision for local people and lack of cafes and restaurants. Councillor Paschoud explained the 50% affordable housing policy was not a target. Emma Talbot confirmed that the number of units purchased as investment properties was not a relevant planning consideration and that no evidence of numbers were available within the council. She also explained that the planning officer's report states that the separation distances between buildings was acceptable.

Councillor Reid expressed concern that the applicants did not apply for GLA funding and requested assurance that no more affordable housing was available within the scheme. Emma Talbot explained that members could ask for the applicant to apply for the GLA grants. If members were minded to grant the planning application, the scheme would need to be referred to the GLA as a Stage 2 referral process, and Officers could follow the grant point up as part of the process. All members agreed to this course of action.

Councillor Amrani expressed concerns that the Renaissance units were still empty. Emma Talbot explained that lessons had been learnt with regards to layout and fit out, and that the proposed scheme would be expected to fit out all the units, including shop fronts which are one of the most expensive items for tenants; the costs of which would be secured through the S.106 legal agreement.

Councillor Clarke queried what would happen to the commercial units if they remained empty and whether there would be any incentives for small businesses. Emma Talbot explained that the units were designed as primary and secondary commercial units, were 15m deep and were therefore more attractive to retailers. She suggested that a condition would be attached that would remove permitted development rights to avoid changes to other uses.

Councillor Amrani moved to approve the application, subject to officers confirming the GLA grant question, inclusion of condition removing permitted development rights on the commercial units and adding an advisory informative on any brick cladding and fire regulations. The motion was seconded by Councillor Clarke.

FOR APPROVAL: Councillors Paschoud (Vice-Chair), Amrani, Coughlin, Reid and Clarke.

AGAINST: None

Application Approved

The meeting ended at 21:16

