

**ROYAL BOROUGH OF GREENWICH**  
**GREENWICH AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**TUESDAY 8 JUNE 2021 AT 6.30 PM**

**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:**

**Members:**

Councillor Stephen Brain (Chair), Councillors Leo Fletcher, Chris Lloyd, Pat Slattery and Geoffrey Brighty

**Officers**

Assistant Director Planning and Building Control, Area Planning Manager (East), Senior Planning Officer and Committee Services Officer

At the commencement of the meeting, the Chair announced the procedure which would be followed for considering planning applications.

The Chair agreed to take Items 5 and 6 together.

**Item  
No.**

**1 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Maureen O'Mara.

**2 Urgent Business**

There was no urgent business.

**3 Declarations of Interest**

**Resolved -**

That the list of Councillors' memberships as Council appointed representatives on outside bodies, joint committees and school governing bodies be noted.

#### **4 Cavatina Point, 4 Bridge Walk, Deptford, SE8 3DB**

Additional correspondence regarding the item was circulated.

The Senior Planning Officer gave an illustrated introduction to the report.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that an application had been made to remove the cladding from the host building but the application was invalid at present because documents were missing from the submission. Officers were not aware that the vinyl stickers constituted a fire hazard, and it was not considered that the green wall constituted a fire hazard. The applicant had submitted a fire strategy which complied with Policy D12 of the London Plan. He suggested that assuming all conditions had been discharged the hotel might be ready to operate in 8-10 weeks.

The Senior Planning Officer advised that it might appear illogical, but that under Planning terms they could not consider the cladding on the host building for this application; the applicant did not own the host building, and the cladding was an issue for the owner of the host building. In Planning terms it was understood that the Planning authority held no liability if the application was granted.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee. He commented on the application history. He indicated that the hotel would contribute to the local economy. He commented on the brand under which the hotel would operate and he explained that the idea behind the windowless rooms was to achieve a 'cocoon' like experience. He highlighted that there was a condition to ensure the green wall was maintained. He confirmed a fire strategy had been submitted, based on the building as it currently was with the cladding. The applicant was aware that the owner of the host building had applied to do remedial works with regard to the cladding.

In response to questions from the Committee, the applicant's agent replied that it was estimated, if granted, that it would be several months before the hotel could operate. He did not know whether the underground storage would be maintained by sprinklers but it would be covered in the fire strategy. The materiality of the vinyl stickers would be dealt with under condition but it was in the interest of the applicant that they be maintained. Being windowless would reduce noise going out and going in.

There was a discussion of the matter. It was understood that in Planning terms there was a difference between the application and the host building and that in Planning terms there was no liability to the Planning authority if the application was granted, however Members wanted to know if Members would be individually liable under criminal law if they granted an application within a building which they knew had unsafe cladding. It was proposed that the item be deferred to obtain legal advice. It was also proposed that further information was required with regard to the fire safety of the underground bin storage

The proposal to defer the Item was put to the vote and it was unanimously

**Resolved -**

That the Item be deferred to–

- a) obtain legal advice on Members' liability as the building was known to have unsafe cladding; and
- b) receive information on whether the underground bin storage included a sprinkler system in respect of fire safety

**5 51 Kemsing Road, Greenwich, London, SE10 0LL**

**6 51 Kemsing Road, Greenwich, London, SE10 0LL**

The Area Planning Manager (East), gave an illustrated introduction to the reports.

In response to a question from the Committee, the Area Planning Manager (East) explained that flush rooflights were generally only required in conservation areas. The proposed rooflights would be otherwise allowed under permitted development and were situated to the rear and so deemed acceptable.

The matter of Item 5, ref. 20.3569.HD, was put to the vote and it was unanimously

**Resolved -**

That planning permission for the construction of a side and rear infill extension and the replacement of existing boundary fences with a 2.2m wall and other associated external alterations subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 2 of the report be granted.

The Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control is authorised to make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in the report

The matter of Item 6, ref. 21.0562.HD, was put to the vote and it was unanimously

**Resolved -**

That planning permission for the construction of two outbuildings with connected basement and lightwell subject to conditions set out in Appendix 2 of the report be granted

The Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control is authorised to make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in the report

The meeting closed at 7.25 pm

---

Chair