

Woolwich and Thamesmead Area Planning Committee 23 March 2021	Agenda Item: 7 Reference No: 20/3891/F
--	---

Applicant: Royal Borough of Greenwich
Agent: Dr. Cinici – Architecture and Partners LLP

Site Address: Schoolhouse Education, 42 Combwell Crescent, Abbey Wood, SE2 9LZ	Ward: Abbey Wood Application Type: Full Planning Permission
--	---

ADDENDUM

I Recommendation

I.1 The Committee is requested to grant full planning permission as outlined below:

- *“The construction of a new 2-Storey Side Extension to replace the existing attached outbuilding, replacement of windows and doors with double glazed units and associated internal and external alterations in connection with the change of use of the existing building from Class F1 (Former Class D1) 'Non-Residential Education Institution' to Class C2 'Children's Home.'*

I.2 Subject to:

- i. To resolve to grant conditional planning permission according to the conditions in appendix 2, to be detailed in the notice of determination, following the expiry of the consultation period on the 26th March 2021 and subject to no further responses being received; and
- ii. To Authorise the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to make any minor change to the detailed working of the recommended conditions, as set out in the report and its addendums, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

2. Changes to the main report

2.1 In the “Public Consultation” Table, the “number in support” should be changed from zero (0) to one (1). This is because one representation from Councillor Morrow in support of the application was received between the time of the publication of the committee report and the day of the

Committee Meeting (also see the amendment to section 6.7 of the report below).

2.2 Section 5.8 of the committee report should be removed and instead replaced with the below:

There will be up to 6 young people (residents) living on site at any one time. Overnight there would also be at least 2 members of staff present, with 1 covering a 'sleep-in' shift and at least 1 covering a "walking" night shift. The total number of staff present would depend on the specific needs of the residents at the time.

2.3 Section 6.7 of the committee report should be removed and replaced with the below:

Following initial publication of the committee report, an additional response has been received from Councillor Morrow. A summary of this response is provided below:

- Support of the application on the basis that similar council run children's homes in the borough are of a high quality.
- Support of the application on the basis that the provision of an additional children's home of this type offer high quality placements locally, as opposed to a higher cost placements elsewhere.

2.4 At Section 6.8 of the committee report, the below section of the table should be read as the below, following a recent response by the Housing Occupational Therapy Department:

Details of Representation	Summary of Comments	Officers comments
Housing Occupational Therapy:	<p>The scheme should comply with the standards of The Building Regulations, Approved Document M (Volume 2 – Buildings other than dwellings).</p> <p>It is noted that there are some areas of non-compliance and these should be addressed by the applicant.</p>	<p>It is noted that this application is for a conversion of an existing building and is not new build proposal. In addition, the proposal only brings forward an additional 28sqm of floorspace to the site above the existing lawful situation.</p> <p>Given the above, it is considered that requiring</p>

	Compliance with M1, M2 and M3 should be conditioned.	for the scheme to be compliant specifically with sections M1, M2 and M3 of the approved Building Regulations via a planning condition is unreasonable. Such matters can therefore be dealt with at Building Control stage.
--	--	---

2.5 Section 9.10 of the Committee report should be removed and instead replaced with the below:

The submitted supporting statement makes clear that the previously occupied specialist educational use was not viable as it was operating significantly below capacity.

2.6 Section 9.14 of the Committee report should be removed and instead replaced with the below:

With supporting data from the RBG Children Safeguarding and Social Care team, the submissions also set out that in the context of the number of children coming into the Council's care going down, the percentage of older children which might be served by a facility of the type brought forward has been increasing year on year.

Report Author: Luke Sapiano (Planning Officer)
 Email.: luke.sapiano@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Reporting to: Victoria Geoghegan, Assistant Director, Planning & Building
 Control Email.: victoria.geoghegan@royalgreenwich.gov.uk