

PLANNING BOARD	Agenda Item: 5
7 September 2021	Reference No: 20/1730/O

Applicant: Cathedral (Greenwich Beach) Ltd (U+I) and Morden College.

Agent: Lichfields (Matt Pochin-Hawkes)

Site Address: Morden Wharf, Located off Tunnel Avenue, Greenwich, London, SE10 0NU	Ward: Peninsula Application Type: Hybrid Planning Permission (Part-Outline, Part-Full)
--	---

ADDENDUM

I. Recommendation

I.1 That full planning permission be GRANTED for:

Hybrid planning application comprising outline planning permission with all matters reserved (43,475 m² site area) and full planning permission (12,992 m² site area). Outline permission is for the demolition of existing on-site buildings and structures (except the Southern Warehouse) and phased mixed-use redevelopment comprising: up to 1,500 residential dwellings; up to 17,311 (m² GIA) of commercial floorspace (Class A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/B1c/B2/B8/D1/D2) and associated car and cycle parking, public realm and open space, hard and soft landscaping, highway and transport works, and associated ancillary works.

Full planning permission is for the change of use of part of the Southern Warehouse from Class B1c/B2/B8 to B1c/B2/B8/A3/A4; refurbishment (including mezzanines) and external alterations to part of the Southern Warehouse; change of use of the Jetty to public realm and installation on the Jetty of Gloriana Boathouse (use class D1/D2); access; landscaping and public realm works including new river wall and upgraded Thames Path.

- 1.2 Subject to the following:
- (i) Referral of the application to the Mayor of London as required under the terms of The Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008;
 - (ii) The conditions (Appendix 2 and as amended by this addendum) to be detailed in the notice of determination; and
 - (iii) The prior completion of an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) containing the planning obligations as summarised in the heads of terms set out in this report (see section 23 of the main report).
 - (iv) A statement being placed on the Statutory Register confirming the main reasons and consideration on which the decision was based were those set out in the report of the Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills as required by Regulation 30 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017
- 1.3 To authorise the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to:
- (a) Make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in this report and Appendix 2 of the main report, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice;
 - (b) Finalise the detailed terms of the planning obligations pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), as set out in this report; and
 - (c) Consider, in the event that the Section 106 Agreement has not been completed within three (3) months of the date of the Planning Board resolution, whether permission should be refused on the grounds that the agreement has not been completed within the appropriate timescale, and that the proposals are unacceptable in the absence of the recommended planning obligations. If, on this basis, the Assistant Director for Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate to determine the application with reasons for refusal, these will include the following:

- 1.4 In the absence of a legal agreement to secure the obligations set out in Section 23, including the provision of affordable housing, transport improvements, healthcare provision, education contributions, employment training and contributions, carbon emissions savings and carbon offset contributions, the development fails to accord with the relevant requirements of the London Plan and Royal Greenwich Local Plan.

Addendum

2. Supplements and Amendments to the Main Report

2.1 This report seeks to supplement the main report as follows:

- To report the correct Benchmark LAR levels.
- To clarify the number of affordable housing within the illustrative scheme at 15.73.
- To provide the full comments of the World Heritage Site coordinator.
- To report that an objection was received from Matthew Pennycook MP on the 17th May 2021.
- To correct the number of residential units and affordable units reported within the illustrative scheme.
- To correct the tenure distribution (para 14.24) as T01 does not contain shared ownership and B02 does not contain private. The summary of the affordable housing numbers for the illustrative scheme is also incorrect (para 14.10).
- To correct the dwelling mix distribution in the illustrative scheme.
- To update the number of proposed car parking spaces.
- To clarify the status of the draft Site Allocations Preferred Approach.
- To correct the number of non-residential car parking spaces provided within the outline element of the proposal and amend Condition 104 (Non-Residential Car Parking) to reflect this.
- To confirm the correct number and versions of the Parameter Plans and Design Code.
- To confirm the overall height of T03 as equivalent of 31 storeys in height.
- To report that additional objections and letters in support of the application have been received.

3. Summary (Change to Section 3 of the main report)

Housing		
Dwelling Mix Number (%) – based on illustrative scheme	Studio	0-7%
	1-bedroom	30-50%
	2-bedroom	40-50%
	3-bedroom	10-15%
	4-bedroom	1-2%

Transportation		
Car Parking	No. Proposed Car Parking Spaces (non-residential - outline).	Up to 50
	No. Proposed Car Parking Spaces (non-residential - detailed)	0

4. Proposals (in detail) (Changes to Section 7 of the main report)

- 4.1 Paragraph 7.6 should be updated to reflect the revised Design Code and the most recent version submitted in August 2021, in response to comments from TfL and the PLA. It should further be noted that there are 13 parameter plans, not 15 as stated in the original report.
- 4.2 For Building T03, the Illustrative Masterplan shows a double height ceiling (ground floor plus 29 storeys), however taking into account the double height ceiling of the ground floor, this is equivalent to 31 storeys.

5. Consultation (Update to Section 8 of the main report)

- 5.1 The consultee response tables should be updated to include the full comments from the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Coordinator and to include an objection received from Matthew Pennycook MP.

Details of Representation	Summary of Comments	Officer's comments
Matthew Pennycook MP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the principle of a mixed-use development, and principle of tall buildings. - The Parkside Towers would be wholly inappropriate for the site and would have a marked detrimental impact on the character of the area. - Use of the consented Enderby Wharf development should not be relied on as justification for heights proposed, and in any case, Morden Wharf should be subordinate to Enderby Place. - Proposal would have an adverse impact on views from General Wolfe Statue within the WHS and from within East Greenwich 	The objection is noted and the topics raised discussed in section 15 of the main report.

	Conservation Area.	
<p>Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Coordinator</p>	<p>Maritime Greenwich was inscribed on the World Heritage List by UNESCO in 1997. Protection for the site, its setting and buffer zone is enshrined in the spatial planning system operated by local planning authorities and statutory designation.</p> <p>The WHS is administered by a World Heritage Site Partnership assisted by an Executive, working to a Management Plan for the Site. Maritime Greenwich is located within the Greater London area and is consequently affected by strategic policies in particular those connected to development and vehicle movement. The Executive is responsible for the overall management of the WHS and comprises Royal Borough of Greenwich, Greenwich Foundation for the Old Royal Naval College, Royal Museums Greenwich, The Royal Parks, University of</p>	<p>The full comments are provided for clarity but have not been updated.</p>

	<p>Greenwich, Greenwich Hospital, Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance, Visit Greenwich and St. Alfege Church.</p> <p>The Executive has considered the details of the application and whilst developments encompassing tall buildings or that are of considerable mass and density often give cause for concern in the backdrop to or wider setting of sites of cultural significance, the Executive, in principle, is supportive of the development of the Morden Wharf site which is situated outside of the boundary and buffer zone of the of WHS site.</p> <p>We consider that considerable attention has been given to assessing visual impact of the development on views and vistas to and from Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site with reference to the Planning Policy Framework, GLA setting guidance,</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Greenwich peninsula Masterplan and the WHS Management Plan. We note that the application also takes account of the ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessment (HIAs) for cultural WHSs.</p> <p>We also note that industrial heritage is an important feature of the development and are encouraged by plans to retain the old wharf building as employment space, re-imagine the historic Sea Witch pub, provide a permanent home for the Gloriana in a boathouse at the existing jetty and improve the public realm including the Thames Path. The latter would help to meet aspirations in the Visit Greenwich Tourism Plan for greater connectivity between the Peninsula and the World Heritage Site, particularly along key walking and cycling routes.</p> <p>On balance, we accept that the elevations in the proposed</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>development will have some impact on the view points from Greenwich Park and would be seen in one strategic view in the Mayor of London's London View Management Framework (LVMF), the London Panorama from the General Wolfe Statue. However, we consider that the development is not in any way more detrimental (and in some ways less) on the views to and from the World Heritage Site than other existing and consented developments along the river front and as such will not impact on its outstanding universal value. In view of this we do not wish to raise an objection to the planning application.</p>	
Greenwich Planning Alliance	Endorse the comments of the Greenwich Society.	These comments were previously reported as being from Positive Plumstead.

5.2 Following publication of the Planning Board report, a further 35 objections and 6 letters of support were submitted. The matters raised are addressed in the original report to committee, and nothing new has been identified.

6. Affordable Housing (Update to Section 14 of the main report)

- 6.1 The number of units in the illustrative scheme is stated as 1,488 at paragraph 14.10 and should be 1,482. As such, the number of affordable units within the illustrative scheme should state 464 affordable units, with 314 affordable rent units and 150 intermediate units (the original report states 469 affordable units, with 316 affordable rent units and 153 intermediate units).
- 6.2 The table below Paragraph 14.23 sets out the benchmark London Affordable Rent (LAR) levels, however the figures stated were for a previous year (2018/2019) and this table has been updated accordingly.

Unit Size	LAR Benchmark (2021/2022)	S/O Income Threshold
1-bedroom	£161.71	£71,000
2-bedroom	£171.20	£71,000
3-bedroom	£180.72	£88,000
4-bedroom	£190.23	N/A

7. Design, Townscape and Heritage (Update to Section 15 of the main report)

- 7.1 The draft Site Allocations, including the site allocation for Morden Wharf (GP2), is a material consideration for this application, however has limited weight in the planning balance. The August 2019 version of the Site Allocations has undergone Regulation 18 consultation, and a draft March 2021 Site Allocations document for Regulation 19 consultation has been prepared but is yet to undergo consultation.

8. Transport, parking and Access (Update to Section 18 of the main report)

- 8.1 To report that additional comments from TfL highlight that a bus garage operates from the Northern Morden Wharf Site on a 24-hour basis, and to further confirm that the car-free nature of the residential proposal is supported in terms of its impact on the local highway network, including TfL services, taking into account the submitted Highways Impact Assessment.

- 8.2 It should be further noted that the detailed element of the proposal does not include any retained parking for commercial uses, and all non-residential parking would be within the outline element of the proposal. Accordingly, condition 30 (Non-Residential Car Parking – Detailed) is not needed and should be deleted, whilst condition 104 (Non-Residential Car Parking) needs to be amended to read as follows:

The non-residential elements of the development hereby approved shall be provided with up to 50 car parking spaces, in accordance with the following details:

- *Up to 16 spaces for health uses*
- *Up to 26 spaces for SW4*
- *5 Car Club spaces*
- *3 Site Operational / Facilities Management spaces*

Car parking shall be introduced by phase, and shall be provided prior to the occupation of the relevant phase, in accordance with the details agreed under the Car Park Management Plan (Condition 93), where these spaces are deemed as essential to support business operations of commercial occupants.

These spaces shall be retained as such thereafter unless any reduction is agreed through the provision and monitoring of the non-residential Travel Plan. The retained spaces shall only be used for essential operational purposes, and if found to be surplus through annual monitoring, any such car parking spaces shall be removed.

Reason: To ensure the development promotes active and sustainable modes of travel in accordance with Policies T1, T2 and T4 of the London Plan (2021).

Report Author: Andrew Thornley, Principal Planning Officer
Tel No.: 020 8921 5698
Email.: Andrew.Thornley@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Reporting to: Victoria Geoghegan, Assistant Director Planning & Building Control
Tel No.: 020 8921 4296
Email.: Victoria.Geoghegan@royalgreenwich.gov.uk