

<p>Eltham and Kidbrooke Area Planning Committee</p> <p>27 April 2021</p>	<p>Agenda Item: 4</p> <p>Reference No: 20/3353/R</p>
--	--

Applicant: Mr Thandi
Agent: Appleby Architects

<p>Site Address: Church of The Ascension, Ascension Vicarage, Thornhill Avenue, Plumstead, London, SE18 2HS</p>	<p>Ward: Shooters Hill</p> <p>Application Type: Discharge of Reserved Matters</p>
---	---

I. Recommendation

I.1 The Committee is requested to grant discharge of reserved matters consent according to the conditions to be detailed in the notice of the determination for the following proposal:

“Submission of Reserved Matters (Appearance, Scale and Landscaping) pursuant to condition 2 of Planning Permission Reference 17/1916/O for the demolition of existing building and construction of 2 x 4-bed dwellings and 2 x 2-bed and 1 x 3-bed flats with associated parking, cycle storage and refuse.”

I.2 Subject to:

- i. To resolve to grant conditional discharge of reserved matters according to the conditions in appendix 2, to be detailed in the notice of determination; 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 Summary

2.1 Detailed below is a summary of the application:

The Site

Site Area (m ²)	939sqm
Local Plan Allocation	None
Heritage Assets	None
Tree Preservation Order	Yes (TPO 55, details below)
Flood Risk Zone	I (No Flood Risk Assessment Required)

Existing Building	
Building height (metres)	10m
No. of storeys	2
Floor area coverage (m ²)	157.7sqm

Proposed Building	
Building height (metres)	10m
No. of storeys	2
Floor area coverage (m ²)	302sqm

Transportation		
Car Parking	No. existing car parking spaces	1
	No. Proposed Car Parking Spaces	5
Cycle Parking	No. Proposed Cycle Parking	10
Public Transport	PTAL Rating	1b (indicating extremely poor public transport accessibility)

Public Consultation	
Number in Support	0
Number of objections	4

- 2.2 The application has been called before committee by Councillor Merrill for members to decide. Councillor Merrill did not set out at the time of call in the reason for the request nor listed any specific areas of concern.
- 2.3 The report details all relevant national, regional and local policy implications of the scheme, including supplementary planning guidance.
- 2.4 The application is considered to be acceptable and is recommended for approval subject to that set out in section 1.1 above.

Site Plan



3 Site and Surroundings

- 3.1 The application site comprises a triangular-shaped plot of land located on the eastern side of Ancaster Street on the junction with Thornhill Avenue. The Ascension Vicarage is located on the land, which is a large detached two-storey building with a single-storey side extension and a two-storey rear outrigger element that exists as an original feature.
- 3.2 The site was originally a vicarage associated with the Parish Church of Ascension which is located in the western corner of Thornhill Avenue and Timbercroft Lane which is opposite the application site.
- 3.3 Timbercroft Primary School is located nearby on the northern corner of Timbercroft Lane and Irwin Avenue.
- 3.4 The application site is not in a designated conservation area and the subject building and none of the nearby properties are statutory or locally listed. It is also not subject to a relevant Article 4 Direction.
- 3.5 Three (3) protected trees (1 x Lime and 2 x Cypressus) (TPO 55) are registered as being in in the rear garden of the application site, although only one tree (the Lime at the southwestern most corner of the site) is present and digital imagery shows this to be the case since at least 2013.
- 3.6 The application site has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) rating of 1B, which is extremely poor (6b being the best).

4. Relevant Planning History

Approved Outline Permission:					
App Number:	17/1916/O	Decision:	Approve	Decision Date:	12/03/2018
Address:	Ascension Vicarage, Thornhill Avenue, Plumstead, London, SE18 2HS				
Description:	Outline planning permission (Appearance, Landscaping and Scale Reserved) for the demolition of existing building and construction of 2 x 4-bed dwellings and 2 x 2-bed and 1 x 3-bed flats with associated parking, cycle storage and refuse.				

Other Relevant Planning History					
App Number:	20/2847/F	Decision:	Withdrawn	Decision Date:	30/11/2020
Address:	Ascension Vicarage, Thornhill Avenue, Plumstead, London, SE18 2HS				
Description:	Demolition of the existing building and construction of a new two storey building with converted loft space to comprise 7 residential units (6 x 2-bed, 1 x 3-bed) together with associated landscaping, refuse, car parking and drop kerb (Reconsultation - Revised Description)				

App Number:	APP/E5330/W/20/3261279	Decision:	Appeal Dismissed	Decision Date:	07/04/2021
Address:	Ascension Vicarage, Thornhill Avenue, Plumstead, London, SE18 2HS				
Description:	APPEAL OF APP - 20/1735/F: Demolition of existing building and construction of part one/part three storey block and three storey block comprising of 1 x 1-bed flat, 1 x 2-bed maisonette and 3 x 5-bed houses with refuse storage, parking and landscaping.				
Summary of appeal findings from inspector:	<p><i>“At present, the appeal dwelling sits comfortably within the plot, and the surrounding space with its boundaries allows the full character of the building to be appreciated. The significant masses of extensions would reduce the separation distances to the boundaries and further increase the scale of the proposal. Overall, the original character of the building would be harmfully eroded resulting in an overly dominant and visually intrusive building that would not harmonise with the street scene.</i></p> <p><i>The mass, scale and excessive bulk of proposed development would harmfully alter the character of the original building and the character and</i></p>				

appearance of the street scene. It would therefore be contrary to the requirements of London Plan 2021 Policy D3 for development to respond to local distinctiveness, and the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) Policies DH1, H5, H(b) and H(c) in their combined design aims.

For the reasons of unsatisfactory internal ceiling heights and light levels into habitable rooms as I have identified, the proposal would not create satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers. It would not meet the requirements of Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies H5 and DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) which seek to achieve housing quality and adequate standards of housing. In addition, it would fail to meet the required standards as set out within the Housing SPG.

A previous approval may have been granted at the site however this was for an outline scheme for new dwellings further to the complete demolition of the vicarage. Its layout and design is not the same proposal as the one before me even though there is a reduced number of bedrooms with this proposal. I apply limited weight to the comparison made to the approved outline permission.”

Officer Comment

The outcome of the appeal proposal has only limited weight on the assessment of this application, as is set out clearly by the planning inspector. The proposal brought forward at this application is of significant less bulk and more overtly represents a corner terrace which is more appropriate within the surrounding residential context.

Whilst the inspector did acknowledge the separation distances between the adjoining boundaries, this comment was in relation to the impact that this would have on the original character of the building.

Officers also highlight the differing contexts of these applications, the appeal proposal was for significant unsympathetic extension works to allow for the provision of dwellings, and this is for the total demolition of the existing building on site to allow for the provision of a new building containing dwellinghouses. Officers would like to highlight that the principle of demolition of the application building as well as the principle of the residential mix, bulk and massing of the

	proposed building has already been established and approved under application 17/1916/O.
--	--

<i>App Number:</i>	20/1735/F	<i>Decision:</i>	Refused. Dismissed at appeal on all grounds	<i>Decision Date:</i>	28/08/2020 (appeal dismissed 07/04/2021)
<i>Address:</i>	Ascension Vicarage, Thornhill Avenue, Plumstead, London, SE18 2HS				
<i>Description:</i>	Demolition of existing building and construction of part one/part three storey block and three storey block comprising of 1 x 1-bed flat, 1 x 2-bed maisonette and 3 x 5-bed houses with refuse storage, parking and landscaping.				
<i>Reasons for refusal:</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed development constitutes an excessive overdevelopment and would appear dominant within the street scene, would fail to respect the open character of the application site and would not respond well to the established pattern of development within the surrounding area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), and Policies DH1, H5, H(b) and H(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014). 2. Unit 8 would fail to provide an adequate floor to ceiling height for at least 75% of the Gross Internal Area, as such would fail to provide an adequate quality of accommodation for prospective occupiers. The Unit would therefore fail to comply with Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Space Standards, Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016), Mayor’s Housing SPG (March 2016) and Policies H5 and DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014). 3. Insufficient details have been provided to demonstrate that Unit 7 would provide adequate floor to ceiling heights for occupants. As such, officers are unable to determine whether the unit would provide an adequate quality of accommodation for this units and 				

	<p>whether the proposed development would be in accordance with Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Space Standards, Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016), Mayor’s Housing SPG (March 2016) and Policies H5 and DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014).</p> <p>4. Units 7 and 8, by reason of its layout and proposed room sizes would not provide adequate private amenity space for all occupants. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016), Mayor’s Housing SPG (March 2016) and Policies H5 and DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014)</p> <p>5. Unit 6 by reason of its small window sizes in one of the bedrooms would not provide an acceptable amount of daylight/ sunlight to occupants and so would provide a poor quality of accommodation. The proposed development is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016), the Mayor’s Housing SPG (March 2016) and Policies H5 and DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014).</p>
--	---

<i>App Number:</i>	19/1720/F	<i>Decision:</i>	Refuse	<i>Decision Date:</i>	29/11/2020
<i>Address:</i>	Ascension Vicarage, Thornhill Avenue, Plumstead, London, SE18 2HS				
<i>Description:</i>	Demolition of existing building and construction of part one/part three storey block and three storey block comprising of 1 x 1-bed flat, 1 x 2-bed maisonette and 3 x 5-bed houses with refuse storage, parking and landscaping.				
<i>Reasons for refusal:</i>	<p>1. The proposed development, by reason of its poor design and inappropriate relationship between Block B and Block A and its appreciation to the front building line of the prevailing pattern of development in Thornhill Avenue would demonstrably harm the character and appearance of the street scene and its surroundings. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), and Policies DH1, H5 and H(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014).</p> <p>2. The proposed accommodation would provide unacceptable floor-to-ceiling heights and would result in undersized bedrooms across all proposed dwellings resulting in substandard living conditions for prospective occupiers of these individual units. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016), Policy H5 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core</p>				

	<p>Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), Nationally Described Housing Standards and Mayoral Housing SPG (2016).</p> <p>3. The proposal, by reason of the inaccessible and lack of sufficient bedroom sizes in House 3, lack of level entry WC in the Maisonette and the absence of front entrance canopies would not be inclusively designed to meet the needs of the wider community and those with mobility difficulties. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy 3.8 of The London Plan (2016), Policy H5 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), and Part M4 (2) of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2015.</p> <p>4. A Tree Survey report accompanying the application is considered out of date as it references a development with a different building footprint and therefore officers are unable to make an accurate and proper assessment on whether the proposed removal of trees and those to be retained would be acceptable. As such, the proposal cannot demonstrate compliance with Policy 7.21 of The London Plan (2016) and Policies OS(f) and H(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014).</p> <p>5. The proposed bin stores of House 2, the Flat and the Maisonette would exceed the maximum 15m carrying distance for waste collectors and in the absence of a waste management plan the proposal would not comply with Policy DHI of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and the Council's Waste Guidance Notes May 2018.</p>
--	---

<i>App Number:</i>	14/0393/O	<i>Decision:</i>	Refuse	<i>Decision Date:</i>	17/04/2014
<i>Address:</i>	Ascension Vicarage, Thornhill Avenue, Plumstead, London, SE18 2HS				
<i>Description:</i>	Subdivision of existing house to provide 2 self contained units, incorporating the construction of rear infill and side extensions, removal of front porch, creation of a 2nd front door, installation of window at front elevation, changes to windows at side elevation, together with other associated external works.				
<i>Reasons for refusal:</i>	1. The proposed development, due to the internal layout of the 3 terraced houses, would fail to provide a high quality development as the overall living accommodation would be of an insufficient size in terms of floor area and the rooms within the loft space would not have an acceptable outlook or receive an adequate level of natural light. As such, the proposal would be contrary to				

	<p>Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2011), Policies SD1, D1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Policies H5 and DH1 of the Core Strategy (Submission Version with Proposed Further Alterations, 2013).</p> <p>2. The proposed development, due to the external layout of the car parking spaces in the front garden together with the refuse storage, cycle storage and front entrances to the flats, would fail to provide a high quality development that would create a positive relationship with the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would be harmful to the visual amenities of the streetscape and would over-dominate the front garden to an unacceptable degree which would be contrary to Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2011), Policies SD1, D1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Policies H5 and DH1 of the Core Strategy (Submission Version with Proposed Further Alterations, 2013).</p> <p>3. In the absence of a Tree Survey to demonstrate that no harm would be caused to the nearby Lime tree (TPO 55) there are concerns about the impact of the adjacent hard surfacing and nearby foundations on its general health due to potential root compaction. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy 5.21 of the London Plan (2011), Policy D8 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Policies DH1 and OS(f) of the Core Strategy (Submission Version with Proposed Further Alterations, 2013).</p>
--	---

5. **Proposals (in detail)**

5.1 The principle of redeveloping the application site for residential development has been established by the Outline Planning Permission (Ref. 17/1916/O). The outline scheme set the parameters for the quantum of development, mix of units, maximum building heights and massing together with layout and access.

5.2 As such, the current application seeks the discharge of reserved matters for the following:

“Submission of Reserved Matters (Appearance, Scale and Landscaping) pursuant to condition 2 of Planning Permission Reference 17/1916/O for the demolition of existing building and construction of 2 x 4-bed dwellings and 2 x 2-bed and 1 x 3-bed flats with associated parking, cycle storage and refuse.”

5.3 The condition with which the reserved matters application relates to is fully listed below:

“No development shall be started until detailed drawings and relevant documents as detailed under each reserved matter have been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority. The relevant part of the development shall in all respects be carried out in accordance with the approved plans:

- Appearance - Including but not limited to block plan, floor plans for building and individual unit, sections, elevations, and full details of the facing/surface materials including samples to be used on the development and all other finishing materials including paving, hard surfacing and means of enclosure.*
- Scale - Including but not limited to drawings detailing massing, elevations and sections.*
- Landscaping- Including but not limited to landscaping plan, hard landscaping plan, car parking plan, cycle facilities, waste and storage facilities, details of any replacement trees and planting (including location, species, size, height and spacing), as well as tree protection and survey plan, and evidence of compliance with recommendations made in Arboricultural Implications Report prepared by SJA Trees- Arboricultural Planning Consultants.”*

Reason: In order that the Council is satisfied with the details of the proposed development and to ensure compliance with Policies 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.8, 5.2, 6.9, 6.13, 7.4, 7.6 of the London Plan and Policies H2, H5, DH1, DH(b), OS(b), Policy IM1, IM4, IM(b) and IM(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (July 2014).

- 5.4 The submissions bring forward plans in accordance with the approved outline permission with detailed drawings as to the proposed appearance, landscaping, and scale of the proposal.
- 5.5 The proposed mix of the development would be the same as that which has been approved in the approved outline permission, being the below:
- 2x 4 bedroom, 6 person dwellings
 - 1x 3 bedroom, 4 person dwellings
 - 2x 2 bedroom, 4 person dwellings
- 5.6 The proposed new building would be two storeys and would be positioned to maintain a reasonable separation distance from the road as it wraps around the junction with Ancaster Street. The building would have a maximum depth of 11.9m, and a width of 25.81m. The building would have a maximum height of 10.1m and a height to the eaves of 5.7m from ground level. The building would utilise a pitched roof construction.

- 5.7 The submissions state that the proposed development would utilise the below materials:
- External Walls - faced with Wienerberger Con Mosso brickwork.
 - Roof - The roofing tiles - clay single-camber with clay bonnet hip tiles, as per the style of the existing building.
 - Windows – Aluminium Frame (Grey Colour)
 - Boundaries – Mixture of brickwork and timber fences.
- 5.8 Material details as to the proposed external doors, garden patios and front hardscaping have not been provided as part of the application.
- 5.9 The submissions bring forward the provision of five (5) off street car parking spaces as well as ten (10) cycle parking spaces and associated waste and refuse storage.
- 5.7 The external amenity spaces would primarily be positioned at the rear of the proposed building in the southernmost corner of the application site, with each dwelling having access to their own private rear garden.

6. Consultation

- 6.1 The application, since being submitted in November 2020 has been subject to full public consultation comprising of a site notice and eighteen (18) neighbour notification letters sent to occupiers within the vicinity of the application site. The Friends of Plumstead Common and the Positive Plumstead Group were also notified about the proposal.
- 6.2 Following discussions with the planning agent, additional drawings were submitted showing greater detail of the proposed trees to be planted at the site. Additional revisions were also received reducing the proposed number of parking spaces at the site to 5 (from 6), in line with the previously approved outline permission. As these submissions were either ancillary to the proposal or were to align the scheme with that which was previously approved at outline stage, re-consultation did not take place in this instance.
- 6.3 Four (4) responses from neighbours were received, all in objection to the proposal. A summary of these responses is provided below:

Summary of Comments	Officers comments
Concern relating to the loss of the existing building	The principle of the loss of the existing building has already been established as part of decision 17/1916/O. The loss of the existing building cannot be considered as part of the assessment of this application.
Concern relating to proposed parking arrangements	The principle number of parking spaces sought to be provided at the site has already been approved as part of decision 17/1916/O and included as an approved condition. Only the design of the proposed parking spaces can be taken into consideration as part of this assessment. These aspects of the development are assessed in section 14 of the report below.
Concern that the proposed new trees may negatively affect neighbouring properties structural stability.	Structural matters are not a material planning consideration in this context. Party wall matters are a civil matter between interested parties. The proposed trees brought forward in the proposal are assessed in section 19 of the report below.
Concern that the visual scale and density of the proposed development is not in accordance with the surrounding architecture and pattern of development in the area.	These aspects of the development are assessed in section 11 of the report below.
Concern that the proposed number of prospective occupants would result in amenity impacts and parking issues.	The proposed mix and number of occupants has been approved in the outline application 17/1916/O, and so cannot be considered as part of the assessment of this application. These aspects of the development are assessed in the section 13 of the report below.
Concern that the current site has already caused anti-social behaviour to occur more than a few times	The antisocial behaviour that may have arisen from the existing vacant building is not a consideration which can be taken

with some calls reported to the police. This included breaking in, throwing stones and rubble the internally demolished building.	into account in determining this application for reserved matters, as this application only relates to appearance, scale and landscaping of an outline permission already approved under application 17/1916/O.
---	---

6.4 **Councillors**

6.5 As noted in section 2.2 of the report, the proposal has been called before committee by Councillor Merrill, however, the call in request did not include any specific concerns in relation to this proposal.

6.6 No other responses from councillors were received.

6.7 **Responses from Council Departments**

6.8 A summary of the consultation responses received along with the officer comments are set out in table below:

Details of Representation and date received	Summary of Comments	Officers comments
Transport and Highways:	<i>“No highway objection is raised to the discharge of conditions”</i>	The transport and highways impact of the proposal is assessed in section 14 below.
Waste Services:	<i>“We are happy with the waste and recycling proposals.”</i>	The waste related aspects of this proposal are discussed at section 16 below. Further details are proposed to be provided via a condition attached to the decision notice.
Environmental Health:	No response received.	The noise and other neighbouring amenity related aspects of this proposal are assessed in section 13 below.
Housing Occupational Therapy:	No response received.	A condition has been attached to the decision notice which requires all

		of the dwellings to be compliant with Building Regulation requirement M4(2)
Tree Officer:	<p><i>“I would have preferred something other than crab apple or prunus. These trees can cause mess from falling fruit and slip hazard on paving, invasive roots/surface roots from prunus</i></p> <p><i>I would have preferred something like birch, maple (all acer sp.) etc, something with some longevity but understand there may be limited planting space available”</i></p>	<p>Following discussions with the planning agent, additional ancillary submissions were provided amending the proposal to so that the types of tree to be planted at the site in accordance with the tree officer comments.</p> <p>The tree related assessment in relation to this proposal is set out below in section 19 of the committee report.</p>
Flood Risk Manager:	No response received.	The application site is not in a flood zone 2 or 3 and so a Flood Risk Assessment is not required for an application of this size.

7. Planning Context

7.1 This application needs to be considered in the context of a range of national, regional and local planning policies and Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents.

- **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF – 2012)**
- **The London Plan (March 2021)**
- **The Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (“Core Strategy” – 2014)**
- **New Developments: Guidance Notes for the storage and collection of waste and recycling materials for the Royal Borough of Greenwich (May 2018)**
- **Mayors Housing SPG (March 2016)**

7.2 For full details relevant policies, SPDs and other documents, refer to Appendix 3.

8. Material Planning Considerations

8.1 This section of the report provides an analysis of the specific aspects of the proposed development and the principal issues that need to be considered in the determination of the planning application (Ref: 20/3353/R):

- Principle of development;
- Density and Mix
- Design
- Quality of Living Environment for future residents
- Impact on neighbouring amenity
- Transport and Highways Impacts
- Cycle Parking
- Waste and Refuse Storage
- Sustainability
- Inclusive Design
- Trees
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL);
- RBG CIL; and
- Implications for disadvantaged groups.

9. Principle of Development

- 9.1 The overriding objective of the Royal Greenwich policy framework is to deliver high quality development which improves the quality and distinctive identity of places and contributes to their success and the area's popularity as somewhere to live, work and stay.
- 9.2 The principle of development, specifically with relation to the loss of the building and associated vicarage and the bringing forward of additional housing was assessed and approved in the previously approved Outline Application (17/1916/O), with which this application is associated.
- 9.3 The proposed is found to be in accordance with the parameters and principles established by the outline consent.

10. Density and Mix

- 10.1 Planning policy seeks to optimise the development capacity of a site. Policy GG2 of the London Plan (2021) (LP) sets out that to make the best use of land, those involved in planning and development must promote higher density development.
- 10.2 Whilst officers do note that the density matrix set out in the previous London Plan (2016) has been abandoned, the new LP clearly sets out that proposals should place focus on the site-specific design conditions and which density would be acceptable within those parameters.
- 10.3 Policy H10 of the LP makes clear that schemes should generally consist of a range of units sizes, and that applicants and decision makers should have regard to the nature and location of the site, the aim to optimise housing potential sites, the need for additional family housing, and, where appropriate, the mix of uses and range of tenures brought forward in a particular scheme.
- 10.4 As set out in the design section below and elsewhere within this report, the previously approved outline permission (17/1916/O) has approved the principle of providing a corner development of modest scale and with characteristic roof form within the application properties surrounding residential context and acknowledging the existing lawful situation. This is considered to be acceptable and appropriate within the context of Policy D3 of the LP.

- 10.5 The provision of a density of around 53 Units Per Hectare which reflects the generally low-density character of the surrounding area is therefore considered to be appropriate in this area.
- 10.6 It is also acknowledged that the proposed density, mix and building footprint would match that which was approved in the outline permission. As the principle of this density and mix was considered to be acceptable in 17/1916/O, the submitted details relating to these aspects of the proposal are therefore considered to again be acceptable in this instance.

11. **Design**

- 11.1 Policy D3 of the LP states that development proposals should be of high quality, enhancing local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.
- 11.2 Policy D4 of the LP sets out that design and access statements submitted with proposals should demonstrate how proposals meet the design requirements of the London Plan. This policy also sets out that where appropriate, modelling and digital imagery can be used to inform planning decisions.
- 11.3 Policy DH1 of the CS requires all developments to be of a high quality of design and demonstrate that they positively contribute to the improvement of both the built and natural environments.
- 11.4 The originally approved outline permission brought forward a building which covered a ground area of 302sqm and provided 5 units over two storeys, with a hipped roof construction. Generally, this format and size was considered to be acceptable subject to more detailed design which has been brought forward as part of this submission.
- 11.5 The submitted details bring forward a building over largely the same footprint (309sqm), providing 5 units over two storeys, with a hipped roof construction. This layout and format, as well as the positioning of the building, is considered to be consistent and in accordance with the more general submissions which were provided as part of outline permission 17/1916/O.
- 11.6 The proposed development would be two storeys with similar heights to that of the surrounding buildings, which would be in accordance with the overwhelming pattern of development within the surrounding area. The

proposed terrace would feature a hipped roof construction which would replicate the semi-detached dwellings in the immediate locality.

- 11.7 The flat roof elements of the proposal would be exclusively positioned towards the rear of the proposed building – whilst this roof form is not sympathetic to those used in the surrounding area, these aspects would not be visible from the wider public realm and so these aspects of the proposal are considered to be acceptable on balance.
- 11.8 The front elevation of the proposed terrace would maintain a reasonable separation distance between the side boundaries of the application property.
- 11.9 The site is a corner plot. On Ancaster Street to the south the prevailing urban grain of the area includes buildings with a front building line approximately 7m from the highway. On Thornhill Avenue to the east the adjacent buildings would typically have a front building line approximately 3.7m from the Highway. In accordance with this urban grain, on the façade facing Ancaster Street, the development would have a separation distance from the pedestrian path of 6.5m and on the façade facing Thornhill Avenue the development would have a separation distance from the pedestrian path of 4.6m.
- 11.10 With respect to the above, the layout of the building is considered to be consistent with the front building lines of the adjoining properties, with setbacks and articulation to match. It is considered that the layout of the building follows the established siting and rhythm of the group of existing buildings adjoining the site at Ancaster Street and Thornhill Avenue.
- 11.11 Whilst officers do acknowledge that with reference to the neighbouring properties on Thornhill Avenue and Ancaster street the distance between the proposed building and the boundary would be less extensive, when viewed from the public realm, the separation between the proposed boundary would be appear reasonable and in accordance with the surrounding architecture of the semi-detached properties in the locality. It is therefore considered that this, when combined with the 2 storey appearance of the development, would retain the open character within the surround area.
- 11.12 The positioning and layout of openings on both the front and rear elevations of the proposed terrace would be sympathetic to the openings on the surrounding semi-detached dwellings.
- 11.13 The proposed layout of the front and rear garden spaces is considered to be appropriate. Noting how units 2, 3 and 5 all share access from the main front entranceway, the sharing of a front forecourt for some of the dwellings is

considered to be acceptable in this instance. At the rear, each dwelling would have their own separated private garden/ amenity space similar built form of the surrounding locality.

11.14 The submissions state that the proposed development would utilise the below materials:

- External Walls - faced with Wienerberger Con Mosso brickwork.
- Roof - The roofing tiles - clay single-camber with clay bonnet hip tiles, as per the style of the existing building.
- Windows – Aluminium Frame (Grey Colour)
- Boundaries – Mixture of brickwork and timber fences.
- Doors – Unclear
- Retaining Walls, Garden Patios, Front hardstandings – Unclear

11.15 Further details of the proposed materials are proposed to be secured through condition to ensure their quality.

11.16 Overall, the proposed details are considered to be in accordance with Policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan (2021), and Policies DH1 and H5 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014).

12. Quality of Living Environment provided for future residents

12.1 Policy D6 of the LP refers to providing high quality housing developments, with adequately sized rooms and convenient and efficient room layouts which are functional and fit for purpose. This is also reflected in Policies H5 and DH1 of the CS.

GIA

12.2 The following sets out the relevant ‘Minimum Space Standards for New Dwellings’ as per the Technical Housing Standards and Table 3.3 of the London Plan (2016).

Unit	Provision	Min Required GIA	Provided GIA	Min Required Built in Storage	Provided Built in Storage	Compliant?

1	4b6p	106sqm	107.39sq m	3.0sqm	Not Shown	Yes
2	2b4p	79sqm	84.54sq m	2.0sqm	Not Shown	Yes
3	2b4p	70sqm	74.66sq m	2.0sqm	3.81sqm	Yes
4	4b6p	106sqm	107.4sq m	3.0sqm	Not Shown	Yes
5	3b4p	74sqm	96.87sq m	2.5sqm	Not Shown	Yes

12.3 The submitted drawings show that all of the proposed units would be compliant with the relevant GIA requirements. Whilst officers do note that the development would not provide any built-in storage, it is considered that this storage can be reasonably provided within the GIA's that have been set out and would not result in a poor quality of accommodation.

Bedroom Sizes

12.4 Pursuant to the Technical Housing Standards, a dwelling with two (2) or more bedspaces must have at least one (1) double (or twin) bedroom. A double or twin bedroom with two (2) bed spaces is required to have a minimum floor area of at least 11.5m² and a width of 2.75m. A single bedroom with one (1) bed space is required to have a minimum floor area of 7.5m² and be at least 2.15m wide.

12.5 All of the proposed rooms appear to be compliant with the relevant width and floorspace requirements. This aspect of the proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Bathroom Provision

12.6 The standards also set out that:

“GIAs for one storey dwellings include enough space for one bathroom and one additional WC (or shower room) in dwellings with 5 or more bedspaces. GIAs for two and three storey dwellings include enough space for one bathroom and one additional WC (or shower room). Additional sanitary facilities may be included without increasing the GIA provided that all aspects of the space standard have been met.”

12.7 All of the proposed dwellings are compliant with the above requirement.

Floor to ceiling height requirements

12.8 The LP standard sets a minimum ceiling height of 2.5 meters for at least 75% of the gross internal area of the dwelling. This is to address the unique heat island effect of London and the distinct density and flatted nature of most of its residential development.

12.9 Reviewing the submitted section drawings, it is considered all of the proposed dwellings would be in accordance with the above requirement.

Outdoor Space

12.10 The Mayor’s Housing SPG also prescribes standards for outdoor space as follows:

- Standard 26 – Minimum 5m² private outdoor space for 1-2 person dwellings and 1m² additional outdoor space per additional occupant.
- Standard 27 – Minimum 1.5m width and depth for all private outdoor spaces.

12.11 With reference to each of the private amenity spaces which are proposed, it is considered that the proposed development would achieve this standard.

12.12 Whilst it is unfortunate that the private rear garden space which would serve Unit 5 is not positioned with direct access from the dwelling, examining how its GIA provision is significantly greater than the minimum requirement for a dwelling of this residential mix, it is considered that this is sufficient compensation for the lack of direct access to the rear garden and so this aspect of the proposal is acceptable in this instance.

Outlook, privacy, access to daylight/sunlight and other considerations

12.13 The proposed dwellings would all be dual-aspect. With the exception of the living accommodation for Unit 3, the bedrooms and habitable spaces including

cooking, living, and sleeping areas, due to the positioning and size of the relevant openings, would receive adequate levels of outlook and would receive a satisfactory amount of daylight. All habitable spaces would receive direct sunlight for part of the day. Given the positioning of the nearby properties, it is considered that the proposed habitable spaces would receive adequate levels of privacy and would not be significantly overlooked in any capacity.

- 12.14 Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed rear habitable living space serving Unit 3 would feature a limited immediate outlook, given that this window would be south facing, that the unit overall is dual aspect and would benefit from its own area of private amenity space, the quality of accommodation for this unit is considered overall to be acceptable.
- 12.15 Officers note that given the nature of the site as a corner plot, as well as the partially flatted nature of the proposed development, a level of overlooking between the proposed areas of external amenity space would be allowed. Within the immediate surrounding areas and particularly in the numerous pairs of semi-detached dwellings in the surrounding area, a level of overlooking from first floor areas into neighbouring gardens is extremely common. This level of overlooking is therefore considered to be acceptable given that this relationship has already been established within the wider area and that some degree of overlooking between private amenity spaces is common on flatted schemes such as this.

Conclusion:

- 12.16 Overall, it is considered that the proposal would provide an acceptable quality of accommodation for residents and would therefore be in accordance to Policy D6 of the LP, the Mayor of London Housing SPG (2016) and Policies H5 and DH1 of the Core Strategy in this regard.

13. Impact on neighbouring amenity

- 13.1 Policy D14 of the LP (2021) sets out that development proposals should seek to proactively manage noise impacts in a variety of ways where possible. Proposals should use good design to mitigate and minimise existing and potential nuisances generated by uses and activities located in the area.
- 13.2 Policy DH(b) of the Core Strategy requires new development to demonstrate that there would be no significant loss of amenity to adjacent or nearby properties, by reducing the amount of daylight, sunlight, privacy or outlook they enjoy, by creating an unneighbourly sense of enclosure, or by unacceptably impacting the wind environment or microclimate.

- 13.3 Policy E(a) states that planning permission will not normally be granted where a proposed development or change of use would generally have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of adjacent occupiers or uses, and especially where proposals would be likely to result in the unacceptable emission of noise, light, vibrations, odours, fumes, dust, water and Soil pollutants or grit.
- 13.4 On the southern boundary, the proposed new building would be 4.1m away from the adjacent No. 1 Ancaster Street. With reference to this separation distance, and taking into account the buildings two storey form, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any significantly detrimental loss of daylight/ sunlight or increased sense of enclosure to this property. Examining how the proposed development would not bring forward any openings on the southern side elevation, it is considered that the development would not result in any significantly detrimental loss of privacy or overlooking related impacts to No. 1 Ancaster Street.
- 13.5 On the eastern boundary, the proposed building would be 3.61m away from No. 2 Thornhill Avenue. The existing western side elevation windows at No. 2 Thornhill Avenue do not appear to serve habitable windows. On this boundary, the building would primarily have a height of around 3.5m (the flat roof element) and officers also take into account the lower topography than No. 2 Thornhill Avenue and the existing outbuilding on the western boundary of this site. With these factors in mind, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in a significantly detrimental loss of daylight/ sunlight or increased sense of enclosure to this property. Examining how the proposed development would not bring forward any openings on the eastern side elevation, it is considered that the development would not bring forward any unacceptable loss of privacy impacts to No. 2 Thornhill Avenue. To further protect the amenity enjoyed by neighbouring properties, a condition is attached to the decision notice to ensure that the flat roof elements of the proposal are not used as private amenity space.
- 13.6 It is noted that the increase in the number of residents at the application site would likely result in an increase in the amount of noise generated by the site. However, given the density is considered acceptable and that the surrounding area is residential in nature, the additional noise created from the additional occupants is not considered to be at a level that would be unacceptable.

- 13.7 A condition is recommended to be attached to the decision notice ensuring that Demolition and Construction Method statement is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority to properly assess any disruption to neighbours that may result from the demolition and construction phases and to ensure that these aspects of development would not result in significantly detrimental impacts to neighbouring amenity.
- 13.8 Taking into account the proposals significant distance away from the other nearby dwellings, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in any significantly detrimental amenity impacts to these properties.
- 13.9 Overall, it is considered that the proposed development is therefore in accordance with Policy D14 of the adopted London Plan (2021) and Policies DH(b) and Policy E(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014).

14. Transport and Highways Impacts

- 14.1 Policy T2 of the LP states that development proposals should deliver patterns of land use that facilitate residents making shorter, regular trips by walking or cycling. This policy also states that development proposals should reduce the dominance of vehicles on London's streets whether stationary or moving.
- 14.2 Policy T6 of the LP states that car-free development should be the starting point for all development proposals in places that are (or are planned to be) well-connected by public transport, with developments elsewhere designed to provide the minimum necessary parking.
- 14.3 Policy T6.1 further sets out that maximum parking provision for residential development should be in accordance with Table 10.3. For a residential development of this size, the London Plan sets out that a maximum of 0.75 parking spaces per dwelling should be provided.
- 14.4 The requirements of these London Plan Policies are supported by Policy IM(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014)
- 14.5 The site has an extremely low access level (PTAL) of 1b (on a scale of 1-6, where 1 is the lowest possible level of public transport accessibility). This indicates that the site has as an extremely low level of public transport accessibility.

- 14.6 The site is not located within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).
- 14.7 Officers note that the provision of five (5) onsite parking spaces was given outline permission in the previous application 17/1916/O. This provision was subject to a reserved matters application which forms the basis of these submissions.
- 14.8 The submissions bring forward the provision of five (5) onsite parking spaces in line with the previous outline permission. One (1) parking space would be accessed via an existing drop kerb from Thornhill Avenue and the remaining four (4) parking spaces would be accessed via two new drop kerbs on Ancaster Street.
- 14.9 Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed drop kerbs are not within the submitted red line boundary, given that Ancaster street does not constitute a classified road, the relevant proposed crossovers do not require formal planning permission and are dealt with solely by the local authorities highways department separately to this application. This approach is therefore considered to be acceptable in this instance.
- 14.10 It is noted that the approved outline consent and proposed provision of only five (5) parking spaces is subtly above the recommended parking provision for proposals of this size within the LP. With reference to the sites extremely low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) the provision of five (5) parking spaces at the site is considered to be an appropriate parking provision for the size of the development which is proposed and would have an acceptable impact on the on-street parking conditions of the surrounding area, which is sensitive given the nearby place of worship and school.
- 14.11 This aspect of the proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable, and this stance is supported by the Local Authorities Transport and Highways internal consultee, who has raised no objection to the submissions.
- 14.12 Officers are therefore satisfied that the proposal would be in accordance with Policies T2, T4, T6 and T6.1 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies IM4 and IM(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014).

15. Cycle Parking

- 15.1 Policy T5 of the LP states that development proposals should help remove barriers to cycling and create a healthy environment in which people choose

to cycle. The policy is clear that proposals should do this by meeting providing cycle parking at least in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Table 10.2 and Figure 10.3. The cycle parking should be fit for purpose, secure and well-located.

15.2 Within Policy T5, Table 10.2 in the LP sets out that a proposal of the type brought forward in this application should provide ten (10) cycle parking spaces.

15.3 This is supported by Policy IM(b) and IM(c) of the Core Strategy.

15.4 Officers note that the provision of cycle parking at the site has been conditioned in the original decision notice of the outline permission (17/1916/O). The condition is listed below:

4. *“Notwithstanding plan 12-51/RP/102A 06.13 approved under Condition 3, and the information required for reserved matters under Condition 2, ten (10) spaces for secure and sheltered parking of bicycles. The construction of the spaces shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development.*

Reason: In order that the development promotes sustainable transport options for prospective residents and ensure compliance with Policy 6.9 of the London Plan (2015) and Policies IM(b) and IM(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014).

15.5 The submissions bring forward ten (10) cycle parking spaces, which is consistent with the previously approved outline permission and the provisions of the LP and the Core Strategy.

15.6 This aspect of the proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable subject to specific details of the cycle storage and their required associated shelters which is sought via a condition attached to the decision notice.

16. Waste and Refuse Storage

16.1 Policy H5 of the Core Strategy identifies that development needs to minimise the production of waste, to promote the reuse and recycling of waste materials and to ensure that waste disposal is environmentally responsible. As such, residential schemes should incorporate measures for community recycling that minimises waste disposal and should provide refuse bins and recycling boxes. This is supported by LP Policies S17 and S18.

- 16.2 In the outline permission, units 1 and 4 were provided three (3) separate refuse bins (size unclear), with an additional shared bin provision for the remaining units with three waste bin and one (1) 1100L eurobin to be provided.
- 16.3 In this submission, the proposed refuse provision would be slightly altered, with Units 1 and 4 being provided three (3) 240L refuse bins each and the remaining units being provided 2 no. 1100l euro bins and a 500L wheelie bin. This is considered to be an acceptable alternate permission, and the acceptability of this proposal is also supported by the Local Authorities Waste Department internal consultee.
- 16.4 This is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the Waste Guidance Note. This aspect of the proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policies S17 and S18 of the London Plan (2021), Policy H5 of the Core Strategy and the Royal Borough of Greenwich's Guidance Note for the Storage and Collection of Waste and Recycling Materials.

17. Sustainability

- 17.1 Policy DH1 sets out Council's expectations for all development to maximise energy conservation and minimise future carbon dioxide emissions and mitigate climate change, and to comply with LP Policy S12 and Policy E1 (Carbon Emissions) of the Royal Greenwich Core Strategy and Detailed Policies 2014.
- 17.2 Policy S12 specifically sets out that non-major residential development such as that which is proposed in this application should achieve a minimum reduction of carbon emissions of at least 10 percent beyond those requirements set out in the building regulations. Where it is clearly demonstrated that the zero-carbon target cannot be fully achieved on-site, any shortfall should be provided, in agreement with the borough, either:
- 1) through a cash in lieu contribution to the borough's carbon offset fund, or
 - 2) of-site provided that an alternative proposal is identified and delivery is certain.
- 17.3 Carbon emissions are to be reduced in accordance with the Mayor's energy hierarchy;
1. Be lean: use less energy
 2. Be clean: supply energy efficiently; and

3. Be green: use renewable energy

- 17.4 The Greener Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document provides guidance on how new development in the borough should be designed and built so that it has a positive impact on the environment and achieves the highest standards of sustainable design and construction.
- 17.5 The above is not a requirement for a development of this scale, however the development as a whole should strive to meet these standards and applicants are encouraged to submit a report that addresses the requirements set by the Greener Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- 17.6 LP Policy SI5 requires development to minimise the use of mains water by incorporating water saving measures and equipment and designing residential development so that mains water consumption would meet a target of 105 litres or less per head per day. This is captured under the Greener Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- 17.7 Conditions are recommended to be attached to the decision notice to ensure that the above policies and recommendations are adhered to.

18. Inclusive Design

- 18.1 Policy D5 of the LP requires developments to achieve the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design.
- 18.2 Policy D7 of the LP also sets out that all new dwellings should meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'.
- 18.3 Core Strategy Policy H5 supports the principles of inclusive living environment and Policy DH1 also states that all new developments should achieve accessible and inclusive environments. The proposed new dwellings at the application site are therefore expected to comply with Part M4(2) of the approved Building Regulations.
- 18.4 Standard 11 of the Mayors Housing SPG (2016) further states that:
- 18.5 "90 per cent of new build housing should meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' with the remaining 10 per cent meeting Building Regulation requirement M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings'."

18.6 Examining the generally large flat sizes and bedroom sizes, it is considered that compliance with Part M4(2) could be achieved for all of the proposed dwellings. A condition is attached to the decision notice requesting further details related to this requirement.

19. Trees

19.1 Policy G7 of the LP sets out that London's urban forest and woodlands should be protected and maintained, and new trees and woodlands should be planted in appropriate locations in order to increase the extent of London's urban forest – the area of London under the canopy of trees.

19.2 Policy OS(f) of the Core Strategy requires an appropriate level of survey to enable decision to be made about the existing trees on the site. Development decisions are required to consider the protection of trees and their root systems both during and after building operations, and achievement of appropriate replacement of trees taking account of size, coverage, and species where it is agreed that trees can be felled.

19.3 Three (3) protected trees (1 x Lime and 2 x Cypressus) (TPO 55) are registered as being in in the rear garden of the application site although only one tree (the Lime at the southwestern most corner of the site) is present, and digital imagery shows this to be the case since at least 2013. This tree is identified as T1 in the drawing pack. A large amount of unkept vegetation is also currently present at the rear of the application site.

19.4 The development footprint is set back 5m from the protected common lime tree, denoted as T1 on the application drawings. From the submitted Arboricultural Assessments, officers are satisfied that this protected tree would not be subject to any significantly detrimental impacts should the proposed development go ahead.

19.5 To accommodate the proposed development, as shown on the proposed layout plan, one individual category 'C' tree (Goat willow no. 2) as identified in the arboricultural implications report, which is not covered by a TPO, is to be removed, because it is situated too close to the proposed development to enable it to be retained. This principle was established under the previously approved outline permission at the site (17/1916/O).

19.6 The unprotected group of trees (G1) as shown in the report is also to be removed as part of the proposals and this too is not covered by the TPO.

- 19.7 The submissions bring forward plans to install four (4) new trees, along with landscaping vegetation, to mitigate the impact of the tree and vegetation loss. The proposed trees would be a mixture of birch and maple species, which have reasonable longevity and would contribute to the leafy character of the surrounding area.
- 19.8 Following discussions with the Local Authorities Tree Officer, this tree re-provision and the general vegetation brought forward by the submissions is considered to be satisfactory.
- 19.9 The proposed development is therefore considered to be generally in accordance with Policy G7 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy OS(f) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014).

20. Community Infrastructure Levy

- 20.1 The Mayor has introduced a London-wide Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to help implement the London Plan (2021), particularly Policy T9. The Mayoral CIL formally came into effect on 1st April 2012, and it will be paid on commencement of most new development in Greater London that was granted planning permission on or after that date. The Mayor's CIL will contribute towards the funding of Crossrail. The Mayor has arranged boroughs into three charging bands. The rate for Greenwich is £35 per square metre.
- 20.2 The current application is liable to this requirement.

21. RBG CIL

- 21.1 The Royal Borough adopted its Local Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule, infrastructure (Regulation 123) list, instalments policy and exceptional circumstances relief policy on the 25th March 2015 and came into effect in Royal Greenwich on the 6th April 2015.
- 21.2 The current application is liable to this requirement.

22. Implications for disadvantaged groups

- 22.1 Beyond those aspects brought forward in the inclusive design section of this report at part 18 of the committee report, there are no implications for disadvantaged groups. A proposal of this size is not required by the London

Plan (2021) to provide any dwellings which are in accordance with Building Regulation Requirement M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings.'

22.2 Notwithstanding the above, officers do acknowledge that the development does bring forward three (3) wheelchair accessible zones adjacent to parking spaces to enable easier vehicular access to wheelchair users.

23. Conclusions

23.1 The proposed development brings forward a scheme which would be in accordance with the relevant outline permission which has been approved (17/1916/O).

23.2 The proposed development would not result in a significantly detrimental impact on the character of the wider surrounding area. The proposed development would not result in any unacceptable impacts to the amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers.

23.3 The proposed development would provide an acceptable quality of accommodation to prospective residents and would not result in any significantly detrimental amenity impacts to any of the nearby properties.

23.4 Accordingly, it is recommended that permission be granted for application reference 20/3353/R, in line with Section 1.1 of this report.

Background Papers:

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

The London Plan (2021)

Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014)

Responses from consultations

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