

# ROYAL BOROUGH OF GREENWICH

## PLANNING BOARD

3 MARCH 2020 AT 6.30PM

### MINUTE

#### PRESENT:

##### Members:

Councillor Sarah Merrill (Chair); Councillors Norman Adams, Olu Babatola, Linda Bird, Peter Brooks, Gary Dillon, Clive Mardner, Linda Perks and Geoffrey Brighty.

##### Officers:

Assistant Director Planning & Building Control, Planning Manager (Major Developments), Senior Principal Planning Officer, Planning Officer, Assistant Head of Legal Services and Corporate Governance Officer

#### Under Standing Orders:

At the commencement of the meeting, the Chair announced the procedure which would be followed for considering the item(s) before the Board. The Chair confirmed the names of members of the public who had registered to speak on the item(s) and clarified that only those members of the public included on the register would be called to address the Planning Board. The Chair advised that all attendees were welcome to film, record, blog or tweet during the meeting so long as this did not disturb proceedings and flash photography was not permitted. The Chair advised that Board Members would be using electronic devices to access the agenda, reports and documents published and submitted for consideration at the meeting.

#### Item

#### No.

#### I. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received for Councillors Angela Cornforth, Adel Khaireh and Nigel Fletcher

## **2. Urgent Business**

The Planning Board noted and accepted the Planning Officers' Addendum Report, circulated in advance of the meeting, in relation to;  
Item 4 – Ordnance Pier, Greenwich – Ref: I7/2842/F

The Chair advised that she was changing the running order of the Agenda and would be taking Item 5 as the first item of 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. Ordnance Pier, adjacent to InterContinental London, The 2 Hotel, Waterview Drive, Greenwich. SE10 0TW**

The Planning Board accepted an illustrative presentation from the Senior Principal Planning Officer who advised that the focus of the ecological considerations was to protect and enhance the ecological environment. In this case, the pier was considered to be of no significant ecological value as there was no evidence of the site being used by ground nesting birds and had become overrun by invasive flora, due to lack of maintenance.

In response to Members' questions, the Senior Principal Planning Officer advised that the exterior elevation would be of glass and aluminium cladding.

The Planning Board accepted an address from the Greenwich Conservation Group representative who, in speaking in objection to the application, stated the Group's main concern was in relation to the s106 Heads of Terms for the Thames Clipper. The proposed pier was located out on a limb, whereas the Knight Dragon development, situated nearby on the Peninsula, would be closer to the residential area.

In response to Members' questions the Greenwich Conservation Group representative advised that the Knight Dragon pier was part of the Masterplan and its location would better provide a benefit to the entire community and commuters. The Conservation Group believed that it was unlikely that the Thames Clipper would stop at both piers and they strongly felt that, if granted, the Ordnance Pier should not be built until the Knight Dragon Pier had been completed.

The Assistant Director of Planning and Building Control responded to Members that, if consent were granted to construction for the Ordnance Pier, this would not rule out construction of another pier, which could be used by the Thames Clipper.

The Planning Board accepted an address from the vice chair of the Greenwich Wildlife Advisory Group, who advised the Planning Board that the Pier was one of the last existing pocket parks, create by children as part of the year 2000 celebrations, along with the ecology park. Unfortunately, due to lack of maintenance and care the pier pocket park had become overrun by invasive vegetation and was not used by ground nesting birds. However, as part of a river survey London Zoo had discovered that sea horses were again living in the Thames and this pier was within their habitat zone. He advised that there was an extreme issue of mud displacement, along the foreshore, since the Thame Clipper began going around the peninsula which was having a detrimental impact on wildlife.

In response to Members' questions the vice chair of the Greenwich Wildlife Advisory Group stated that when the site was operational as docks, the vessels used were less powerful. The Thames Clipper's most detrimental impact was when it left a mooring as the engine worked like jet propulsion, with the greatest impact below the waterline. The Woolwich Yacht Club had been reporting the reduction of mud on the foreshore, since the Thames Clipper service commenced to Woolwich. He confirmed that the London Zoo survey was undertaken two years ago and had found Short Nose Sea Horses in the area.

The vice chair of the Greenwich Wildlife Advisory Group believed that the issue of the impact of the Thames Clipper on the erosion of the riverbank needed to be properly investigated before work on the pier commenced. He added that the erosion of the foreshore had, over the past few years, had a real impact on wildlife and many once common birds to the area had almost disappeared. He believed that there was an issue that developers and the GLA were not considering the wider impact of developments on the Thames and the wildlife it supported.

A Member noted the concern but believed that the objection did not appear to fall within areas the Board could consider, and questioned if a further, in depth Environmental Impact Assessment was required.

The Chair considered that this was a wider issue which officers could look at, regardless of the Boards decision on this application. The Assistant Director of Planning and Building Control added that Condition 36, set out in appendix

2 to the report, required that no river service vessel could operate at the development until an impact assessment on any potential impact on the riverbed had been undertaken.

The Planning Board accepted an address from a resident from Tower Hamlets, opposite the site, who, speaking in objection, stated that he was concerned that no account appeared to have been taken of the Council's Air Quality Report 2019. There were Cruise ships mooring in the area, the Woolwich Ferry Service down river and the existing Thames Clipper service, none of which have been referenced, nor the impact the proposed water taxi. The GLA guidance required the reduction of emissions and any vessel using this pier would add to the pollution levels. He noted that if Transport for London ULEZ (Ultra Low Emission Zone) covered the Thames, the proposed vessels using the pier would be banned and would have a significant impact on local air quality, breaching guidance.

In response to Members questions the resident responded that he felt that the report indicated that Greenwich Council was brushing the issue of air quality 'under the carpet' as there was no mention of emissions from the use of the river.

The Planning Board accepted an address from a second resident from Tower Hamlets, opposite the site, who, speaking in objection, stated that whilst he supported the development of public infrastructure, he objected to the inclusion of a bar, café and restaurant on the pier, due to the noise, which easily travelled over the Thames. He advised that the services were not necessary for the function of a pier and would create noise pollution and disturbance to residents.

The Planning Board accepted an address from the applicant who set out the background to the application. He advised that the building would be of a stone and concrete core with aluminium cladding. He was aware of the issues that had come to light since the Grenfell fire and assured Members that the products being used were not similar at all. In respect of the highlighted environmental impact, he advised that he wanted to develop something that would benefit future generations and that this would improve accessibility to the area whilst taking traffic off the roads.

The applicant advised that he wanted to build somewhere special, stating that the pier would help 'put Greenwich on the map'. He noted that the Port of London Authority supported improvements to river transport and that the Thames Clippers were getting greener, with 2 hybrid vessels coming into use

by 2021. He considered that the pier would allow improved accessibility to the peninsula.

In response to Members' questions the applicant advised that he would be looking to employ workers from the Borough, before going further afield.

The applicant's planning agent confirmed to Members that the initial concerns raised by the GLA had been addressed in the revised proposal before Members. The applicant added that they had worked with the Mayor's Officer, GLA and Port of London Authority over the past three years to overcome the issues of accessibility.

Members commented that the applicant had not addressed the concerns around the environmental impact of the pier and construction, thereof. They also sought clarification on an impact on the Thames Path, and how the applicants intended to reassure residents regarding noise and disturbance.

The applicant's planning agent advised that they had considered the ecological impact which was covered by conditions. He added that they were committed to protecting local wildlife and would take the required mitigating actions, as required. There would be a green roof to the pier building, which would provide more green space than that of the current pier.

The applicants planning agent confirmed that there were no plans to close the Thames Path as most of the construction would be carried out via the river. The applicant added that, if at any point, it did become necessary to temporarily close the footpath this would be staffed to ensure health and safety was maintained.

A Member noted the comment that this was one of two remaining ecology parks established as part of the year the 2000 celebrations and asked if the applicant if it would be possible to commemorate the site's history, as part of the development.

The applicant's planning agent considered that it would be appropriate to incorporate a design element to reflect the history of the site and local school children could be approached to design a history memorial.

A Member noted that hybrid Thames Clippers were due to come into use by 2021 and asked if it was possible to condition that only hybrid vessels could dock at the pier. The Assistant Director of Planning and Building Control advised that this would be considered an unreasonable condition.

The applicant advised the Board that they would be encouraging the use of hybrid and green vessels and would be fitting an electric charge point. In respect of the use of the building on the pier, he had no fixed plans as to restaurant and café provision, but it would be under cover. The pier would not be near residential areas and he would ensure that no noise nuisance was caused to the residents, on either side of the Thames.

In determining the application before them, the Planning Board Members made the following comments.

A Member felt that this was a complicated site but felt that the Conditions were sufficient and could be enforced.

A Member considered that the proposal would bring more benefit to the applicant than to residents on either side of the River but considered that the Conditions alleviated their concerns.

Several of the Board Members commented that there was a need to develop infrastructure, but this must be done in a way as to respect and protect the natural environment. Two Members requested that, further to the outcome of this application, Officers progressed investigations as to any damage begun caused to the Thames foreshore by the operation of the Thames Clipper.

A Member noted that this was an interesting development, open to everyone.

The Chair put the Planning Officers recommendation to grant planning consent to the vote with 9 Members in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

### **Resolved unanimously –**

That full planning permission be granted for the conversion of the pier for riverboat passenger services involving alterations and extension of existing pier including additional link bridge, single storey restaurant, bar, cafe and toilet together with new brow, pontoon, piles and associated works.

That planning permission be granted subject to:

- A. 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;

- B. The prior completion of an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) containing the planning obligations summarised in the heads of terms set out in this report (Section 18), its addendums, and according to the conditions (Appendix 2) to be detailed in the notice of determination;
- C. To authorise the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to:
- i. make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in this report (Appendix 2) and its addendums, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice; and
  - ii. 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 (Section 18) and its addendums.
- D. That in the event that the Section 106 Agreement is not completed within three (3) months of the date of this Planning Board meeting, to authorise the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to consider whether permission should be refused on the grounds that the proposals are unacceptable in the absence of the benefits which would have been secured, and if so, to determine the application with reasons for refusal which will include the following:
- a. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure use of the pier for passenger services and works to the adjacent Thames Path, the development would comprise non-river related development within the Blue Ribbon Network contrary to policies 7.25 and 7.28 of the London Plan (2016) and policies DH(k), DH(n) and IM3 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (Adopted July 2014) and the Planning obligations (s106) Guidance SPD (adopted July 2015).

## **5. Garages to the rear of 36 Southspring, Avery Hill, DA15 8EA**

The Planning Board accepted an illustrative presentation from the Planning Officer who, in response to Members' questions, advised that the exact species of plants to be used on the green wall would be agreed as part of the Conditions.

The Planning Officer confirmed that a flood risk assessment had been undertaken and reviewed. It was considered that there was a low risk of flooding and adequate flooding mitigation actions were proposed.

In respect of the roof design the Planning Officer advised that it was considered a flat roof reduced the impact on the street scene, was complementary and of a high quality. He confirmed that it would be a green roof.

The applicant's agent advised that they were in attendance to respond to Members' questions, clarifying that the green wall would be a wire structure with climbing plants. That all possible measures were being taken to future proof the properties with the ground floors to be 500mm higher than the 300mm 1-in-100-year flood guidance. This would also accommodate a 40% increase on the projected increased rain levels due to climate change.

The Chair put the Planning Officers' recommendation to grant planning consent to the vote with 9 Member in favour 0 against and 0 abstentions.

**Resolved unanimously –**

That planning permission be granted for the demolition of existing garages and construction of a two-storey, two-bedroom dwelling house, with associated parking space, landscaping, waste and cycle storage.

That planning permission be granted in accordance with the conditions set out in appendix 2 of the report, to be detailed in the notice of determination; and

That the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control be authorised to make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in this report, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

The meeting closed at 8.28pm

---

Chair