

ROYAL BOROUGH OF GREENWICH

PLANNING BOARD

5 MARCH 2024 AT 6.30PM

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Members:

Councillor Gary Dillon (Chair); Councillors, Olu Babatola, Sandra Bauer, David Gardner, Maisie Richards Cottell, and Pat Greenwell.

Officers:

Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control, Senior Principal Planning Officer Major Developments, Planning Officer, Planning Officers x 4, Assistant Head of Legal Services and Committee Services Officer.

At the commencement of the meeting, the Chair announced the procedure which would be followed for considering the item(s) before the Board and confirmed the names of those who had registered to speak, clarifying that only those included on the register would be called to address the Planning Board.

Item

No.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Majella Anning, Peter Baker, Clare Burke-McDonald, and Danny Thorpe

2. Urgent Business

The Planning Board accepted the Planning Officers' Addendum Report, circulated in advance of the meeting, in relation to -

- Item 5 – Land adjacent to 25 Morden Street, London, SE13 7QX and 82 Lewisham Road, London, SE13 7QR – Ref: 23/0889/F
- Item 6 – Alpha Meridian College, 148 Greenwich High Road, London, SE10 8NN – 22/1754/F & 22/1626/L
- Item 8 - The Albion, 48 Woolwich Church Street, Woolwich, SE18 5NN - Ref: 22/0969/F

The Planning Board also accepted public and applicants submissions in respect of Items 5, 6, 7 & 8

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. Minutes of previous meeting

Resolved -

That the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Board held on 21 November 2023; 5 December 2023 and 6 February 2024 be agreed upon and signed as a true and accurate record.

5. Land adjacent to 25 Morden Street, London, SE13 7QX and 82 Lewisham Road, London, SE13 7QR – Ref: 23/0889/F

This application was considered by Planning Board on 16 May 2023 and was deferred for a site visit. It was represented to the 18 July 2023 meeting, and further deferred for the applicant to consider improvement's to the cohesion of the public open space.

Planning Board noted submission of a public submission and accepted the Planning Officers illustrative presentation. In response to Members questions the Planning Officer confirmed the reconfigured green area was for public use. The existing garage/garden walls would be replaced with brick walls to a height of 2.4 metres. The new building flank wall would be the same distance away from 84 Morden Street as the existing fence with no windows in the flank wall. The only windows facing the ballpark and nursery were bathrooms with obscured glazing.

Four residents addressed the Planning Board in objection to the revised proposal, accepting that it had been realigned to address concerns raised previously but still felt that the proposal was unsuitable.

That whilst the realignment provided one green space, a significant loss of amenities for existing residents remained, including removal of mature trees and public seating areas surrounded by tall building and a large brick wall.

The loss of trees and green space would adversely impact ground rainwater and created a non-functional space with insufficient space for the Quaggy Festival stage, stalls, and activities. A tall brick wall could overshadow existing gardens and create a walled alleyway encouraging anti-social behaviour with no mention of CCTV provision.

The new blocks were not in keeping with the surroundings and, at 3 floors, was too high. A speaker questioned why a resident was refused consent to add a floor to their house, whereas the over height of the proposal was deemed as acceptable. The bathroom windows would overlook the play area and nursery and although with obscured glazing, could be opened to watch the children.

It would create density issues and further pressure on facilities in an already overpopulated area where provisions, such as doctor's surgeries and dental practices were already oversubscribed. The general consensus was for the green space to remain as it currently was and for another location, off this site, to be found for the blocks.

In response to Members questions the speakers accepted the revisions addressed a lot of the concerns raised but remained an overdevelopment of the site and should be reduced in scale and height to lower than existing blocks. One speaker felt that the applicant had carefully ticked all the boxes, addressing the issues raised on paper, but would still result in the loss of mature trees in favour of sapling or young trees. There would still be a loss of 1/3rd of the community space with an abundance of walls, fencing and secluded areas.

The applicant's representatives addressed the Planning Board, advising all statutory consultation requirements had been adhered to. They had spoken with the Quaggy Centre last week, who confirmed they were satisfied that the revised proposal would accommodate the Quaggy Festival.

The existing sub-station access road and turning circle had to be retained but could be of water permeable paving and greening, where possible. The alleyway between ball court and the development would have a metal railing, not a wall, allowing views though the site. Some boundary treatments resulted from Secure by Design officers recommendations. The replacement rear garage to garden brick walls respected residents wishes.

In response to Members questions the applicant's representatives advised the height of the replacement garden walls was carefully considered with regards to the land elevation and Secure by Design recommendations.

Access to the open green space would be via the existing access routes from Morden Street and Lewisham Road. All six trees would be removed with 16 new trees, a minimum of 10 years old in replacement; a tree specialist had been engaged and if any of the new trees died within the first 5 years, they would be replaced. The Councils Sustainable Team had not raised the question of off-site green space provision solutions.

The Chair noted the replacement and welfare of the trees was covered by Condition's 5 & 13.

Councillor Aiden Smith, Cabinet Member for Regeneration addressed the Planning Board setting out the demand for social housing. The proposal had been re-configured to address the concerns raised by objectors and Board Members and the Quaggy Festival organisers had no objection; open green areas would be retained for public use. He noted there was an unused driveway by House 6 which could be de-paved to increase the green area.

Members considered the application before them and it was generally commented that the proposal was a significant improvement on the original proposal providing 6 new family homes.

It was expressed that the applicant should ensure they establish good communication links with residents, keeping them informed throughout the construction period.

Regret was expressed at the loss of green space but noted the realignment retained public green space and the preservation of the Quaggy Festival.

Councillor David Gardner proposed that an Informative be added requesting that the applicant look at further areas, close to the development site, that could be utilised as an additional public open space. The Chair also sought the additional Condition requiring the use of water permeable paving to Existing Sub Stations access road.

The Chair put the Officers recommendation to grant planning consent with the additional Condition covering the permeable paving of the Sub-Station access and Informative to investigate other areas of potential public greenspace, with

6 Members in favour
0 Members against
0 Members abstaining

Resolved unanimously -

- That Planning Permission be granted for the construction of 2 x 2-Bed Houses and 4 x 3-Bed Houses with associated hard and soft landscaping as well as the rearrangement of footpaths and the communal amenity space on the former garage area.
- That the granting of planning permission be subject to;
 - The conditions set out in Appendix 2 to the main report and its addendums, to be detailed in the notice of determination.
 - An additional condition requiring the use of water permeable paving to Existing Sub Stations access road.
 - An additional Informative requested the applicant to look at further areas, close to the development site, that could be utilised as an additional public open space.
- That the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) be authorised to make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in the main report Appendix 2, its addendums, and the minutes of this Planning Board meeting, where the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) considers it appropriate, before issuing the final decision notice.

6. Alpha Meridian College, 148 Greenwich High Road, London, SE10 8NN – 22/1754/F & 22/1626/L

This application was previously considered by the Planning Board on 17th October 2023 and was deferred to enable the applicant to undertake further daylight and sunlight assessments and consider the comments made by speakers and Members at that meeting.

Planning Board noted submission of a public submission and accepted the Planning Officers illustrative presentation who, in response to Members questions advised the provision of 7 additional units in place of the flexible commercial/community space did not increase the affordable offer, as the build costs for residential accommodation was higher than for open plan office floorspace. The applicant had sought to increase the affordability of the existing affordable units.

A Member expressed disappointment, as they felt the Board was given the impression that conversion of the flexible commercial space to housing units, would increase the percentage of affordable units offered.

The Planning Officer and Senior Principal Planning Officer Major Developments advised Members on the early and late-stage viability process.

Planning Board accepted addresses from two speakers who advised the concerns in relation to noise and disturbance from the external amenity were assured by Condition (*Roof Terrace Hours of Use*) but also sought a commitment from the applicant to provide the telephone number for the concierges, on their website, for quick and direct action, if there was an issue.

One resident stated they had been assured by the investigations into light loss to their home and accepted the assurances given as to the noise level of construction which would be measured, particularly from their property.

Members had no questions for the public speakers and moved to accepting an address from the applicant's representatives who gave a brief history of the building and the work with Planning and Conservations Officers to develop a residential led mixed scheme, which had been considered by the design review panel, and set out the wider public and stakeholder consultation process.

The applicant's representatives continued that as a result of Planning Board Members previous comments some of the commercial/officer space had been converted into residential accommodation which had enabled an increase to discounts on the affordable homes, ranging from 40% to 20% discount applied to the market rent.

In response to Members questions, the applicants representative commented that, as consent had not yet been received it was not possible to market the community space but they had received interest from a local Dance and Yoga School. It was not possible to give a commitment to offer the use of the area at a peppercorn rent to community groups, as management of the space may be undertaken by another company.

The Senior Principal Planning Officer Major Developments advised that, if Members were minded, the request could be made requiring the applicant to market it for community use before going out for a wider commercial use, through the s106 agreement.

The applicant's team continued that Members had made comment on the discount level of the affordable units and whilst the overall all percentage of affordable housing had reduced from 21% to 19%, it was possible to offer these at a higher discount level to address the concerns at truly affordable rent levels, nothing that there was also a late-stage viability review. Whilst the country wide increase in the rents was documented, building cost and interest rates had also increased, noting the viability used 6.5% interest development assessment which was currently 8% - 9%. The cost of converting a building rather than new build was deceptive as the conversion and re-configuration had to be within the confines of the listing requirements, which required specialist skills and additional costs that would not, necessarily, apply to a new build.

They confirmed there would be a dedicated website for the development with the contact details for the concierges including the telephone number. Residents would also be able to approach the on-site management team in person. In terms of public access to the key heritage aspects of the building there was a commitment to opening the Clock Tower, four times a year, for full public access and could look at other community use of that area of the building.

The Planning Officer confirmed to Members that there was on site, outdoor play provision in the sunken courtyard at ground level.

Members considered the application before them expressing disappointment at the lack of additional affordable housing. However, they accepted the advice of the independent consultant to accept the viability report and there would be a deficit on the project, noting the late-stage viability review process.

The resolution of the issue of the impact of light to the neighbouring and development properties was welcomed and the condition to address noise from the external facilities. The proposal was considered a good use of the building and it was hoped that certain areas could be used by the wider community and welcomed that a listed building was being brought back into use.

The Chair put the recommendation that planning consent be granted to the vote with

6 Members in favour

0 Members against

0 Members in abstention

Resolved unanimously -

Application A - ref: 22/1754/F

- That Planning Permission be granted for the construction of a part 1, part 2-storey rooftop build-to rent residential extension (Use Class C3) including rooftop amenity area, alongside a refurbishment and change of use of the existing building from education to a mix of residential (Use Class C3) and flexible employment/community/retail floorspace (within Use Classes E and F), together with hard and soft landscaping, refuse and recycling storage, cycle parking, disabled car parking, and all ancillary works and associated development.

- That the granting of planning permission be subject to:
 - The satisfactory completion of a Section 106 (S106) Legal Agreement obligations as set out in Section 25 of the main report and its addendums
 - The Conditions set out in Appendix 3 of the main report and its addendums.

- That Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) be authorised to:
 - (i) Make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in the report (Appendix 3), its addendums and the minutes of this Planning Board meeting, where the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) considers it appropriate, before issuing the final decision notice.

 - (ii) Finalise the detailed terms of the section 106 agreement (including appended documents) and form of the planning obligations as set out in this report (Section 25), its addendums and the minutes of this Planning Board meeting.

 - (iii) Consider, in the event that the Section 106 Agreement is not completed within three (3) months of the date of this Planning Board resolution, whether consent 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; and if the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) considers it appropriate, to determine the application with reasons for refusal which will include the following:
In the absence of a legal agreement to secure the necessary obligations regarding affordable housing, health and education infrastructure, transport and highway works, public transport enhancements, public

realm improvements, employment and training, the development would fail to mitigate its impact on local services, amenities and infrastructure, environmental sustainability and open space contrary to policies H1, H4, H5, H7, H8, S2, SI 2, SI 3, T2, T4, T9 and DFI of the London Plan (2021) and H3, H5, H(e), EA4, EA(c), OSI, EI, CH(a), IM1, IM4, IM(a) and IM(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (Adopted July 2014), and the Planning Obligations (s106) Guidance SPD (July 2015).

Application B - Listed Building Consent ref: 22/1626/L

- That Listed Building Consent be granted for a part 1, part 2-storey rooftop build-to rent residential extension (Use Class C3) including rooftop amenity area, alongside a refurbishment and change of use of the existing building from education to a mix of residential (Use Class C3) and flexible employment/community/retail floorspace (within Use Classes E and F), together with hard and soft landscaping, refuse and recycling storage, cycle parking, disabled car parking, and all ancillary works and associated development.
- That the granting of Listed Building Consent be subject to the Conditions set out in Appendix 4 of the main report and its addendums.
- That the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) be authorised to make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in the report (Appendix 4), its addendums and the minutes of this Planning Board meeting, where the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) considers it appropriate, before issuing the final decision notice.

The Planning Board briefly adjourned at 08.50 pm, reconvening at 08.58 pm.

7. Kidbrooke Village, Phase 5, Block C only, Kidbrooke, SE3 – Ref: 23/3546/MA

Planning Board noted the applicants additional submissions and accepted an illustrative presentation from the Planning officer who, in response to Members questions confirmed that electric vehicle charge points were secured by condition. The shared podium areas would only be accessible to residents of the block and was policy compliant.

The Planning Officer confirmed the re-configuration of each floor would result in overall increase of 22 units with no change to the affordable offer. The play space area was being increased and individual properties retained policy compliant outdoor amenity space. Whilst the London Plan supported car free developments, the existing scheme remained implementable and whilst a further reduction in car parking was encouraged, the cycle parking was increased car parking was still provided and permissible.

That the visual impact assessment showed the increased height of 1.2 metres to building C1 and 0.9 to building C1 would be largely imperceptible and it was considered there would be little to any impact of the view from Blackheath.

The applicant addressed the Planning Board advising on the overall housing mix with 22% 3-bed family homes, which, with the increase in 2-bed four person units would result in an overall increase to 49% larger homes which they considered could be used by families

In response to Members questions the applicant stated there was no additional basement parking added. There would be a reduction of 13 car parking spaces on the extant proposal and the car parking management plan allowed for further reduction, if necessary. The provision of accessible parking spaces was retained, and the level of cycle parking increased.

The change in construction process from modular to traditional resulted from the closure of the Barkley Homes modular factory. The change resulted in decreased floor to floor heights which did not impact individual rooms or floor to ceiling heights, resulting in some buildings decreasing in height and only minor increases, 1.2 metres and 0.9, which were not considered to materially impact views from Blackheath.

The Chair enquired if an alternate tenure such as affordable rent was considered. The applicant advised that, whilst the shared-ownership market was challenging, they considered it was not possible to change the tenure types and percentage in relation to this application due to the costs related to required fire safety amendments. However, the overall percentage provision across the masterplan would remain policy compliant as a result of the proposal. The provision of additional rented and affordable rented accommodation was being considered for delivery in a further phase.

The Chair moved straight to the vote on the recommendation to grant material amendments to extant planning consent with

6 Members in favour

0 Members against

0 Members abstaining

Resolved unanimously

- That an application submitted under section 73 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 be **granted** for a material amendment to Planning Permission 19/3415/F dated 31st March 2021 for the 'Demolition of existing buildings and erection of residential units, publicly accessible open space and associated access, car parking, cycle parking and landscaping, erection of a new pavilion building within the Park. The proposals result in the uplift of residential units compared to approved Planning Permission refs. 14/2607/F (as amended) related to Phase 3 and ref. 14/2611/F (as amended) related to Phase 5' for a amendments to condition 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.
- That the material amendments be granted by agreement of;
 - The amendments to Condition 2 (Approved Drawings), 4 (Quantum of Development), 6 (Compliance with Approved Environmental Statement), 7 (Compliance with EIA Mitigation Measures), 8 (Land Uses), 9 Quantum of Development), 10 (Maximum Floor Space Restrictions) and amendments to other relevant conditions as necessary, and the addition of energy and suitability Conditions 74-78 to capture the following changes to Phase 5, Building C:
 - That the Fire Strategy updates comply with current guidance including additional staircases and lifts, protected lobby, risers, and other related changes.
 - The change from modular to traditional construction, thereby resulting in a reduction in the height of building C2 by 1.2m and building C3 by 0.9m.
 - The revised undercroft layout including revised cycle storage, car parking, plant requirement, bins, etc.
 - Offset of the NIA lost to additional staircase and lifts, results in the following:
 - i. Revisions to the unit mix.
 - ii. Increase in the height of building C1 and C4 by 1.2m and 2.450m respectively.
 - iii. Additional 22 residential units; and
 - iv. Refinement of the footprint/stepping on the elevations.

- That consent be subject to:
 - i. The completion of a Deed of Variation to the extant s106 Agreement (dated 31 March 2021) securing the heads of terms set out in this report (Section 23) or a replacement consolidated S106 Agreement incorporating the provisions of the 31 March 2021 Agreement as amended by the heads of terms set out in this report (Section 23) (the form of which shall be as the Assistant Head of Legal Services (Planning & Procurement) considers most appropriate), and
 - ii. Conditions set out in Appendix 2 of the report.

- That the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) be authorised to:
 - i. Make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in the report (Appendix 2), its addendums and the minutes of this Planning Board meeting, where the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) considers it appropriate, before issuing the final decision notice

 - ii. Finalise the detailed terms of the deed of variation or section 106 agreement (including appended documents) and form of the planning obligations as set out in this report (Section 23), its addendums and the minutes of this Planning Board meeting

 - iii. Consider, in the event that the deed of variation or Section 106 Agreement is not completed within three (3) months of the date of this Planning Board resolution, whether consent 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; and if the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) considers it appropriate, to determine the application with reasons for refusal which will include the following:

In the absence of a legal agreement to secure the necessary obligations regarding affordable housing, sustainability and energy performance, and public realm improvements, the development would fail to mitigate its impact on local housing supply, amenities and infrastructure, environmental sustainability and open space contrary to policies H1, H4, H5, H6, SI 2, SI 5, ad S4 of the London Plan (2021) and H3, H5, H(e), and E1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (Adopted July 2014), and the Planning Obligations (s106) Guidance SPD (July 2015).

8. The Albion, 48 Woolwich Church Street, Woolwich, SE18 5NN - Ref: 22/0969/F

Planning Board noted the applicants additional submissions and accepted an illustrative presentation from the Planning Officer recommending refusal of planning consent for the reasons given in the report.

In response to Members questions the Planning Officer confirmed there was no on-site affordable housing offer and an affordable housing financial contribution offer was considered insufficient, drawing Members attention to reason for refusal 2.

Planning Board accept a presentation from the applicant's team who advised the proposal would provide high quality, energy efficient adaptable or accessible, homes, with private external amenity space and met or exceeded room space standards. A second internal stair core was incorporated, in line with new fire and safety regulations, as well as a dedicated firefighting lift. Over 30% of the units would be 3-bed with 186 m² of flexible commercial space at the ground floor, creating an active street frontage.

Each unit would have a dedicated onsite parking space at basement level and there was a 25% increase in cycle parking spaces and visitors' cycles, parking spaces at the entrance; the cycle parking accommodated larger cargo bikes. The dedicated refuse storage area would double in size to provide improved recycling options and reduce the risk of rubbish being left on the street.

In a rebuttal to the recommendation for refusal 1, on the basis of height and massing and that the proposal would detract from the Grade II Listed Chimney to Steam Factory. The height of the proposal would be 2.5m lower than that of the previously approved, 2017 scheme, remaining subordinate to the Chimney, which was at the very eastern edge of the recently formed conservation area with the proposal was not visible in any of the 4 key fixed views and is visible in 1 of the 13 dynamic views. On this view the Morris Walk (North) development including the 13-storey building would appear in the foreground. The chimney will still remain as a distinct and conspicuous landmark.

In relation to the recommendation for refusal 2, in relation to the lack of affordable housing, the applicant's barrister advised that unusually it had been common ground between the applicant and the Council, disagreeing with the GLA, that the scheme could not viably produce more affordable housing and concern was expressed by the applicant in the way in which the Planning

Board was being advised as it was not correct to suggest that in national policy there is in effect an absolute requirement in all cases to provide 10% affordable housing for major development because NPPF paragraph 58 expressly envisages a viability appraisal providing a reason not to meet that 10% minimum policy requirement (also reflected in Local Plan Policy GG4), so it was not correct to suggest that only because the minimum 10% offer was not being met, the proposal automatically failed; it was a requirement to consider the viability appraisal. However, the Planning Officers were suggesting that limited weight should be afforded to the viability appraisal but no reasons had been given for this without setting out how the viability appraisal was wrong or why it should not be given weight. It was noted that the Councils appointed viability assessors agreed the scheme could not viably provide affordable housing. An ex-gratia contribution of £150,000 would be made to support affordable home provision.

The applicant's team noted that no objections had been received but 51 letters of support, with the common theme of people wanting to see greater housing provision, which the proposal would supply, had been received.

In response to Members questions the applicant's representatives confirmed there would be a late-stage viability test and any financial surplus could go to further affordable housing contribution.

That efforts were made to deliver affordable housing and the applicant undertook two pre-application process with Planning Officers, both proposals delivering affordable housing. In both instances Planning Officers advised the developments were too large. The development approved in 2017 was not built out due to viability issues. Since which construction costs had risen and the value of sales had fallen. The viability position on the current proposal was worse than the 2017 application.

The applicant clarified that the provision of green and association space, the development would provide, would be 120 m² space on site incorporating a dedicated play space for 1- 5's. An adventure playground would be provided for older children. There would also be a green roof.

The applicant's team noted that the proposal did not fall within the Conservation area. That the proposal would adopt the similar symmetry and design to that approved in 2017. Whilst design to compliment the nearer Morris Walk surrounding, the external brick appearance would reflect the brick material of the Chimney.

The Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control advised Members that the 51 letters of support were addressed in the addendum report.

Members considered the application before them with a Member taking the view that the impact on the Conservation Area, which had not been designated in 2017, was now a consideration, and on the Grade II listed Chimney. It was considered the impact of the proposal was quite severe and would take away from the listed chimney and the wider conservation area, noting it was much closer to the Chimney than the Morris Walk north development. That they felt that the public benefit of the proposal did not outweigh the damage to the heritage assets and they agreed with the recommended reasons for refusal.

A Member questioned if the applicant was able to review their affordability.

The Chair put the recommendation to refuse planning consent, on the grounds set out in the report to the vote with

6 Members in favour

0 Members against

0 Members abstaining

Resolved unanimously -

- That Planning Permission be refused for the redevelopment of the site to provide a multi-storey mixed-use building comprising of basement level disabled car parking, residential cycle storage and plant room. Ground floor level mixed use commercial space; commercial cycle storage; residential and commercial refuse storage with self-contained flats above
- That refusal be agreed for the following reasons:

Reason for refusal I

The proposed development by reason of its height, scale, bulk and massing in relation to the Grade II Listed Chimney to Steam Factory, Royal Dockyard would detract from its setting and cause less than substantial harm to this designated heritage asset. The Thames Barrier and Bowater Road Conservation Area Character Appraisal SPD (March 2021) identifies the Grade II Listed Chimney to Steam Factory, Royal Dockyard as a conspicuous landmark in the Conservation Area. The proposal will negatively compete with the Grade II listed building as a landmark building and result in an unbalanced and dominant relationship with the setting of the Grade II Listed Chimney to Steam Factory and as such would result in

less than substantial harm to the setting of the Thames Barrier and Bowater Road Conservation Area. The public benefits of the scheme do not outweigh this harm contrary to paragraphs 205 and 208 of the NPPF (2023), Policies D1, D3 and HCl of The London Plan (2021) and Policies, DH1, DH3, DH(h) and DH(i) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (Adopted July 2014), The Thames Barrier and Bowater Road Conservation Area Character Appraisal (March 2021) and the Urban Design Guide SPD (2023) and, on the application of the tilted balance in paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework, the application of policies in that Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed, specifically in relation to the settings of the Grade II Listed Chimney to Steam Factory, Royal Dockyard and Thames Barrier and Bowater Road Conservation Area.

Reason for refusal 2

The scheme is unacceptable due to the failure to sufficiently support and contribute to the Borough's and London's affordable housing delivery by providing insufficient affordable housing, having regard to paragraph 66 of the National Planning Policy Framework stating that, for major development involving the provision of housing, at least 10% of the total number of homes should be available for affordable home ownership, the need for affordable housing and policies GG4 and DF1 of the London Plan (2021) and policy H3 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (July 2014). The viability assessment is afforded limited weight in this context. The tilted balance in paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework also provides a clear reason for refusing planning permission.

Reason for refusal 3

The proposal, by reason of the lack of a s106 agreement or unilateral undertaking to secure necessary planning obligations including, review mechanisms to secure affordable housing, parking restrictions for future occupants, car club membership, participation in GLLaB, details of fit-out and marketing of the Use Class E unit and carbon off-set payment would fail to maximise the delivery of affordable housing and fail to mitigate its impact on local infrastructure and the environment contrary to policies H3, EA(c), EI, IM1, IM4 and IM(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (July 2014) and the Planning obligations (s106) Guidance SPD (July 2015) and Policies H4, SI 2, and policy T6 of the London Plan (March 2021).

- That refusal also be subject to:
 - 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; and
 - The authorisation of the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to make any minor change to the detailed wording of the reason(s) for refusal, as set out in the report and any addendums, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

The meeting closed at 10.30 pm

Chair