Lovell’s, Granite, Badcock’s and Pipers Wharf, Greenwich

in the Royal Borough of Greenwich

planning application no. 14/0460/F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic planning application stage II referral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised application for part of Phase 1 and all of Phase 2 (namely blocks 3, 4, 5, 6a, 9, 10 and 11) for a mixed use development comprising 439 residential units (increasing from 282) (Class C3) and changes to non-residential floorspace quantum to provide office use (Class B1), cafe/bar/restaurant (Class A3/A4), ecological centre/community centre (Class D1), medical health centre (Class D1), nursery (Class D1), rowing club (Sui Generis) and health club (Class D2), creation of new areas of open space, play areas, provision of plant and service areas and parking facilities together with associated works including vehicular access, cycle pedestrian routes, landscaping works to river wall and foreshore.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The applicant is Greenwich Wharf Limited and the architect is Squire and Partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The concerns raised at the consultation stage regarding the relocation of the existing boating yard, affordable housing, urban design, inclusive design, sustainable development and transport have been satisfactorily addressed through further amendments or secured by planning condition or obligation, and the proposal now accords with strategic planning policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Council’s decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this instance Greenwich Council has resolved to grant permission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That Greenwich Council be advised that the Mayor is content for it to determine the case itself, subject to any action that the Secretary of State may take, and does not therefore wish to direct refusal or direct that he is to be the local planning authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Context

1 On 13 March 2014 the Mayor of London received documents from Greenwich Council notifying him of a planning application of potential strategic importance to develop the above site for the above uses. This was referred to the Mayor under Categories 1A, 1B and 1C of the Schedule to the Order 2008:

Category 1A

- Development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats, or houses and flats.

Category 1B

- Development (other than development which only comprises the provision of houses, flats, or houses and flats) which comprises or includes the erection of a building or buildings — (c) outside Central London and with a total floorspace of more than 15,000 square metres.

Category 1C

- Development which comprises or includes the erection of a building of one or more of the following descriptions — (a) the building is more than 25 metres high and is adjacent to the River Thames.

2 On 9 April 2014 the Mayor considered planning report PDU/0258f/01, and subsequently advised Greenwich Council that while the overall scheme was generally supported, subject to the relocation of the existing boatyard being satisfactorily resolved and secured, there were some outstanding issues that needed to be resolved before the decision making stage and these and their potential remedies were set out in paragraph 78 of that report.

3 A copy of the above-mentioned report is attached. The essentials of the case with regard to the proposal, the site, case history, strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance are as set out therein, unless otherwise stated in this report. Since then, the application has been revised in response to the Mayor’s concerns (see below). On 9 April 2014, Greenwich Council decided that it was minded to grant planning permission for the revised application. Following an extensive period of negotiation on the draft section 106 agreement the Council referred that application on the 21 November 2014. Under the provisions of Article 5 of the Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor may allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, direct Greenwich Council under Article 6 to refuse the application or issue a direction to Greenwich Council under Article 7 that he is to act as the Local Planning Authority for the purposes of determining the application. The Mayor has until 4 December 2014 to notify the Council of his decision and to issue any direction.

4 The environmental information for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 has been taken into account in the consideration of this case.

5 The decision on this case, and the reasons will be made available on the GLA’s website www.london.gov.uk.
Update

At the consultation stage Greenwich Council was advised that while the overall scheme was generally supported, subject to the relocation of the existing boatyard being satisfactorily resolved and secured, there were some outstanding issues that needed to be resolved before the decision making stage and these and their potential remedies were set out in paragraph 78 of that report:

- **Principle of development:** The principal of development is established from the previous permission which has been implemented and is currently under construction. The GLA would however welcome further discussion with the applicant regarding the relocation of the boatyard.

- **Housing:** It is understood that the quantum and mix of affordable housing has been verified as the maximum reasonable amount by the Council’s independent review of the submitted financial viability assessment. The outcome of this review should be shared with GLA officers to confirm compliancy with London Plan policy 3.12. Further information regarding the residential mix and tenure across the wider site should also be provided.

- **Urban design:** The proposed height, scale and massing is supported. The design team need to undertake further work regarding the layout of the linear blocks in relation to the corridor lengths and unit to core ratio.

- **Inclusive design:** The access strategy for the site results in unfortunate constraints between Banning Street and the River Walk. Officers would welcome further discussion regarding inclusive access through these routes.

- **Sustainable development:** The carbon savings fall short of the 40% reduction target set out in London Plan policy 5.2. The applicant should consider the scope for additional measures aimed at achieving further reductions as set out above and liaise with the Council to ensure any shortfall is met off-site. In line with the comments above, the applicant should not install CHP onsite and prioritise connection to one of the district heat networks within the vicinity of the site. A condition is suggested to ensure this. Further information and clarification is sought with regards to the proposed site heat network and the submitted flood risk assessment.

- **Transport:** The application is broadly compliant with London Plan transport policies. However, suitable provisions should be made to prevent residents from obtaining parking permits; secure Blue Badge parking and cycle facilities in accordance with London Plan standards; and the updating of the travel plan.

**Principle of development**

**Relocation of the boatyard**

As set out in the Mayor’s initial representations and those made throughout the planning process for this development, the Thamescraft Dry Docking boatyard facility (existing boatyard occupier) is considered a strategically important facility and its relocation should remain conditional to any planning permission in accordance with London Plan Policy 7.27. It is noted that this approach is supported by the Council and the Council’s planning committee report confirms that the requirement to relocate the boatyard will remain conditional to the granting of any planning permission.

Furthermore, it was understood that a planning obligation would be secured to meet the relocation costs of the boatyard, including the cost required to obtain the necessary PLA
licences as part of a supplementary section 106 agreement for this application. This is in addition to the clause relating to the relocation of the boatyard secured by the original section 106 agreement for the original planning consent 06/1749/F.

9 However, while this approach was generally supported, the GLA requested that the Council defer the stage two referral until a time when a more detailed draft of the relevant section 106 clauses relating to the relocation of the boatyard could be reviewed, to allow the Mayor to make a well informed decision regarding this strategic issue. This was considered pertinent as the necessary agreements to enable the relocation of the existing operator to the largely completed replacement facility at Bay Wharf had still not been made; despite written undertakings with the boatyard owner, letters from the Mayor to the developer and continued discussion with the current boatyard owner. The Council cooperated with this requested which is strongly welcomed.

10 GLA officers have now had the opportunity to review and clarify the detailed draft wording of the relevant section 106 clauses which are the product of further negotiations between the developer, the Council, the GLA and the boatyard owner and it is understood that the approach, including the sum of the payments, have now been broadly agreed upon by all parties. The section 106 agreement will secure the financial contributions towards the cost of the relocation via two staged payments to be paid to the Council and released to the boatyard owner at the appropriate trigger points as follows:

- First contribution – £535,000 to be paid to the Council on completion of the section 106 legal agreement and released to the existing boatyard occupier within five days of the grant of the new planning permission.

- Second contribution – £150,000 to be paid to the Council on completion of the section 106 legal agreement and released to the existing boatyard occupier when it has confirmed and given vacant possession (VP) of the existing boatyard to the developer. This is provided that VP has occurred no later than five months following the new boatyard site at Bay Wharf having been completed to the satisfaction of the Council and the developer has offered to grant a lease to the existing boatyard occupier for the operation of the new boatyard for at least ten years; or by 30th September 2015.

11 As previously set out, the Mayor recognises that the operation of the boatyard is highly seasonal in nature with peak workloads occurring over winter months. It is therefore understood that the facility is best relocated during the summer; otherwise this could have significant commercial impacts on the business and potentially threaten the strategically important facility for London. In this context, it is paramount that any relocation takes place at an operationally appropriate time so as to not put any unacceptable timing and financial impacts on the boatyard business. In this regard, the relocation clauses set out an approach that, amongst other requirements, restricts the developer from lawfully carrying out any material operations on the second phase until it has confirmed to the Council that there is a legally binding agreement providing for VP of the existing boatyard on terms mutually agreed with the existing occupier.

12 In light of the above, as the clause requires the mutual (and legally binding) agreement between both parties on the time that the relocation would take place, it would provide an appropriate degree of security to the boatyard owner that they could not be forced to relocate at an inappropriate and commercially damaging time. In addition, the boatyard owner would also have already had the first financial contribution released to them in accordance with the above triggers to assist with the move, with the second released on giving and confirming vacant possession. All financial contributions are to be held by the Council therefore reducing the potential for any further dispute and delay regarding payment between the two parties.

13 Therefore, the approach set out within the relocation clauses will provide a robust mechanism to secure both the relocation of the existing boatyard operator and financial contributions toward the associated cost, while affording enough control and flexibility to the
existing boatyard operator to secure an appropriate relocation time frame. This helps address the previous concerns raised regarding the seasonal nature of the business and the potential commercial impacts on the timing of any relocation and based on the current information shared with GLA officers, is supported.

14 Notwithstanding the above, in light of the prolonged nature of this issue, the Mayor wishes to see the commercial and financial arrangements between the applicant and Thamescraft Dry Docking secured as part of this planning application to ensure that the boatyard is relocated to the new premises at Bay Wharf without further delay, cost or unacceptable timing impacts on the boatyard business.

Affordable housing

15 As set out at the consultation stage, 31 affordable units, or 8% of the units are proposed as part of the revised phase two application. When considered in terms of the residential uplift represented by the revised application (157 units) this equates to 20% on-site affordable housing provision. Including the 250 affordable housing units already built out or currently under construction as part of the consented application and those proposed as part of the residential uplift in this application, this would equate to 33% of the total number of residential units to be delivered across the wider site (281 units).

16 In response to the request made at the consultation stage, the Council has shared the results of the independent review of the applicant’s financial viability assessment which supported the proposed affordable housing offer with GLA officers. The independent review advises that a higher amount of affordable housing with a locally compliant tenure mix would be unviable. The applicant has also since agreed to a review mechanism towards the end of the construction phase within the section 106 agreement in order to capture any potential future uplift in values during the build out of the scheme, which could in turn deliver a larger amount of affordable housing as a result of improved scheme viability. Any uplift would be secured as a financial contribution towards off-site affordable housing within the Borough. This approach is supported and has been secured in the draft section 106 agreement.

17 Therefore, given the independent verification of the affordable housing offer as the maximum reasonable amount and the inclusion of an affordable housing review mechanism to secure any potential future uplift in values towards the future provision of affordable housing in the borough, the proposed level and tenure split of affordable housing is considered acceptable.

Urban design

Residential quality

18 In response to the Mayor’s initial representations, the applicant has sought to address the concerns raised regarding the long corridors and high unit to core ratios in the residential finger blocks and confirmed that the internal layout of Blocks four and five can be amended to accommodate no more than eight units per core by physically dividing the corridor in two. The applicant has provided revised drawings demonstrating how this will be achieved, which is welcomed.

19 With regards to Block three, the applicant has explored an alternative layout arrangement that would physically separate the three residential cores to ensure that each core would access no more than eight units in accordance with the Mayor’s Housing SPG best practice guidance. The applicant has provided an illustration demonstrating how the long corridor could be divided into three dead-end corridors, permanently separated by double sided smoke shafts. While this would impact on the existing fire strategy, the applicant has discussed this with Fire and Safety Consultants and with the use of sprinklers this has been considered acceptable. This approach is
welcomed and has been confirmed by the submission of updated detailed drawings demonstrating that no residential core will serve more than eight units.

20 The above amendments are supported and helps resolve those issues raised at the consultation stage as it will improve the overall residential quality of the scheme in accordance with Mayor’s Housing SPG and the London Housing Design Guide.

Inclusive design

21 Concerns where previously raised regarding the lack of choice of stair free routes to access the residential cores. In response, the applicant has investigated the possibility of ramped access from Banning Street at additional points between Blocks four and eleven and Blocks five and eleven. However, the applicant has argued that this option would not produce a viable option due to the length of ramps required in order for them to be of an acceptable gradient given the height difference across the site. As a result, the long ramps would compromise access to the central lawn and play space for the future residents which are currently already wheelchair accessible and thus impact on the overall quality of the amenity space. Given the site constraints and the location of the step-free access routes already proposed at Block five and three, the distances to access the residential cores are considered to not be unreasonable in this case. Therefore, no further issues are outstanding with regards to inclusive design.

22 The full details of the inclusive access arrangements are required to be submitted to and approved by the Council prior to commencement by planning condition which is also welcomed.

Sustainable development

23 A number of issues that required further discussion and clarification were raised at the consultation stage regarding the scheme’s ability to meet the 40% carbon reduction target, the installation of photovoltaic panels, the potential opportunities to connect to a future district heat network and the nature of the proposed site heat network. The applicant has since met and engaged with the GLA regarding these issues and they have been resolved as set out below.

Renewable technologies

24 The applicant’s energy strategy identified the potential for 476 sq.m. of photovoltaic panels (PV) to be installed onsite and given that the development failed to achieve the 40% carbon reduction target set by London Plan Policy 5.2, the applicant was advised to commit to their installation. In response, the applicant has stated that the residential part of the development meets the 40% target and that PV would be installed if required for the non-domestic. However, the 40% carbon reduction target is assessed across the whole of the development including non-residential uses and therefore the carbon savings for this development (34%) still fall short of the London Plan policy target.

25 In response, the applicant has argued that the necessary space requirements to install the quantum of PV required to make up the difference between what is currently being achieved and that which is required by strategic planning policy is not feasible on this development. While, the space constraints to achieving a 40% carbon reductions are acknowledged, the applicant should commit to installing the 476 sq.m. as identified in the submitted energy strategy to demonstrate that opportunities for carbon savings on site have been maximised, as advised at the consultation stage. Any remaining shortfall in meeting the London Plan Policy target should be delivered via a cash in lieu contribution in agreement with the Council.
District heating and site heat network

26 At the consultation stage, the applicant had identified the Greenwich Peninsula District Heating Network (GDHN) as being within the vicinity of the site and the applicant was advised to explore the potential opportunities for the development to connect to this heat network. The applicant was also advised of a planned low temperature district heat network to the south of the site, however, it has since been confirmed that connection to this network would require considerable redesign of the energy systems on site and installation of additional plant. This is accepted given that much of the plant room has already been constructed onsite under the first phase.

27 The applicant has however, met with the operators of the GDHN; Pinnacle Power, to discuss the opportunities for connection to the network and has provided minutes from the meeting. The correspondence suggests that a connection to the GDHN may be possible in the future and that Pinnacle Power have aspirations to extend the network south and west towards the site, but that timescales for the extension of the network to the application site have not been finalised and that the first phase of GDHN may not have the capacity to serve the application site. It is understood that dialogue is continuing with regards to the cost and practicalities for a connection to the network. The applicant has also provided schematics of the communal heating system and the constructed plant room as requested confirming that the development is designed to allow future connection to the GDHN. This has been secured by planning condition and is welcomed.

28 The schematics provided also confirm that the energy centre (including the installation of over 50% of the CHP capacity) has already been constructed onsite as part the first phase of development (Blocks two and eight) that will also serve the blocks associated with this second phase of the development, accept from 6A which is currently a standalone building due to its isolation from the main site and site constraints. Therefore, given that this application represents the revised second phase of an already part constructed scheme where the energy centre to serve both phases has already been constructed onsite (including CHP installation) the suggested condition precluding the installation of on-site CHP until a defined point is no longer considered reasonable in light of the specific circumstances of this application. Notwithstanding this and given the shortfall in carbon savings, the applicant should continue to prioritise connection to the GDHN and continue to liaise with Pinnacle Power to ensure that a future connection is facilitated.

Flood risk

29 The applicants Environmental Statement contains a full assessment of flood risk. The assessment shows that the site is acceptable and is protected by London’s flood defences including The Thames Barrier. Furthermore, the acceptability of the proposed uses of the site with regards to flood risk has been established by the existing consent for residential uses. In addition, conditions requiring the details of proposed flood defence/river wall and its implementation to be submitted to the Council in consultation with the Environment Agency have also been secured by planning condition. This is welcomed and satisfies the request for further information regarding flood risk at the consultation stage.

Transport

30 At the consultation stage, Transport of London (TfL) considered that the application was broadly compliant with the transport policies of the London Plan subject to the imposition of various conditions and to section 106 transport obligations.

31 The requested conditions securing Blue Badge parking and cycle facilities for the additional residents in accordance with London Plan standards and construction management
arrangements (including consideration of use of the river) and a delivery and servicing plan have been agreed and secured by the Council. Clauses requiring an updated travel plan and the prevention of residents securing parking permits have been included in the section 106 heads of terms. These are all welcomed.

32 The commitment from both the applicant and the Council to ensuring the relocation of the existing boatyard and to the provision of a river bus jetty on the site in the event that one is not delivered as part of the nearby Enderby Wharf scheme is welcomed. The agreed planning conditions and obligations secure both these river uses.

33 In summary all transport matters raised at the consultation stage have now been resolved through being secured by way of planning condition or obligation.

Other comments

Impact on Maritime Greenwich World heritage site

34 As set out at the consultation stage, in response to the reasons for refusal of the previous application, the height, massing and scale of the revised application now broadly reflects that of the consented scheme and is therefore considered acceptable from a strategic perspective. Notwithstanding this, the submitted Environmental Statement assesses the scheme’s impact on the views from the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site. The report concludes that due to the reduction in scale of the linear blocks, the proposed massing will have a similar impact to the consented scheme which has was previously accepted and while the development will be visible it will be in the distance and not detract from the significance of the World Heritage Site or its setting.

Response to consultation

35 Greenwich Council publicised the application by sending letters to 644 local residents and issuing site and press notices.

Public consultation

36 In response to the public consultation for the revised application, the Council received a total of five letters of objection from local residents within the consultation period and 1 letter outside this time frame. The East Greenwich Residents Association also provided written representations offering positive comments on the revisions to building heights and increase in community provision. For the convenience of the Mayor a brief summary of the issues raised by these objections is contained in the following paragraphs.

37 The representations raised objections to the height of the buildings and their relationship with the existing properties, streetscape and landscape, the impact of the buildings on the view of the O2 arena, objections to any increase in building height, impact on the skyline of East Greenwich, impact on transport infrastructure, local amenities and services, impact on a UNESCO world heritage setting, objections to any increase in density and the impact on public services, impact on views of the River Thames, impact on the character of Westcombe Park Conservation Area in particular views from Woodland Heights, impact on the character of Greenwich, impact on the relationship with the river both physically and visually, failure to consult residents of the Westcombe Park Conservation Area, objections to loss of Medical Health Centre, concerns over quantum of office space and its potential to be converted to residential use, concerns over potential conversion of rowing club and restaurant/cafe uses to residential use, loss of privacy to adjacent properties, overshadowing of adjacent properties, impact on river views from Sir Walter Raleigh Court and resultant property values for shared ownership housing, that block nine would
be out of scale with surrounding properties, increase in traffic, noise and dust, insufficient and badly designed children’s play areas.

38 The East Greenwich Residents Association provided representations offering no substantive objection to the proposals and welcomed the progress on community provision and revisions to the building heights returning them generally back to that of the consented 2007 scheme. The Group did however request transparency from the Council on how the section 106 payments will be used.

39 The objections raised during the consultation process are addressed within the Council’s committee report and do not raise any strategic issues that have not already been considered.

Statutory consultees and local bodies

40 The following statutory consultees provided a consultation response to this application. Full details of the comments received is provided in the Council’s committee report. A summary of the issues raised is provided below:

- **Port of London Authority (PLA):** The PLA raised no principle objection to the redevelopment of the site for residential uses. The applicant was advised to contact the PLA’s Licensing Department in order to obtain the necessary river works licenses. Further clarification was required from the applicant with regards to the location of the Rowing Club and launching sites in the context of the consented cruise liner terminal at Enderby Wharf and whether there is an identified need for such a facility. With regards to the relocation of the existing boatyard the PLA considered that consent should only be granted if the existing section 106 clause and condition three are applied to the revised application, and that the PLA would object if they were not. As set out above, the previous clause and condition will remain part of this application. Notwithstanding the above, in additional comments the PLA objected to the revised phasing scheme being discharged in the absence of information given on the implications for the relocation for the boatyard. The PLA also acknowledged the seasonal nature of the facility and expressed that the ongoing relocation matters should be resolved swiftly to enable its relocation in summer 2014. Furthermore, the PLA reiterated that moorings will need to be retained in the area in association with the Bay Wharf facility and therefore signage should be erected to inform local residents. The PLA also requested full details of the potential for a river jetty to be provided adjacent to block five should one not be delivered on the Enderby Wharf scheme to assess any potential impact on river navigation. Further information was requested regarding restricting occupation of block five until planning permission has been granted for an alternative river jetty and related section 106 clauses. Full details were also requested regarding works of Mean High Water, protection of reed beds, foreshore pilling and the necessity of timber marking posts demarking site ownership. A condition was requested requiring that the developer maximise the river for the transportation of materials, the provision of life saving equipment, lighting, ecological monitoring, landscape management and remediation. Planning obligations and conditions have been secured to satisfactorily address these comments.

- **Environment Agency (EA):** The EA raised concerns over the reduction in the area of the approved inter-tidal terracing and the impact of the extended basement car park on the engineering options for improving flood defences in the future. A number of conditions regarding flood risk management, ecology, in-channel works, and land contamination were recommended. Suitable conditions and informatives have been secured to address the EA’s concerns and are detailed in the draft decision notice and committee report.

- **Marine Management Organisation:** Requested that the applicant be informed that they may require a license under the Marine and Coastal Access Act (2009). The applicant has been informed by the Council.
• **London City Airport:** London City Airport had no safeguarding objection, but informed the Council that any increase in the height of scaffolding or carnage during construction would require separate consultation. An informative has been provided to satisfy this.

• **Natural England:** Natural England stated that the advice provided on the previously refused application applies equally to this application, although they did not raise any objections. As the amendments relate largely to design, Natural England advised that the proposals are unlikely to have significantly different impacts on the natural environment than the original proposals. The applicant was advised that if the proposal was amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment then they would require further consultation. It is noted that the ecological enhancements that form part of this application are secured by planning condition.

• **Thames Water:** Thames Water raised no objection on sewage infrastructure capacity grounds and requested that the applicant incorporate protection to their property from potential sewerage network discharge during storm conditions, the installation of properly maintained fat traps on catering establishments, the installation of petrol/oil interceptors in all car parking/washing/repair facilities and that a trade effluent consent will be required. Further conditions were requested requiring impact studies of existing water supply infrastructure and an impact piling method statement to be submitted to and approved by the Council. These have been secured.

• **English Heritage (Archaeology):** The Council was advised that no archaeological fieldwork needed to be undertaken prior to determination of the application, but that the archaeological position should be reserved by the imposition of two planning conditions and related informative regarding building recording and archaeological site investigation. These conditions have been secured.

• **English Heritage (Buildings):** Advised that the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance.

• **Greenwich Society:** The Greenwich Society warmly welcomed the revised application which largely addresses their previous objections to the previous application. However, concerns were raised over the increased residential density and that occupancy should be conditional to the delivery of the Thames Clipper river jetty on the Enderby Wharf site, concerns over the slight increase in heights of nine, ten and eleven and the impact on Banning Street, and concerns were also raised over the increase in parking provision and the resultant traffic impact.

• **Greenwich Conservation Group:** The Greenwich Conservation Group welcome the significant changes to the scheme and the levels of pre-submission consultation undertaken by the applicant with local residents groups and amenity organisations. However, minor concerns were raised with regards to the proposed level of car parking and the potential impact it will have on the local road network, the rationale for the private balcony spaces and the reduction in commercial floorspace was questioned. Notwithstanding the above minor issues raised, the group raised no objections to the revised proposals.

• **Thamescraft Dry Docking Services Ltd:** Thamescraft Dry Docking is the owner and operator of the existing boatyard facility that is subject to relocation as part of this application. To summarise, the representations continue the dialogue regarding the dispute over the relocation costs, which were estimated in April 2013 to total £1,178,990.39 (comprising re-location cost of £762,230.39 plus necessary work on dry docks costing £416,760 in order to obtain an operator license at Bay Wharf from PLA). In 2006, the total relocation cost including the work on three dry docks was calculated at £718,279. That year, it is understood that the applicant agreed to meet the relocation costs plus the work to one dry dock which totalled £560,809.50, which Thamescraft was prepared to accept at the time, but this payment was never arranged or made. However, Thamescraft further
stated that it was willing to accept the 2006 estimated costs of £718,279 to bring the issue to a close. However, this was subject to the completion of the Bay Wharf facility and payment being irrevocably committed, and that in order for it to relocate this year, this would have needed to take place by the end of April 2014 to allow relocation to take place over the summer months; outside of the facility’s peak period for operation. The representations go further to state that the failure to satisfactorily resolve this issue continues to threaten the business and therefore London’s river transport. To conclude, Thamescraft requested that if permission was to be granted a legal agreement should be agreed that would require the applicant to pay the sum of £718,279 to meet the relocation costs into escrow before commencement of development as part of the section 106 agreement, and that this money be released against evidence of Thamescraft’s payments made to date and costs incurred and the remaining balance be paid to Thamescraft within seven days of providing vacant possession of the Badcocks Wharf site. As set out above, the relocation is to be secured by the section 106 agreement which now broadly agreed upon by all parties.

- **Tower Hamlets Council**: Raised no objection to the proposals.
- **Globe Rowing Club**: Raised no objection to the principle of development, but requested that permission be withheld until the Trafalgar Rowing Centre, Globe Rowing Club and Curlew Rowing Club have been consulted, to ascertain whether any clubs may wish to relocate to this part of the river. Concerns were also raised with regards to potential risks from the nearby proposed cruise liner terminal. Further suggestions were also provided as to how existing facilities could be supported rather than providing new facilities.

41 The statutory responses to the Council’s consultation do not raise any material planning issues of strategic importance that have not already been considered by the Mayor at the consultation stage and/or in this report or within the Council’s planning committee report.

**Consultation responses to the Mayor**

42 In addition to those representations received by the local authority the Mayor has been directly forwarded representations made to the Council objecting the proposed development on the grounds of its potential impacts on views from Woodland Heights within the Westcombe Park Conservation Area, with particular reference to the layout of the blocks and their relationship to the landscape and the river. As mentioned, these representations were issued to the Council and forwarded electronically to the Mayor and have therefore been considered in the Council’s committee report and detailed above. They therefore do not raise any strategic issues that have not already been considered.

43 In addition to the above, the Mayor received a letter from Paul Deverell of Thamescraft Dry Docking Services Ltd. The letter stated that in order for the boatyard to relocate it would require at least £718,990.39 as set out in the objection that was put forward to the Greenwich Council Planning Board. The letter further raised the issue of timing for the relocation and that it would need to relocate over the summer months as to not impact on the business and to have the specified funds in escrow. It was requested that the Mayor indicate to Greenwich that the funds should be in escrow prior to any move before he could decide to allow the Council to grant permission.

44 The Company of Watermen & Lightermen of the River Thames also wrote directly to the Mayor raising concerns over the delays over the boatyards relocation and reiterating the importance of relocation outside of peak workloads as set out in the letter from Paul Deverell. The Mayor was also requested to use his planning powers to withhold planning permission until the boatyard facility was complete and the full payment had been made.
The issues set out within these representations have been satisfactorily addressed in paragraphs seven to fourteen of this report.

**Article 7: Direction that the Mayor is to be the local planning authority**

Under Article 7 of the Order the Mayor could take over this application provided the policy tests set out in that Article are met. In this instance the Council has resolved to grant permission with conditions and a planning obligation, which satisfactorily addresses the matters raised at stage I, therefore there is no sound planning reason for the Mayor to take over this application.

**Legal considerations**

Under the arrangements set out in Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor has the power under Article 6 to direct the local planning authority to refuse permission for a planning application referred to him under Article 4 of the Order. He also has the power to issue a direction under Article 7 that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application and any connected application. The Mayor may also leave the decision to the local authority. In directing refusal the Mayor must have regard to the matters set out in Article 6(2) of the Order, including the principal purposes of the Greater London Authority, the effect on health and sustainable development, national policies and international obligations, regional planning guidance, and the use of the River Thames. The Mayor may direct refusal if he considers that to grant permission would be contrary to good strategic planning in Greater London. If he decides to direct refusal, the Mayor must set out his reasons, and the local planning authority must issue these with the refusal notice. If the Mayor decides to direct that he is to be the local planning authority, he must have regard to the matters set out in Article 7(3) and set out his reasons in the direction.

**Financial considerations**

Should the Mayor direct refusal, he would be the principal party at any subsequent appeal hearing or public inquiry. Following an inquiry caused by a direction to refuse, costs may be awarded against the Mayor if he has either directed refusal unreasonably; handled a referral from a planning authority unreasonably; or behaved unreasonably during the appeal. A major factor in deciding whether the Mayor has acted unreasonably will be the extent to which he has taken account of established planning policy.

Should the Mayor take over the application he would be responsible for holding a representation hearing and negotiating any planning obligation. He would also be responsible for determining any reserved matters applications (unless he directs the council to do so) and determining any approval of details (unless the council agrees to do so).

**Conclusion**

As set out within this report, the issues raised at the consultation stage regarding the relocation of the existing boatyard, affordable housing, urban design, inclusive design, sustainable development and transport have been resolved through the provision of further information and amendments secured by planning condition or section 106 legal agreement and the application is now considered acceptable in strategic planning terms.
for further information, contact GLA Planning Unit - Development & Projects Team

Colin Wilson, Senior Manager – Development & Projects
020 7983 4783   email colin.wilson@london.gov.uk

Justin Carr, Strategic Planning Manager (Development Decisions)
020 7983 4895   email justin.carr@london.gov.uk

Jonathan Finch, Case Officer
020 7983 4799 email jonathan.finch@london.gov.uk
Strategic planning application stage 1 referral


The proposal

Revised application for part of Phase 1 and all of Phase 2 (namely blocks 3, 4, 5, 6a, 9, 10 and 11) for a mixed use development comprising 439 residential units (increasing from 282) (Class C3) and changes to non-residential floorspace quantum to provide office use (Class B1), cafe/bar/restuarant (Class A3/A4), ecological centre/community centre (Class D1), medical health centre (Class D1), nursery (Class D1), rowing club (Sui Generis) and health club (Class D2), creation of new areas of open space, play areas, provision of plant and service areas and parking facilities together with associated works including vehicular access, cycle pedestrian routes, landscaping works to river wall and foreshore.

The applicant

The applicant is Greenwich Wharf Limited and the architect is Squire and Partners.

Strategic issues

The proposal for the residential led mixed use development is established by the existing consent.

The amended housing strategy for the site is generally supported subject to the submission of further information. Further work is required regarding design quality, inclusive access, sustainable development and the transport matters, including the relocation of the current boatyard as set out in this report.

Recommendation

That Greenwich Council be advised that while the overall the scheme is generally supported subject to the relocation of the existing boatyard being satisfactorily resolved and secured, there are some outstanding issues that need to be resolved before the decision making stage and these and their potential remedies are set out in paragraph 78 of this report.
Context

1 On 13 March 2014 the Mayor of London received documents from Greenwich Council notifying him of a planning application of potential strategic importance to develop the above site for the above uses. Under the provisions of The Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor has until 23 April 2014 to provide the Council with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. The Mayor may also provide other comments. This report sets out information for the Mayor’s use in deciding what decision to make.

2 The application is referable under Categories 1A, 1B and 1C of the Schedule to the Order 2008:

*Category 1A*

- Development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats, or houses and flats.

*Category 1B*

- Development (other than development which only comprises the provision of houses, flats, or houses and flats) which comprises or includes the erection of a building or buildings — (c) outside Central London and with a total floorspace of more than 15,000 square metres.

*Category 1C*

- Development which comprises or includes the erection of a building of one or more of the following descriptions — (a) the building is more than 25 metres high and is adjacent to the River Thames.

3 Once Greenwich Council has resolved to determine the application, it is required to refer it back to the Mayor for his decision as to whether to direct refusal; take it over for his own determination; or allow the Council to determine it itself.

4 The environmental information for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 has been taken into account in the consideration of this case.

5 The Mayor of London’s statement on this case will be made available on the GLA website www.london.gov.uk.

Site description

6 The site is situated on the Thames riverside at the south-west part of the Greenwich Peninsular in the Royal Borough of Greenwich in a part of the borough known as Peninsula West and in its wider context as Greenwich Riverside.

7 As set out in the case history below, the application site is part of a larger site, which has a planning consent for 680 units. Part of this consent has been built out/is under construction, and these buildings now form the southern and eastern boundary of the site. Banning Street and Christchurch Way are located to the east and comprise Victorian residential streets. Enderby
Wharf is located immediately to the north of the site which comprises of former wharf and industrial buildings with permission for comprehensive redevelopment for a mix of uses, whilst the River Thames runs along the western boundary.

8 The wider site encompasses four former riverside wharves, from south to north Lovell’s Wharf, Granite Wharf, Badcock’s Wharf and Pipers Wharf. The roughly triangular area of land bordered by Banning Street, Derwent Street and Christchurch Way which formed part of the original planning application has been developed. The site also currently includes London’s largest boatyard facility, Thamescraft Dry Docking.

9 The site is located approximately 400 metres from the A206 Trafalgar Road which forms part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN). The A102 Blackwall Tunnel Approach, part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), is located around 500 metres away.

10 Public transport accessibility level (PTAL) is measured on a scale of 1 to 6 where 6 is the most accessible. This site has a score of 3. Maze Hill Railway Station is situated about 750 metres away, with Cutty Sark DLR station being 1.1 kilometres from the site. Furthermore, a number of bus routes stop on Trafalgar Road providing links to North Greenwich, Greenwich Town Centre and Central London.

**Details of the proposal**

11 The application is for 439 residential units and a mix of 4,497 sq.m. (GEA) commercial space and seeks to address the reasons for refusal stated for application 13/0657/F (see case history).

12 Blocks 1a, 1b, 6b, and 7 (see figure 1) of the original planning permission have been completed and comprise 244 affordable homes and 29 private residential units. The applicant is currently on site building Blocks 2 and 8 which comprise a crèche and changing facility for the multi-use games area.

13 The proposed planning application comprises the remainder of the site which includes Blocks 3, 4, 5, 6a, 9, 10 and 11 and proposes an uplift of 157 residential units on this part of the site taking the total number of units within these blocks from 282 (originally approved) to 439. This increases the number of residential units on the comprehensive site from 667 to 836.

14 The uplift in unit numbers has been created by enhancing the efficiencies of the buildings as part of the design review, reducing the quantum of commercial use including office and hotel and introducing residential into blocks 9, 10 and 11 and increasing the height of block 5 by two metres.

15 The table below sets out a breakdown of the various land uses for the application in the context of the wider permission currently being constructed on site and the revised application which was refused.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Proposed (sq.m.)</th>
<th>Consent (site wide sq.m.)</th>
<th>Refused (site wide complete and built sq.m.)</th>
<th>Proposed (site wide complete and built sq.m.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>3,334</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td>2,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio workshops</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,656</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boatyard/boat club</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,672</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco centre</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creche/Nursery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath centre</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Club</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total employment</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,497</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,806</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,961</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,402</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Case history**

16 On 20 February 2007, Greenwich Council granted planning permission for mixed use redevelopment of the site for 667 residential units, retail and commercial space, rowing club, hotel, eco centre, health centre and club, other flexible space and 742 car parking spaces. The former Mayor supported the proposals following the removal of the safeguarded wharf direction by the Secretary of State and subject to relocation of the existing boatyard (PDU/0258c/02).

17 This permission was subsequently revised (reference number 07/1936/F) on 26 September 2007, for an amended basement layout. Subsequent to that approval a section 73 planning application was approved under reference number 11/2959/V for minor material changes to Blocks 2 and 3 which included the redistribution of uses within the Blocks and elevational changes to the buildings. Two further section 73 applications have recently been made to increase the number of units within Block 2 by 13 and change the elevation treatment of Block 8 from metal and glass to brick under reference numbers 12/2465/MA and 12/2943/MA respectively. These more recent changes were referred to the Mayor. Officers raised no strategic issues. The Council’s Committee Members resolved to grant both planning applications at the Council’s Planning Board on 31 January 2013, subject to completion of a Deed of Variation, which is due to be completed.

18 In September 2012 a pre-application meeting was held regarding proposals for amendments to the consented scheme. The revisions related to blocks 3, 4, 5, 6a, 9, 10 and 11 and proposed an uplift of 246 residential units on this part of the site, increasing the total number of units within these block to 528 (282 consented) and increasing the site wide residential provision to 913 units (667 consented). The uplift in unit numbers was created by increasing the heights of
Buildings 3, 4 and 5 at the River and introducing residential use to Buildings 9, 10 and 11 and replacing the hotel and rowing club with residential accommodation. At the meeting GLA officers raised matters regarding design and access, in particular the level changes across the site and the corridor layouts to the linear blocks. Progress regarding the relocation of the boatyard was also raised. The GLA did not receive payment for the pre-application meeting and therefore the advice letter was not issued.

19 On 22 May 2013 the Mayor considered a report on application 13/0657/F for revisions set out above. Whilst the scheme was generally supported further information was required to address London Plan compliancy issues regarding the relocation of the boatyard, affordable housing, urban design and access, climate change and transport. In October 2013 Greenwich Council resolved to refuse the application against officer recommendations and the Council notified the Mayor of this decision 7 November 2013. On 20 November 2013 the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Chief of Staff, acting under delegated authority, considered a report on this application and was content to allow Greenwich Council to determine the case itself, subject to any action that the Secretary of State may take, and did not therefore wish to take over the application for his own determination.

20 This application seeks to address the reasons for refusal set out in the Council’s decision notice. These were based around the increased height, scale, bulk and massing and its relationship to its context and the river, visual amenity, open space provision, loss of employment generating uses and parking provision and residential density.

**Strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance**

21 The relevant issues and corresponding policies are as follows:

- **Principle of development**  
  London Plan

- **Housing**  
  London Plan; Housing SPG; Housing Strategy; draft Revised Housing Strategy; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Children And Young People’s Play And Informal Recreation SPG

- **Affordable Housing**  
  London Plan; Housing SPG; Housing Strategy; draft Revised Housing Strategy;

- **Urban design**  
  London Plan; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context, draft SPG; Housing SPG; London Housing Design Guide; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG

- **Inclusive design**  
  London Plan; Accessible London: achieving an inclusive environment SPG; Planning and Access for Disabled People: a good practice guide (ODPM)

- **Regeneration**  
  London Plan; the Mayor’s Economic Development Strategy

- **Retail/town centre uses**  
  London Plan; draft Town Centres SPG

- **Sustainable development**  
  London Plan; Sustainable Design and Construction SPG; Mayor’s Climate Change Adaptation Strategy; Mayor’s Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy; Mayor’s Water Strategy

- **Transport**  
  London Plan; the Mayor’s Transport Strategy;

22 For the purposes of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the development plan in force for the area is the Greenwich Unitary Development Plan 2006 (as saved 15 July 2009) and the 2011 London Plan (with 2013 Alterations).

23 The following are also relevant material considerations:

- National Planning Practice Guidance.
- Greenwich Council’s draft Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Documents (Submission Stage).
- The Draft Further Alterations to the London Plan (January 2014).

**Principle of development**

24 The site is located at the south west corner of Greenwich Peninsula. It is however outside the 2004 Peninsula masterplan area and south of the Peninsula West masterplan area as defined in the Council’s 2012 Peninsula West SPD, but is identified as part of the Peninsula West Strategic Development Location (table 3.4 of the Core Strategy Submission version 2013). The site is also referred to in the context of Deptford Creek/Greenwich Riverside (Policy EA3 and paragraphs 4.2.10-4.2.11 of the Cores Strategy).

25 The London Plan identifies both the Peninsula and Deptford Creek/Greenwich Riverside as Opportunity Areas and the latter as a Strategic Cultural Area. The strategy for this site, which is in the hinterland of both areas is provision of a complementary urban quarter to the O2 Arena and Deptford that includes a cruise liner terminal and associated leisure, hotel and enterprise space in addition to new housing and to carry forward where relevant the strategic industrial location as an Industrial Business Park which relates largely to land north of the proposal site – including the protection of safeguarded wharves. The nearest existing town centre is East Greenwich District centre approximately 300 metres east of the site. As set out in the case history the principle of mixed use development is already established and construction has started on site. The land use approach for this site means the proposal is generally well placed in strategic terms to deliver housing in particular, as well as other complementary mixed uses.

26 Whilst this is the case there are Blue Ribbon Network matters that require consideration as set out below.

**Boat yard**

27 The current site includes London’s largest boatyard facility, Thamescraft Dry Docking. The strategic importance of this facility has long been recognised by the Mayor as key to ensuring the continued delivery of passenger, freight and leisure services on the River Thames. An indication of the importance of such facilities is given by the fact that the Mayor’s River Action Plan (2013) and London Plan Implementation Report (2013) both contain an action to deliver a new boatyard facility within London, over and above the relocation of the existing Thamescraft facility.

28 As stated previously, the adequate re-provision of the boatyard facility is an essential pre-requisite for any redevelopment and the replacement proposals are generally acceptable. In recognition of this the previous planning permission was conditional on the relocation of Thamescraft Dry Docking to an appropriate new facility. The former Mayor previously requested that the local planning authority impose a condition to secure its timely replacement and operation prior to the occupation of any residential units to ensure compliance with blue ribbon network policies in the London Plan.
The new facility has been largely completed at Bay Wharf, however the applicant has failed to deliver the relocation over a period of approximately eight years, despite written undertakings with the boatyard owner, letters from the Mayor and continued discussion with the current boatyard owner. Therefore, the requirement to relocate the boatyard should remain conditional to any planning permission and be secured with the section 106 agreement in order to comply with London Plan Policy 7.27, supported by the Assessment of Boatyard Facilities on the River Thames (2007), Mayor’s Transport Strategy and Mayor’s River Action Plan (2013). This approach to securing the relocation of the boat yard is supported by the Council.

In light of the prolonged nature of this issue, the Mayor would wish to see the commercial and financial arrangements between the applicant and Thamescraft Dry Docking secured as part of this planning application to ensure that the boatyard is relocated to the new premises at Bay Wharf without further delay, cost or unacceptable timing impacts on the boatyard business. The Mayor recognises that this boatyard is an important strategic land use in London and that the operation is highly seasonal in nature with peak workloads occurring over winter months. It is therefore understood that the facility is best relocated during the summer.

**Employment uses**

As demonstrated in the table above, the revised proposals results in a significant reduction in the proportion of commercial uses compared to the consented scheme. The proposed reduction in employment generating uses as presented in the previously refused application formed the basis for one of the reasons for refusal. However, this reason was based on a lack of evidence provided by the applicant that suggested the development could no longer viably accommodate the approved level of employment uses. In response, the applicant has provided an office and hotel report as part of this application to support the revised employment offer. The detailed analysis provided within the report indicates that this location cannot support a hotel or the quantum of commercial uses that was approved as part of the consented scheme. Therefore, as stated in the Mayor’s initial representations to the previous application, it is considered that the reduction in commercial floorspace is generally accepted and will not undermine the overall objective to create a new urban quarter at Peninsula West.

**Housing**

The application proposes 439 residential units and the current mix is illustrated in the table below. The consented residential units within the application site have been included for comparative purposes as well as an overview of the proposed residential mix on the wider site scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consented (application site)</th>
<th>Proposed (application site)</th>
<th>Uplift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residential mix on comprehensive site scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comprehensive site (approved)</th>
<th>Comprehensive site (refused)</th>
<th>Comprehensive site (proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>680</strong></td>
<td><strong>926</strong></td>
<td><strong>837</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable housing

33 The table below sets out the residential accommodation mix by tenure to be provided as part of this revised application:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Affordable Rent</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>408</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34 As set out in the table above, this application would provide 31 affordable units which equates to approximately 8% of the proposed units. However, it is important to note that the majority of the affordable housing (244 units) required for the consented scheme has been built out within the development of the first part of Phase 1 (Buildings 1A, 1B, 6B, 6C and 7). The remaining six intermediate affordable units are currently being built out within Block 2 which comprise in total 37% affordable housing when calculated on a units basis across the consented scheme. Of that affordable provision 51% has been delivered as family-sized accommodation within the social rented affordable component.

35 In light of the above, the affordable housing element of this application has been presented in terms of the residential uplift from the implemented scheme (157 units). When considered on this basis, the application proposes 20% on-site affordable housing provision. Including the 250 affordable housing units already built out or currently under construction as part of the consented application and those proposed as part of the residential uplift in this application, this would equate to 33% of the total number of residential units to be delivered across the wider site (281 units).
The applicant has submitted a financial viability assessment to support the proposed affordable housing offer and it is understood that this has been verified by the Council through an independent review that a higher proportion of affordable housing would not be viable. The GLA welcome the fact that a significant proportion of affordable housing has been delivered on site already as part of this scheme, however, the Council should share the findings of the review with GLA officers to confirm that the revised offer of an additional 31 affordable units represents the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing in relation to the amendments proposed.

Tenure

Within the proposed affordable housing provision, the applicant is proposing a balance of 65% affordable rent and 35% intermediate (shared ownership) units.

The submission version of Greenwich Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD seeks a 70:30 (affordable rented:intermediate) tenure split, as opposed to the strategic London Plan target of a 60:40 affordable rent:intermediate housing split. The Council has set out evidence that this better meets local need in its Development Management Policies Development Plan Document and this was considered acceptable by the Mayor in his response to the statutory consultation for this document (ref:PDU/LDF32/LDD01/01).

Given that the proposed tenure split sits between local and strategic tenure splits and that the Mayor has previously considered the locally-led policy approach as acceptable, and subject to the Council sharing the results of the financial viability assessment review, the proposed tenure split as part of this application is considered acceptable.

The applicant should however provide an affordable housing tenure split across the wider scheme.

Housing choice

The residential mix achieves a 40% provision of family housing within the affordable rent component of the revised application, responding very positively to the strategic aims of London Plan Housing policies 3.8 and 3.11, and strategic guidance set out within the Mayor’s Housing SPG (2012). However, as part of the above request the applicant should provide the full bedroom size mix by tenure across the comprehensive site.

Residential standards

All of the residential units will meet or exceed with the Mayor’s minimum space standards set out in table 3.3 of London Plan and the Housing SPG and will have access to private amenity space, which is supported. The design section below will address the residential quality in further detail.

Residential density

As set out in the case history, one of the reasons for the Council’s refusal of the previous application was on density grounds; the refused scheme had a residential density of 569 hr/ha.

Given that the application site has a public transport accessibility level of three (PTAL), the London Plan density matrix shown in table 3.2 of the London Plan would suggest that the development should achieve a residential density in the region of 200 to 450 habitable rooms per hectare (ha/hr).
The proposal seeks the provision of 439 residential dwellings which comprises an uplift of 157 units resulting in a total number of units for the wider site of 849. The calculated density for the consented scheme was 502 ha/hr. When considering the residential uplift as proposed by this planning application the applicant confirms that the density for the comprehensive site increases to 532 hr/ha. While this marginally exceeds the London Plan density matrix and the density considered appropriate in the existing and part implemented consent, the density proposed is generally supported.

Children’s play space

The fourth reason for refusal of the previously refused application was based on the grounds of an inadequate uplift in open space in a location that is currently deficient of a local park. The application has sought to address this reason in the revised application.

Using the methodology in Appendix Two of the Mayor’s Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG (2012), the applicant has calculated an expected child yield of the whole development (including those elements already built out/under construction) as a result of the residential uplift of 347. Based on this, the Mayor’s SPG indicates that the development would generate a total playspace requirement of 3,470 sq.m. for play and informal recreation.

In response, the scheme will provide 3,545 sq.m. of play space to meet the needs of the range of children’s age groups. This represents an increase of 741 sq.m. compared to that which was proposed for the refused application and an increase of 2,285 sq.m. over the consented scheme. The applicant has provided a landscape strategy setting out the variety of spaces proposed from door-stop play for children under five, local/neighbourhood play, a games court and space for informal play. With respect to the provision of play space and the proposed landscape strategy, officers welcome the applicant’s approach.

From the material provided, GLA officers are content that the initial stage of the scheme meets and exceeds the on-site play provisions required by the SPG and is in general accordance with London Plan Policy.

Urban design

The Mayor’s initial representations for the refused application raised design concerns with regards to the proposed residential layout and the permeability of the site. However, the previously proposed increase in height, scale, bulk and massing formed the basis for five of the Council’s reasons for refusal. The proposed amendments to the refused scheme are summarised below.

The previous application proposed to increase the height of the blocks along the river (Blocks 3 and 4) from ten to thirteen storeys in height and Block 5 from eight to thirteen storeys. This application now seeks to largely maintain the consented heights of these linear blocks; Block 5 will increase by two metres. The Banning Street elevations are to remain as consented at seven storeys.

The previously refused scheme proposed to increase Blocks 9 and 11 from two to five storeys on Banning Street and Block 10 was proposed to increase from four storeys to eight storeys fronting onto Banning Street. This application will reduce the heights of these buildings, with Blocks 9, 10 and 11 increasing by one storey over the consented scheme. This will result in the Blocks 9 and 11 being three storeys in height and Block 10 standing at five storeys in height when viewed from Banning Street.
It is considered that the proposals now broadly reflect the height, scale and massing of the approved scheme and is therefore considered acceptable from a strategic perspective.

**Layout**

As raised with the previous scheme, there are still fundamental concerns with the layout arrangements of the proposed residential linear blocks. The three linked cores create a corridor effect internally and will reduce the sense of ownership over these communal spaces. This approach conflicts with the guidance in the Mayor’s Housing SPG and the London Housing Design Guide regarding unit to core ratios. GLA officers previously raised the matter throughout the consultation stages for the previous application and these issues still remained at the decision making stage. It is therefore disappointing that this has not been addressed. Whilst the design team has provided a basic study on the options these do not demonstrate that an alternative layout is not feasible. An option where one unit each side of the central core marginally extends in depth to close the long ‘hotel-like’ corridor should be explored. This would improve the core to unit ratio and help improve the overall residential quality of the scheme.

**Appearance**

The use of brick on the smaller blocks and the linear blocks is fully supported. It provides a common language of built form that responds well to the heritage buildings and residential streets. It also adds a level of robustness to the scheme. The architecture is high quality and responds well to its context.

**Inclusive design**

All of the residential units will meet Lifetime Homes standards and this has been demonstrated against the standards in the submitted design and access statement with a typical flat layout. This also confirms that 10% will be wheelchair adaptable, which is also welcomed. The applicant should provide floor plans showing the proposed location of the wheelchair adaptable units and these should be distributed across unit size and tenure.

In terms of the access arrangements the level change creates a significant barrier between Banning Street and the River Walk and from the access plan it would appear that step-free access to the residential cores may become convoluted with only two routes proposed from Banning Street. In light of this, the GLA would therefore welcome further discussion on this matter with the GLA’s Access Advisor and the applicant’s access consultant to better understand the approach taken.

**Sustainable development**

**Climate change mitigation**

The applicant has applied the energy saving hierarchy detailing savings from the provision of Combined Heat and Power (CHP) of 34%. The applicant has investigated the feasibility of a range of renewable energy technologies but is not proposing to install any. The potential for 476 sq.m. of photovoltaic panels is identified within the energy assessment and given the shortfall in meeting the London Plan 40% reduction target, the applicant should commit to its implementation.
District heating

The applicant has identified that the Greenwich Peninsula district heating network is within the vicinity of the development. Evidence of correspondence with the network operator should be provided. In addition, a low temperature district heating heat network is also planned for south of the development. This network will use a large scale heat pump, with water from the River Thames as the heat source, to provide heat for the low temperature network. The applicant should also investigate the potential to connect to this network by liaising with GLA Decentralised Energy Project Delivery Unit.

The applicant should provide information on the design measures (e.g. space for heat exchangers, proposed pipe route to the edge of the development) being taken to allow connection of the development to a district heating network. In order to facilitate connection to a network, the proposed site heat network should adopt a low temperature design. Details of the proposed operating temperatures (i.e. flow and return temperature) should be provided.

Site heat network and Combined Heat and Power (CHP)

The applicant is proposing to install a site heat network linking Blocks 3, 4, 5, 9, 10 and 11 i.e. the blocks covered by this application excluding Block 6A. However, the applicant should confirm that all apartments and non-domestic building uses will be connected to the site heat network. A drawing showing the route of the heat network linking all buildings on the site should be provided. The applicant should also clarify why block 6A cannot be connected into the network. The energy assessment suggests that the site heat network will be supplied by an energy centre/plant room under the podium of the development. The applicant should provide a drawing showing the location of energy centre and clarify the floor area.

The applicant has confirmed that Blocks 2 and 8, which are currently under construction, will also be connected to the site heat network. The applicant should clarify why the existing Blocks 1 a/b, 6b/c and 7 could not also be connected to the site heat network.

The applicant should confirm that there is not an existing energy centre on the site serving the earlier phases which have already been constructed. If there is an energy centre serving the earlier phases of the development, the applicant should clarify why the site heat network could not be supplied from it.

The applicant is proposing to install 222kWe of gas fired CHP unit as the lead heat source for the site heat network which provide the domestic hot water load, as well as a proportion of the space heating. However, the installation of on-site CHP should not proceed. Instead the applicant should prioritise connection to one of the district heating networks in the vicinity of the site (see paragraph 60). The carbon savings from connection to district heating should be estimated and provided. A condition should be secured precluding the installation of on-site CHP until a defined point (e.g. 60% of the development is built out) to allow the developer and district heating operator time to reach agreement regarding connection.

The overall carbon savings fall short of the 40% target within Policy 5.2 of the London Plan. The applicant should consider the scope for additional measures aimed at achieving further reductions as set out above. In liaison with the Council the developer should ensure any remaining short fall in carbon reductions is met off-site.

Climate change adaptation
The proposal includes a number of measures in response to strategic policies regarding climate change adaptation, which are welcomed. The residential element will be designed to meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level Four and to achieve BREEAM excellent rating. Other measures proposed than those set out above, include the provision of green/brown roofs, water and energy efficient fittings and the promotion of sustainable urban drainage techniques. The proposed measures should be secured by the Council through condition.

Blue Ribbon Network

Rowing club

The consented scheme includes the provision of a rowing club. This facility was not proposed as part of the refused scheme. Following public representations the facility has been re-introduced as part of this application and is therefore welcomed.

Flood risk

A flood risk assessment has been undertaken and confirms that the site is within Flood Zone 3a and is defended to a high standard by the existing Thames Tidal Defences. It is understood that the adopted approach to flood risk has been approved by the Environment Agency. GLA Officers have not had sight of this document and it should therefore be provided for assessment purposes and to ensure that the proposals comply with London Plan policy 5.12.

Transport

Given the refused application proposed a total of 913 residential units and this application proposes 849 units, Transport for London (TfL) remain content that no additional public transport mitigation is necessary. As per the previous proposals, the applicant has agreed that new residents will be prevented from applying for parking permits within the existing Controlled Parking Zone, which is welcomed and should be secured in the section 106 agreement.

Whilst it is disappointing that car parking has increased by 20 spaces compared to the refused scheme, provision remains within the maximum London Plan standards. Electric vehicle charging points are to be provided in accordance with London Plan policy as will disabled parking, both of which should be secured by condition.

It is understood that cycle parking could be further increased above minimum London Plan standards, which is welcomed. The amount of parking and its location and type should be confirmed as should the provision of appropriate facilities for staff that cycle. The cycle parking and facilities should be secured by condition.

The applicant’s continuing commitment to deliver a new pier for river buses at Lovell’s Wharf if one is not provided at the nearby Enderby’s Wharf is welcomed. The applicant should agree the details of the pier with TfL prior to its implementation.

The travel plan for the site will be amended to reflect the changes to the scheme and Greenwich Council should secure this through an appropriate planning mechanism.
Community Infrastructure Levy

74 The Mayor has introduced a London-wide Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to help implement the London Plan, particularly policies 6.5 and 8.3 toward the funding of Crossrail. The rate for Greenwich is £35 per square metre. The required CIL should be confirmed by the applicant and council once the components of the development have been finalised.

Local planning authority’s position

75 It is understood that Greenwich Council officers consider the application acceptable and will be recommending the planning application for approval, subject to conditions and satisfactory completion of a section 106 agreement.

Legal considerations

76 Under the arrangements set out in Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor is required to provide the local planning authority with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. Unless notified otherwise by the Mayor, the Council must consult the Mayor again under Article 5 of the Order if it subsequently resolves to make a draft decision on the application, in order that the Mayor may decide whether to allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, or direct the Council under Article 6 of the Order to refuse the application, or issue a direction under Article 7 of the Order that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application and any connected application. There is no obligation at this present stage for the Mayor to indicate his intentions regarding a possible direction, and no such decision should be inferred from the Mayor’s statement and comments.

Financial considerations

77 There are no financial considerations at this stage.

Conclusion

78 London Plan policies on housing, affordable housing, urban design, inclusive design, sustainable development and transport are relevant to this application and overall the scheme is generally supported subject to the relocation of the existing boatyard being satisfactorily resolved and secured. However, there are some outstanding issues that need to be resolved before the decision making stage and these and their potential remedies are set out below:

- Principle of development: The principal of development is established from the previous permission which has been implemented and is currently under construction. The GLA would however welcome further discussion with the applicant regarding the relocation of the boatyard.

- Housing: It is understood that the quantum and mix of affordable housing has been verified as the maximum reasonable amount by the Council’s independent review of the submitted financial viability assessment. The outcome of this review should be shared with GLA officers to confirm compliancy with London Plan policy 3.12. Further information regarding the residential mix and tenure across the wider site should also be provided.

- Urban design: The proposed height, scale and massing is supported. The design team need to undertake further work regarding the layout of the linear blocks in relation to the corridor lengths and unit to core ratio.
Inclusive design: The access strategy for the site results in unfortunate constraints between Banning Street and the River Walk. Officers would welcome further discussion regarding inclusive access through these routes.

Sustainable development: The carbon savings fall short of the 40% reduction target set out in London Plan policy 5.2. The applicant should consider the scope for additional measures aimed at achieving further reductions as set out above and liaise with the Council to ensure any shortfall is met off-site. In line with the comments above, the applicant should not install CHP onsite and prioritise connection to one of the district heat networks within the vicinity of the site. A condition is suggested to ensure this. Further information and clarification is sought with regards to the proposed site heat network and the submitted flood risk assessment.

Transport: The application is broadly compliant with London Plan transport policies. However, suitable provisions should be made to prevent residents from obtaining parking permits; secure Blue Badge parking and cycle facilities in accordance with London Plan standards; and the updating of the travel plan.

For further information, contact GLA Planning Team - Development & Projects Unit:

Colin Wilson, Senior Manager – Development & Projects  
020 7983 4783 email colin.wilson@london.gov.uk

Justin Carr, Strategic Planning Manager (Development Decisions)  
020 7983 4895 email justin.carr@london.gov.uk

Jonathan Finch, Case Officer  
020 7983 4799 email jonathan.finch@london.gov.uk