

representation hearing report GLA/4295/03

7 December 2018

1A & 1C Eynsham Drive, Abbey Wood

in the Royal Borough of Greenwich

planning application nos. 17/4080/F

Planning application

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended); Greater London Authority Acts 1999 and 2007; Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 (“the Order”).

The proposal

Demolition of existing car wash and pet hospital and the construction of a residential-led mixed-use development, including four buildings of between three and seventeen storeys, comprising 272 new homes, a replacement pet hospital facility, flexible commercial floorspace and associated car parking and landscaping.

The applicant

The applicants are **Abbey Wood Property Ltd** and the architect is **Assael**.

Recommendation summary

The Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills, acting under delegated authority as Local Planning Authority for the purpose of determining this application,

- i. grants conditional planning permission in respect of application 17/4080/F for the reasons set out in the reasons for approval section below, and subject to the prior completion of a section 106 legal agreement;
- ii. delegates authority to the Assistant Director - Planning or the Executive Director of Development, Enterprise and Environment to issue the planning permission and agree, add, delete or vary, the final detailed wording of the conditions and informatives as required, and authority to negotiate, agree the final wording, and sign and execute, the section 106 legal agreement;
- iii. delegates authority to the Assistant Director – Planning or the Executive Director of Development, Enterprise and Environment to agree any variations to the proposed heads of terms for the section 106 legal agreement;

- iv. delegates authority to the Assistant Director - Planning or Executive Director of Development, Enterprise and Environment to refuse planning permission, if by 7 March 2019 the section 106 legal agreement has not been completed;
- v. notes that approval of details pursuant to conditions imposed on the planning permission would be submitted to, and determined by, Greenwich Council;
- vi. notes that Greenwich Council would be responsible for the enforcement of the conditions attached to the planning permission.

Drawing numbers and documents

Existing Drawings	Existing Plans
A2874 100 - R12 Existing Site Plan (Existing context)	A2874 001 - R12 Site Location Plan
A2874 101 - R12 Emerging Site Plan (Proposed context)	A2874 002 - R12 Site Location Plan - Emerging Context
A2874 102 - R12 Proposed Alterations Plan	
A2874 103 - R12 Existing Site - Ground Floor Plan	
A2874 104 - R12 Existing Site - Roof Plan	
A2874 130 - R12 Existing Sections	
A2874 140 - R12 Existing Elevations	
A2874 141 - R12 Existing Elevations	
Proposed drawings	
Site plans	
A2874 200 - R20 Proposed Plan - Ground Floor	A2874 209 - R20 Proposed Plan - Ninth Floor
A2874 200-1 - R20 Proposed Plan - Basement Floor	A2874 210 - R20 Proposed Plan - Tenth Floor
A2874 201 - R20 Proposed Plan - First Floor	A2874 211 - R20 Proposed Plan - Eleventh Floor
A2874 202 - R20 Proposed Plan - Second Floor	A2874 212 - R20 Proposed Plan - Twelfth Floor
A2874 203 - R20 Proposed Plan - Third Floor	A2874 213 - R20 Proposed Plan - Thirteenth Floor
A2874 204 - R20 Proposed Plan - Fourth Floor	A2874 214 - R20 Proposed Plan - Fourteenth Floor
A2874 205 - R20 Proposed Plan - Fifth Floor	A2874 215 - R20 Proposed Plan - Fifteenth Floor
A2874 206 - R20 Proposed Plan - Sixth Floor	A2874 216 - R20 Proposed Plan - Sixteenth Floor
A2874 207 - R20 Proposed Plan - Seventh Floor	A2874 217 - R20 Proposed Plan - Roof Plan

A2874 208 - R20 Proposed Plan - Eighth Floor	A2874 290 - R20 Proposed Plan - Phasing
Proposed Sections	
A2874 300 - R20 Proposed Sectional Elevation 1	A2874 304 - R20 Proposed Sectional Elevation 5
A2874 301 - R20 Proposed Sectional Elevation 2	A2874 305 - R20 Proposed Sectional Elevation 6
A2874 302 - R20 Proposed Sectional Elevation 3	A2874 306 - R20 Proposed Sectional Elevation 7
A2874 303 - R20 Proposed Sectional Elevation 4	A2874 307 - R20 Proposed Sectional Elevation 8
Proposed Elevations	
A2874 400 - R20 Proposed North Elevation (Eynsham Drive)	A2874 402 - R20 Proposed South Elevation (Service Road)
A2874 401 - R20 Proposed East Elevation (Harrow Manorway)	A2874 403 - R20 Proposed West Elevation (Service Road)
Supporting documents	
R4 Design and Access Statement	Flood Risk Assessment
R1 Design and Access Statement Addendum	Land Contamination Report
A2874 700-712 - R20 Area schedule	Health Impact Statement
Cover letter	Air Quality Assessment
Planning application form and CIL form	Construction Management Plan
Design and Access Statement (including landscape and playspace strategy)	Acoustic Assessment
Transport Statement, Travel Plan, Delivery and Servicing Management Plan and Car Parking Management Plan	Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing Assessment
Energy Statement	Ecological Appraisal
Landscape and Townscape Visual Impact Assessment	Sustainability Statement

Wind Microclimate Assessment	Statement of Community Involvement
Planning Statement, including Affordable Housing Statement and Economic Statement	

Introduction

1 Having assumed authority to determine this planning application, this report sets out the matters that the Deputy Mayor must consider in forming a view over whether to grant or refuse planning permission and to guide his decision making at the upcoming representation hearing. This report includes a recommendation from GLA officers, as set out below.

Officer recommendation - reasons for approval

2 The Deputy Mayor, under delegated authority and acting as the Local Planning Authority, has considered the circumstances of this application against strategic and local development plan policy, national planning policy, relevant supplementary planning guidance and all material planning considerations. He has had regard to Greenwich Council's planning committee report, dated 5 June 2018, the draft decision notice, approving the application, and all consultation responses and representations made on the case. The reasons set out below are why this application is acceptable in planning policy terms:

- I. The site lies within the Thamesmead and Abbey Wood Opportunity Area and at the boundary of a Housing Zone. The Opportunity Area designation supports the redevelopment of the site to provide housing and support uses. The principle of a residential led, mixed use development is strongly supported by both strategic and local planning policy. The proposals would provide much needed housing for which there is an identified and well-documented need. The proposals make provision for the delivery of a viable quantum of employment, within flexible floorspace and replacement pet hospital floorspace, which is compatible with the proposed residential uses. The proposal optimises the development density, taking into account the accessibility of the location. The proposal is therefore policy compliant in land use terms in accordance with the NPPF, London Plan Policies 2.13, 3.3, 3.4, 3.11, 3.16, 4.7, 4.12, draft London Plan Policies GG2, GG4, SD1, H1, H5, E9, E11, S1, Greenwich Local Plan Policies H1, H2, H3, CH1, CH2 and the Thamesmead and Abbey Wood SPD (2009).
- II. The scheme would provide 272 residential units, of which 95 would be affordable (36% by habitable room, 35% by unit). There is the potential to deliver more through the use of grant funding. The housing proposed is of a high quality. Overall, the scheme would make a significant contribution to housing delivery targets for Greenwich. The proposed level of affordable housing responds to the strategic target set out in the Draft London Plan and meets the requirements of the Mayor's Affordable Housing & Viability SPG, and a review mechanism would be secured if an agreed level of progress is not made within 24 months of grant of planning permission and would secure additional affordable homes if viable. On this basis, the applicant has demonstrated compliance with London Plan Policies 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.8, 3.11, 3.12, draft London Plan Policies D4, H1, H3, H5, H6, H7 and H12, the Mayor's Housing SPG (2016 as amended), the Mayor's Affordable Housing and Viability SPG (2017), Greenwich Local Plan Policies H1, H2, H3, H5, and DH1, and the Thamesmead and Abbey Wood SPD (2009).

- III. The design and layout principles are well-considered and the scheme achieves a high quality of placemaking, with well-defined new public routes and spaces, enhanced by high quality landscaping. The massing strategy responds to the site characteristics and the existing and emerging context. The quality of design, architecture and materials will ensure a distinctive and high quality development which will contribute positively to the regeneration of this part of Abbey Wood. The setting and significance of most nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets would remain unharmed. Less than substantial harm has been identified to the setting and by reason thereof to the significance of the scheduled monument and Grade II Listed Lesnes Abbey located in the London Borough of Bexley. However, it is considered that, the public benefits delivered by the scheme namely the delivery of housing including 36% affordable housing clearly outweigh the limited harm to identified designated heritage asset. The proposals adhere to the principles of designing out crime. As such the proposal complies with Policies 3.5, 3.6, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.7, 7.8, 7.10 and 7.13 of the London Plan; Policies GG6, D1, D2, D4, D7, D8, D10, D11, D13, HC1, HC2 and G5, Greenwich Local Plan Policies H5, DH1, DH2 DH3, Policy DH(b), Policy DH(e), Policy DH(g), Policy DH(i) and the Thamesmead and Abbey Wood SPD (2009).
- IV. The proposed development has embedded the principles of inclusive access and would comply with the relevant inclusive design housing standards. As such, the scheme complies with London Plan Policies 3.8, 7.2 and 7.6, draft London Plan Policies D3 and D5, Greenwich Local Plan Policies DH1 and H5.
- V. The proposed development has demonstrated that a high standard of sustainable design and construction would be achieved, minimising carbon dioxide emissions, using energy efficiently and including renewable energy in accordance with the energy hierarchy. The development would be acceptable in respect of flood risk, deliver sustainable urban drainage, ecology and urban greening benefits over the existing situation at the site. The environmental impacts of the development, in terms of minimising exposure to poor air quality, wind conditions, addressing contaminated land and waste management, are acceptable taking into account the proposed mitigation measures. As such the scheme complies with the policies contained with Chapter 5 and Policies 7.7 and 7.14 of the London Plan, draft London Plan chapter 9 and Policies SI1, SI2 and SI, Greenwich Policies DH1, H5, E1, OS4, OS(f), E2, E(a).
- VI. The development proposals would have an acceptable impact on neighbourhood amenity. No neighbouring residential properties would experience unacceptable reductions to their daylight and sunlight. The proposals would not unacceptably reduce privacy to neighbouring residential properties and issues of noise and disturbance would be adequately mitigated through planning conditions. As such the proposed development complies with London Plan Policies 7.6, 7.7 and 7.15, draft London Plan Policies D2, D8 and D13, Greenwich Local Plan Policies H5, DH1, DH(b) and H5.
- VII. The quantum of proposed car parking across all uses is acceptable subject to a suitable framework of controls including a car parking management plan, electric vehicle charging points, travel plans and car club spaces. The proposal strikes an appropriate balance between promoting new development and encouraging cycling, walking and public transport use. As such the proposed development complies with the policies contained within Chapter 6 of the London Plan, draft London Plan Policy T1 and Policy T6, Greenwich Local Plan Policies IM4, IM(a), IM(b) and IM (c).
- VIII. Appropriate, reasonable and necessary planning conditions and planning obligations are proposed to ensure that the development is acceptable in planning terms and the environmental impacts are mitigated. Accordingly, there are no, or insufficient, grounds to

withhold planning consent on the basis of the policies considered and other material planning considerations.

Recommendation

3 That the Deputy Mayor, acting under delegated authority and acting as Local Planning Authority, grants planning permission in respect of application 17/4080/F, subject to prior completion of a section 106 legal agreement, and the inclusion of planning conditions and informatives, as summarised below. The detailed wording of conditions and informatives will be set out in an addendum to this report.

4 That the Deputy Mayor delegates authority to the Assistant Director – Planning and the Director of Development, Enterprise and Environment to issue the planning permission and agree, add, delete or vary the final wording of the conditions and informatives as required.

5 That the Deputy Mayor agrees that the Assistant Director of Planning and the Director of Development and Environment, be given delegated authority to negotiate and complete the s106 legal agreement, the principles of which have been agreed with the applicants as set out in the heads of terms detailed below.

6 That the Deputy Mayor delegates authority to the Assistant Director – Planning and the Director of Development, Enterprise and Environment to refuse planning permission if, by 7 March 2019 the s106 legal agreement has not been completed.

7 That the Deputy Mayor notes the approval of details pursuant to conditions imposed on the planning permission would be submitted to, and determined by, Greenwich Council.

8 That the Deputy Mayor notes that Greenwich Council would be responsible for the enforcement of the conditions attached to the permission.

Section 106 Legal agreement - Heads of Terms

9 The following are recommended as the heads of terms for the section 106 agreement, referred to in the above Recommendation.

Affordable housing

The following affordable housing provisions would be secured:

- a) 95 affordable units to be secured, comprising 67 London Affordable Rent units and 28 shared ownership units;
- b) Obligation to engage with RPs to explore grant funding, to deliver a minimum of 40% affordable housing with grant;
- c) Details of affordable housing definitions, fit out, transfer/lease to a Registered Provider, priority for those living/working in the borough, service charges, the income thresholds for the intermediate accommodation, rent levels for the affordable rented units and the retention of the affordable units at the proposed rent levels, would be set out in the section 106 agreement.
- d) All affordable rent units would be secured at London Affordable Rent (LAR) in accordance with GLA standard definitions;

- e) All shared ownership secured at income caps of £55,000 for 1 bed, £71,000 for 2 bed and £85,000 for 3 bed for the first three months, before being offered to eligible purchasers on household incomes of up to £90,000.
- f) An early implementation review mechanism, which would be triggered if the development has not been substantially implemented within two years of the date of consent, in line with the Mayor's SPG standard formulae.

Transport

The following transport mitigation and improvement measures would be secured:

- a) Travel Plans and monitoring;
- b) Car Club – a commitment to extending the existing car club, provision of car club spaces and payment of a period of initial membership;
- c) Monetary contribution to facilitate the investigation and implementation of the extension of the CPZ zone to include the surrounding area, including within LB Bexley;
- d) Parking permit exemption for future residents;
- e) Dedication of land at Harrow Manor Way to facilitate road network upgrade works;
- f) Cycle training contribution of £5,440;
- g) A car parking management plan, monitoring and review to cover the PDSA car parking apportionment.

Employment and training

The following employment and training measures would be secured:

- a) Commitment and participation towards GLLaB and business support including financial contribution of £401,927.

Other obligations

Other obligations would be secured as follows:

- a) Carbon offset contribution – £315,000.
- b) £50,000 towards public realm improvements to the Thistlebrook Estate;
- c) Entering into Section 278 Agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980;
- d) Payment of legal, engineers cost;
- e) Payment of S106 monitoring costs.

Conditions to be secured¹

1. Approved plans
2. Details of Materials
3. Archaeology
4. Construction Method Statement
5. Construction Logistics Plan
6. Construction Travel Plan
7. Construction Plant and Machinery (NRMM)
8. Timing of Vegetation Clearance (Breeding Birds)

¹ Draft conditions have been prepared and will be published as an addendum to this report; this list provides a summary of the draft notice condition headings

9. Cranes
10. London City Airport's OLS
11. Drainage
12. Contaminated Land
13. Noise from fixed plant & equipment
14. Vibration
15. Sound Attenuation - Environmental / Transport Noise
16. Air Quality and Air Quality Neutral Assessment
17. Air quality assessment - Domestic boilers
18. Landscaping
19. Lighting
20. Details of Children's Play Areas
21. Carbon Emissions Reduction -Domestic
22. Future Connection to Heating, Cooling and Power Networks
23. Heating, Cooling and Power Networks
24. Water efficiency
25. On-site renewable energy technologies
26. BREEAM
27. On-site renewable energy technologies – evidence of installation
28. Heating, Cooling and Power Networks
29. On-site renewable energy technologies – monitoring
30. Ecological Assessment
31. Ecological / Landscape management plan
32. Brown roof
33. Accessibility
34. Wheelchair Adaptable Dwellings
35. Wheelchair Accessible Dwellings
36. Sound Insulation for D1/D2 Premises
37. Noise from fixed plant and equipment
38. Flood Risk
39. Groundwater Protection
40. Piling
41. Air quality assessment - Biomass/CHP/combustion plant Condition
42. Air quality assessment - Domestic Boilers Condition
43. Car Parking Spaces (Residential)
44. Car Parking Spaces (Commercial)
45. Electric Vehicle Charging Points
46. Car Parking Spaces - Protection
47. Parking for Car Club
48. Delivery and Servicing Plan
49. Detailed design and implementation of shared space
50. Parking for car club
51. Car Park Management Plan
52. Vehicular access drawing
53. Cycle parking (minimum of 550 spaces)
54. Hours of Operation (Flexible commercial space)
55. Refuse Storage and Collection Management
56. Restriction on D1 Use
57. Retail Restrictions
58. Restriction on permitted change of ground floor
59. Security
60. Boundary treatments
61. Plaque

Publication protocol

10 This report has been published seven days prior to the Representation Hearing, in accordance with the GLA procedure for Representation Hearings. Where necessary, an addendum to this report will be published on the day of the Representation Hearing. This report, any addendum, draft decision notices and the Mayor of London's decision on this case will be made available on the GLA website:

<https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/planning-applications-and-decisions/planning-application-search/eynsham-drive>

Site description

11 The 0.63 hectare (1.55 acres) plot comprises an existing mechanical car wash and PDSA pet hospital with associated hardstanding car parking in Abbey Wood in the Royal Borough of Greenwich. The site is located immediately to the south-west of the roundabout junction with Harrow Manorway, Yarnton Way and Eynsham Drive. Eynsham Drive bounds the site to the north, Harrow Manorway to the east, which also forms the administrative boundary of the London Borough of Bexley, Thistlebrook Estate Travellers Site immediately to the south and a Lidl supermarket and small industrial estate to the west, which is not subject to any policy designation.

12 The surrounding context comprises a mix of low-rise residential development, industrial uses and the 1960's Thamesmead housing estate, which is currently subject to a series of outline and detailed planning applications for a comprehensive estate renewal scheme. A large new supermarket is located a short distance to the south of the site and Abbey Wood neighbourhood centre, which provides a range of local shops and services, is situated immediately to the south of the railway station.

13 Thamesmead and Abbey Wood is a key area of strategic growth as reflected by its Opportunity Area status in the London Plan and draft London Plan and is adjacent to the boundary of a Housing Zone. At the local scale, the Council's Core Strategy (2015) identifies the site as being within the Thamesmead Strategic Development Location. The Council produced the Thamesmead and Abbey Wood SPD (2009) to help guide sustainable development in this area. A number of planning applications have been recently granted in the vicinity of the site in both the Royal Borough of Greenwich and London Borough of Bexley for residential-led, mixed-use redevelopment, which include taller buildings ranging from approximately ten to 21 storeys in height.

14 The A2016, Eastern Avenue, is the closest part of the Strategic Road Network and is 650 metres north of the site. The South Circular Road, located west of the site is the nearest part of the Transport for London Road Network. Abbey Wood is the closest station to the proposal and will be served by the Elizabeth Line (Crossrail). The nearest bus stop is located outside the site along Eynsham Drive and this stop is served by route 177 and 469. There is a further bus stop south of the site along Harrow Manorway, which offers an additional five services. As a result, the site records a good public transport accessibility rating of four, on a scale of 0-6b, where 6b is the highest. This will increase to a rating of five once Crossrail is operational.

Details of the proposal

15 The application as originally submitted to the Council in December 2017 sought full planning permission for the demolition of existing car wash and pet hospital and the construction of a residential-led mixed-use development, including four buildings of three, eight, fourteen and seventeen storeys, comprising 272 new homes, a replacement pet hospital facility, flexible commercial/community (A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, D1, D2) floorspace together with associated cycle

parking, car parking, playspace, landscaping and public realm. 36% of the units (by habitable room) were offered as affordable housing.

16 Following the Mayor’s decision to call in the application and to act as local planning authority for the purposes of determining it, the applicant has made the following amendments to the scheme. These amendments were subject to public consultation between 15 October and 5 November 2018.

- Increase in residential ground floor frontage, through the introduction of duplex units to southern elevations;
- Amendments to the housing mix to provide; 3 fewer one bed units, 2 additional 3 bed units and the introduction of a 4 bed unit,
- Enhanced boundary treatment with the Thistlebrook Estate to provide a new masonry wall of 2.5 metres;
- Revisions to the landscaping approach at ground floor with amendments to parking area material and finish and additional planting;
- Revisions to the landscaping approach on roofscapes and playspace provision; and
- A reduction in the number of car parking spaces by 10.

17 The development would comprise four buildings (A-D) which sit on a podium with two commercial tenancies at ground floor level. The single storey podium links the buildings and would provide amenity and playspace for the residents of the scheme.



Figure 1: Proposed groundfloor plan (A2874 200 R20)

18 As shown in figure 1, The proposed groundfloor layout includes internal car parking spaces within a grade level car park on the site frontage, along the site boundary and beneath a first floor podium centralised within the site. The vehicular entrance to the podium car park is at the southern edge of the building line. This point serves as both the entrance and egress. The site contains three residential cores.

19 The ground floors of the two storey houses are located on the southern edge of the site also opening at podium level with front doors onto the shared amenity space. The replacement pet hospital is located at the north east corner of the site within buildings B and A. A 207 sq.m flexible commercial unit is located at ground floor level fronting a new public space in building C (see ground floor plan in figure 1 above).



Figure 2: Proposed first floor plan (A2874 201 R20)

20 As shown in Figure 2, above podium level the development would comprise four blocks all containing residential units on the upper floors. The scheme is arranged in a perimeter block of three to eight storeys with two taller elements of fourteen and seventeen storeys above the podium.



Figure 3: Proposed scheme – axonometric view of blocks A-D

21 The proposal includes the creation of a public and private amenity space. The revisions undertaken have sought to increase planting across the scheme and update the boundary conditions at the boundary with the Thistlebrook Estate. New tree planting is also proposed across the site and along key routes. Resident’s amenity space would be provided in the form of private balconies or winter gardens for each flat and communal podium amenity spaces.

22 The scheme proposes 49 total car parking spaces, which includes provision for both residents and visitors to the pet hospital. There will be 17 accessible residential bays. The car parking will be split across the surface level which will have provision for; 16 pet hospital visitor spaces, 2 commercial/residential visitor spaces, 2 car club spaces and 8 residential accessible spaces. The remainder of the car parking will be located below the podium and will provide for; 12 pet hospital spaces and 9 residential accessible bays. A total of 550 cycle spaces are provided across the entire scheme and will be split across buildings A, B and C.

Relevant planning history

23 In 1998 planning permission was granted for the construction of a single storey veterinary hospital and new access road. Since this time there has been limited planning history. The site currently comprises a mechanical car wash and PDSA pet hospital with associated hardstanding car parking.

Current application

24 The scheme was subject to extensive pre-application discussions with GLA offices as well as Royal Borough of Greenwich officers. On 27 June 2017, a formal pre-planning application meeting was held at City Hall focusing on the principle of development, housing, affordable housing, urban design, inclusive design, sustainable development and transport.

25 The GLA's pre-application advice report of 13 July 2017 stated that, whilst the land use principles and proposed residential and employment intensification of this site in an Opportunity Area that would deliver a policy compliant amount of affordable housing is supported in principle, the applicant was advised that any future planning application would need to address the matters raised in the advice report, with respect to exploring available GLA funding to further maximise affordable housing delivery and resolve urban design issues including; residential quality, children's play space, inclusive design and parking issues.

26 Stage 1: On 2 February 2018, the Mayor of London received documents from Greenwich Council notifying him that a planning application had been submitted that was of potential strategic importance, referring it under Categories 1A and 1C of the Schedule to the Order:

- Category 1A: Development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats, or houses and flats.
- Category 1C(c): Development which comprises or includes the erection of a building more than 30 metres high and outside the City of London.

27 On 5 March 2018, the Mayor of London considered a GLA planning report reference: GLA/4295/01. The report advised Greenwich Council that the application did not fully comply with the London Plan and issues around affordable housing, urban design, climate change and transport should be addressed; however, it noted that the land use principles were strongly supported.

28 On 5 June 2018, Greenwich Council's planning committee deferred the application to allow for a Members' site visit to be undertaken.

29 Then on the 9 July 2018 Greenwich Council, against officer recommendation, resolved to refuse planning permission for the application. It is noted the decision to refuse the application was against officers' recommendation, and, on 31 July 2018, the Council advised the Mayor of this decision. The Council's draft decision notice includes the following reasons for refusal:

- The proposed development represents overdevelopment of the site by reason of its density, height, scale and massing, and would fail to complement the character and appearance of the street scene, surrounding area, and would cause less than substantial harm to the setting of Lesnes Abbey which is a scheduled ancient monument and grade II listed building. This harm is not outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme. As such the proposal is contrary to the NPPF, policies 7.4, 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) and policies H2, H5, DH1, DH3, and DH(I) of the Council's Core Strategy with detailed Policies (2014).
- The proposed development due to its height, scale, orientation and relationship with adjoining properties would result in a loss of residential amenity for the occupiers of Thistlebrook Estate to the south in terms of loss of privacy due to overlooking contrary to Policy 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and Policies DH1 and DH(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies July 2014.
- The proposed development due to the lack of appropriate private and communal amenity spaces would result in the creation of a poor living environment for prospective occupiers contrary to Policy 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and Policies DH1 and H5 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies July 2014.

30 Stage 2: On 13 August 2018, the Mayor considered a GLA planning report reference GLA/4295/02. The report concluded that, having regard to the details of the application, the development is of such a nature and scale that it would have a significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan, and there are sound planning reasons for the Mayor to intervene in this case and issue a direction under Article 7 of the Order that he would act as the Local Planning Authority for the purpose of determining the application. The report identified that there were outstanding matters that needed to be resolved, including issues pertaining to affordable housing, urban design, climate change and transport. The Mayor agreed this recommendation.

31 Since the direction was issued, GLA officers have worked with the applicant to amend the application to address the Council's reasons for refusal and matters raised at Stage 1 and 2. Revised plans were submitted by the applicant on 21 September 2018. The amendments are set out above and discussed in the relevant sections of this report.

32 Re-consultation on amended plans: A 22-day re-consultation was carried out on 15 October 2018, notifying interested parties on proposed amendments by the applicant to plans and documents in relation to the amendments outlined above.

33 Site visit: The Deputy Mayor will undertake an accompanied site visit in advance of the representation hearing with GLA and TfL officers, representatives of the Council, and the applicant team.

Relevant legislation, policies and guidance

34 In determining this application, the Deputy Mayor must determine the application for planning permission in accordance with the requirement of Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. In particular, the Deputy Mayor is required to determine the application in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

35 For the purposes of Section 38(6), the development plan for the area comprises the following documents: Greenwich Core Strategy with Detailed Policies Development Plan Documents

2014 (collectively forming the 'Greenwich Local Plan' and referred to accordingly hereafter); and the London Plan (2016, consolidated with alterations since 2011).

36 On 1 December 2017, the Mayor published his draft London Plan for public consultation, which closed on 2 March 2018. On 13 August 2018, the Mayor published a version of the draft Plan that includes his minor suggested changes. This must be taken into account, but the weight attached to the draft Plan must reflect its stage of preparation, in accordance with the guidance set out within the NPPF paragraph 48.

37 The Deputy Mayor is also required to have regard to national planning policy in the form of the Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), as well as supplementary planning documents and, depending on their state of advancement, emerging elements of the development plan and other planning policies. A full list of supplementary planning documents and guidance is set out below. However, the following is SPD, which is specific to the area in which the application site is located, is considered to be particularly material:

- Thamesmead and Abbey Wood Supplementary Planning Document (December 2009).

38 The principal relevant material planning considerations which arise in the context of the current application are: land use principles (including housing, and employment); housing (including affordable housing, housing tenure, mix, density and housing quality) urban design (including layout, landscaping, height and massing, architectural quality and appearance, heritage, fire safety and designing out crime); inclusive design; neighbouring amenity impacts (including privacy/overlooking; noise/disturbance); natural environment; sustainability (including climate change mitigation and adaptation, including sustainable drainage); other environmental considerations (including air quality, contaminated land and waste management); transport, and; mitigating the impact of development through planning obligations and conditions. The relevant planning policies and guidance at the national, regional and local levels are as noted in the following paragraphs.

National planning policy and guidance

39 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides the Government's overarching planning policy, key to which, is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. First published in 2012, the Government published a revised NPPF in July 2018. The NPPF defines three dimensions to sustainable development: an economic objective contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy; a social objective supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities; and, an environmental objective contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment. The relevant components of the NPPF are:

- 2. Achieving sustainable development
- 4. Decision-making
- 5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- 6. Building a strong, competitive economy
- 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities
- 9. Promoting sustainable transport
- 11. Making effective use of land
- 12. Achieving well-designed places
- 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 15. Natural environment
- 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

40 The National Planning Practice Guidance is also a material consideration.

Regional planning policy and guidance

41 The London Plan (as amended 2016) is the Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London. The relevant policies within the London Plan are:

- Policy 1.1 Delivering the strategic vision and objectives for London;
- Policy 2.3 Growth areas and co-ordination corridors;
- Policy 2.9 Inner London;
- Policy 2.14 Areas for regeneration
- Policy 2.13 Opportunity area and intensification areas;
- Policy 2.18 Green infrastructure;
- Policy 3.1 Ensuring equal life chances for all;
- Policy 3.2 Improving health and addressing health inequalities;
- Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply;
- Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential;
- Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments;
- Policy 3.6 Children and young people’s play and informal recreation facilities;
- Policy 3.8 Housing choice;
- Policy 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities;
- Policy 3.10 Definition of affordable housing;
- Policy 3.11 Affordable housing targets;
- Policy 3.12 Negotiating affordable housing;
- Policy 3.13 Affordable housing thresholds;
- Policy 4.1 Developing London’s economy;
- Policy 4.2 Offices
- Policy 4.3 Mixed use development and offices;
- Policy 4.7 Retail and town centre development;
- Policy 4.9 Small shops
- Policy 4.12 Improving opportunities for all;
- Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation;
- Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions;
- Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction;
- Policy 5.4A Electricity and gas supply;
- Policy 5.5 Decentralised energy networks;
- Policy 5.6 Decentralised energy in development proposals;
- Policy 5.7 Renewable energy;
- Policy 5.9 Overheating and cooling;
- Policy 5.10 Urban greening;
- Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs;
- Policy 5.12 Flood risk management;
- Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage;
- Policy 5.14 Water quality and wastewater infrastructure;
- Policy 5.15 Water use and supplies;
- Policy 5.17 Waste capacity;
- Policy 5.18 Construction, excavation and demolition waste;
- Policy 5.21 Contaminated Land;
- Policy 6.1 Strategic approach;

- Policy 6.2 Providing public transport capacity and safeguarding land for transport;
- Policy 6.3 Assessing the effects of development on transport capacity;
- Policy 6.4 Enhancing London's transport connectivity;
- Policy 6.5 Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure;
- Policy 6.7 Better streets and surface transport;
- Policy 6.9 Cycling;
- Policy 6.10 Walking;
- Policy 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion;
- Policy 6.12 Road network capacity;
- Policy 6.13 Parking;
- Policy 6.14 Freight;
- Policy 7.1 Lifetime neighbourhoods;
- Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment;
- Policy 7.3 Designing out crime;
- Policy 7.4 Local character;
- Policy 7.5 Public realm;
- Policy 7.6 Architecture;
- Policy 7.7 Location and design of tall and large buildings;
- Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology;
- Policy 7.13 Safety, security and resilience to emergency;
- Policy 7.14 Improving air quality;
- Policy 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes;
- Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature;
- Policy 7.21 Trees and woodlands;
- Policy 8.2 Planning obligations; and,
- Policy 8.3 Community Infrastructure Levy.

42 The draft London Plan was published for consultation on 1 December 2017, with Minor Suggested Changes published on 13 August 2018. This must be taken into account in the determination, but the weight attached to the draft Plan must reflect its stage of preparation, as referred to above. The following policies are considered to be relevant:

- Policy GG1 Building strong and inclusive communities;
- Policy GG2 Making best use of land;
- Policy GG3 Creating a healthy city;
- Policy GG4 Delivering the homes Londoners need;
- Policy GG5 Growing a good economy;
- Policy GG6 Increasing efficiency and resilience;
- Policy SD1 Opportunity Areas;
- Policy SD10 Strategic and local regeneration;
- Policy D1 London's form and characteristics;
- Policy D2 Delivering good design;
- Policy D3 Inclusive design;
- Policy D4 Housing quality and standards;
- Policy D5 Accessible housing;
- Policy D6 Optimising housing density;
- Policy D7 Public realm;
- Policy D8 Tall Buildings;
- Policy D10 Safety, security and resilience to emergency;

- Policy D11 Fire Safety;
- Policy D12 Agent of change;
- Policy D13 Noise;
- Policy H1 Increasing housing supply;
- Policy H3 Monitoring housing targets;
- Policy H5 Delivering affordable housing;
- Policy H6 Threshold approach to applications;
- Policy H7 Affordable housing tenure;
- Policy H12 Housing size mix;
- Policy S4 Play and informal recreation;
- Policy E1 Offices;
- Policy E9 Retail, markets and hot food takeaways;
- Policy E11 Skills and opportunities for all;
- Policy HC1 Heritage conservation and growth;
- Policy G1 Green infrastructure;
- Policy G4 Local green and open space;
- Policy G5 Urban greening;
- Policy G6 Biodiversity and access to nature
- Policy G7 Trees and woodland;
- Policy SI1 Improving air quality;
- Policy SI2 Minimising greenhouse gas emissions;
- Policy SI3 Energy infrastructure;
- Policy SI4 Managing heat risk;
- Policy SI5 Water infrastructure;
- Policy SI7 Reducing waste and promoting a circular economy;
- Policy SI8 Waste capacity and net waste self-sufficiency;
- Policy SI12 Flood Risk Management;
- Policy SI13 Sustainable drainage;
- Policy T1 Strategic approach to transport;
- Policy T2 Healthy streets;
- Policy T3 Transport capacity, connectivity and safeguarding;
- Policy T4 Assessing and mitigating transport impacts;
- Policy T5 Cycling;
- Policy T6 Car parking;
- Policy T6.1 Residential parking;
- Policy T6.2 Office parking;
- Policy T6.3 Retail parking;
- Policy T6.5 Non-residential disabled persons parking;
- Policy T7 Freight and servicing;
- Policy T9 Funding transport through planning; and
- Policy DF1 Delivery of the plan and planning obligations.

43 The following published strategic supplementary planning guidance (SPG), strategies and other documents are also relevant:

- Affordable Housing and Viability SPG (August 2017), which must be considered in the context of the decision in *R(McCarthy & Stone) v. Mayor of London*.
- Crossrail Funding (March 2016)
- Housing SPG (March 2016, as amended);

- Social Infrastructure SPG (May 2015);
- Accessible London: achieving an inclusive environment SPG (October 2014);
- The control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition SPG (July 2014);
- Shaping Neighbourhoods: character and context SPG (June 2014);
- Sustainable Design and Construction SPG (April 2014);
- Shaping Neighbourhoods: play and informal recreation SPG (September 2012); and
- All London Green Grid SPG (March 2012)
- Mayor’s Housing Strategy (May 2018);
- Mayor’s Transport Strategy (March 2018);
- Mayor’s Environment Strategy (May 2018).

Local planning policy and guidance

Greenwich

44 Greenwich’s Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), provide the local policy approach for the borough. The relevant policies are:

- Policy H1 New Housing
- Policy H2 Housing Mix
- Policy H3 Affordable Housing
- Policy H5 Housing Design
- Policy H(e) Children’s Play Areas
- Policy EA1 Economic Development
- Policy EA(c) Skills and Training
- Policy DH1 Design
- Policy DH2 Tall Buildings
- Policy DH3 Heritage Assets
- Policy DH(b) Protection of Amenity for Adjacent Occupiers
- Policy DH(e) Shopfronts and Signs
- Policy DH(g) Local Views
- Policy DH(i) Statutory Listed Building Protection of Listed Buildings
- Policy DH(m) Archaeology
- Policy OS4 Biodiversity
- Policy OS(f) Ecological Factors
- Policy E1 Carbon Emissions
- Policy E2 Flood Risk
- Policy E(a) Pollution
- Policy E(c) Air Pollution
- Policy E(e) Contaminated Land
- Policy E(f) Living Roofs and Walls
- Policy CH1 Cohesive Communities
- Policy CH2 Healthy Communities
- Policy IM1 Infrastructure
- Policy IM4 Sustainable Travel
- Policy IM5 Freight
- Policy IM(a) Impact on the Road Network
- Policy IM(b) Walking and Cycling
- Policy IM(c) Parking Standards

- Policy IM(d) London City Airport

Supplementary planning guidance (SPG) and supplementary planning documents (SPD)

56 The following adopted Greenwich Council SPDs and SPG are also relevant to the proposal:

- Royal Borough of Greenwich Planning Obligations SPG (February 2008); and,
- Thamesmead and Abbey Wood Supplementary Planning Document (December 2009).

Community Infrastructure Levy

57 London borough councils are able to introduce Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charges which are payable in addition to the Mayor's CIL (which sets a charging rate of £35 per sq.m. in the Royal Borough of Greenwich). Greenwich Council's CIL came into effect on 6 April 2015.

58 The Greenwich CIL charging schedule splits the borough into 2 zones with the application site falling within Zone 2. The Greenwich CIL charging schedule sets a variable rate for residential uses with the CIL rate in Zone 2 £40 per sq.m. There are no charges set out for the other uses included within the scheme.

Response to consultation

59 Greenwich Council has publicised the application locally. In addition, the GLA has carried out consultation on revised plans that were submitted subsequent to the Mayor taking over the application, and comments received are outlined below.

Initial consultation

60 Greenwich Council publicised the application by sending notifications to 393 addresses, as well as issuing site and press notices. A total of 13 objection comments were received. 52 pro-forma support forms from the pre-application exhibition were also received.

61 The grounds for objection included the lack of affordable housing; ensuring sale to local residents; lack of vegetation; inadequate parking; surrounding roads unsafe for cyclists; wind impact; excessive height and density; out of character; impact on infrastructure and schools/health facilities; land contamination; and overlooking and privacy.

62 At Stage 2 **Councillor Denise Hyland** objected to the excessive density, lack of family housing, lack of play space, mass and scale, unattractive design, impact on health facilities and schools, traffic safety, overlooking and overshadowing.

Statutory consultee responses

63 The following statutory consultees have also commented:

- **Environment Agency:** No objection, subject to conditions.
- **Historic England:** Considers that there would be harm to the setting of Lesnes Abbey, in conjunction with the cumulative development already approved in the area.
- **Historic England (Archaeology):** Recommended condition for archaeological investigation.
- **Natural England:** No comments, standard advice should be followed.

- **Metropolitan Police:** Request condition requiring the development to meet Secured by Design standards.
- **LB Bexley (adjoining borough):** Raised some traffic and ecology concerns, as well as a request for extended CPZ and transfer of land to enable Harrow Manor Way improvement works.

64 Internal consultees: Greenwich borough officers have provided comments in relation to the environment, environmental health, highways, historic environment, designing out crime, the natural environment, public health, flood risk, housing, sustainability and waste. The points raised have been considered in the body of the report and are reflected in the suggested conditions.

Re-consultation exercise

65 The planning application was called in on 13 August 2018. Since that time, a neighbourhood re-consultation exercise took place, between 15 October 2018 and 5 November 2018 for 22 days in relation to revisions to the scheme that had been updated since the original consultation exercise. A total of 393 letters of notification were distributed to local addresses and those who previously commented. Press notices were posted in the 24 October edition of 'The Weekender'. Site notices were also erected on the site.

66 Responses: The Mayor and/or GLA officers have received 15 responses (11 in objection and 4 in support) as a result of the public consultation exercise, including 2 from Greenwich Councillors 1 from Greenwich Council and 1 from Bexley Council. The majority of the objections reiterate concerns raised with the Council at the initial consultation stages, as detailed above. These responses have been made available to the Deputy Mayor for viewing and have been taken into account in this report.

67 In summary, the points raised in objections to the scheme can be broadly summarised as regarding:

- Overcrowding,
- Loss of privacy to the residents of the Thistlebrook Estate,
- Lack of parking and resultant pressure on surrounding parking availability,
- Failure to address Greenwich Council's reasons for refusal,
- Scheme density,
- Design,
- Height,
- Overshadowing,
- Pressure on school spaces,
- Lack of community facility,
- Concerns that the properties will be 'buy-to-let' investments purchased from abroad and the prevalence of buy-to-let properties and HMO's in the borough,
- Increasing rent levels,
- Lack of social housing,
- Lack of family sized accommodation,
- Quality of children's play area,
- Effect on local character,
- Pressure on local infrastructure e.g. doctor surgeries,
- Construction impacts,
- Visual effect on the Lesnes Abbey Woods views,
- Insufficient CIL and S.106 contributions,

- Lack of monies made available to local enhancements,
- Pressure on public transport, and
- Lack of democratic decision taking.
- **Councillor Denise Hyland** – the Councillor outlined concerns regarding; height of the buildings, impact of the scheme on the character of the surrounds, overcrowding, scheme residential density, lack of family sized accommodation, lack of designated play space, elevational treatments and broader design principles, lack of supporting infrastructure such as schools and health facilities, lack of CIL/S106 contributions, parking pressures and transport impacts, privacy and overshadowing.
- **Councillor Anne-Marie Cousins** - the Councillor outlined concerns regarding; height, risk of flooding, ecology, loss of trees, occupation of commercial units, carbon savings, energy production, impact of historic environment and Lesnes Abbey – nature reserve and Special Scientific Interest, lack of vehicle charging points, lack of clarity surrounding employment generated, lack of CIL/S106 contributions, lack of affordability of units, impact on local businesses, wind, microclimates, open space, pedestrian routes, lack of larger units, lack of private spaces, boundary treatments, viability.

68 The objection to the revised scheme received from **Councillor Sarah Merrill Chair of Planning Board for Greenwich Council** sought to assess the alterations made by the scheme against the Council’s reason for refusal. The representation concludes that the Council’s reasons for refusal have not been sufficiently addressed by the amendments and should thus be refused under the same terms. GLA officers note that the representation states that there is no in principle objection to providing a new development in this location. The comment can be summarised under the headings below:

Overdevelopment:

- The height and massing of the proposals are inappropriate in this location;
- The proposals fail to appropriately respond to their contexts;
- Negative amenity impacts arising from the density;
- The density of the schem.

Impact on listed building

- The interruption of the view of the River Thames from the Lesnes Abbey;
- Reduction in public enjoyment as a result of harm to the setting of the Lesnes Abbey.

Neighbouring amenity

- Insufficient separation distances between the proposed development and its neighbours;
- Boundary treatments and resultant sense of enclosure particularly to the Thistlebrook Estate;
- Overlooking;
- Reduction in outlook;
- Reduction in light;
- Scale.

Quality of accommodation – private and communal amenity spaces

- Under provision of sufficient private and communal amenity spaces.

69 The objection to the revised scheme from **Bexley Council** can be summarised as follows:

- Easement Strip set aside for the Harrow Manor Way/Eynsham Drive Public Realm works must be secured,
- impact on parking and adjacent highways networks,
- recommended to secure; proposed Access/Egress arrangements, Car park and Servicing Management plans, Travel Plan, CPZ extension within Bexley, TMO's on Yarnton Way and other Bexley roads if required, Car Club provision and Transfer of Land to complete the full Harrow Manor Way enhancement works.

70 In summary, the points raised in support of the scheme can be broadly summarised as regarding:

- Increased housing provision,
- Improved physical environment,
- Increased employment, and
- Investment in local area.

71 A letter of support from the PDSA has been provided by the applicant which pre-dates the application (October 2017) which supports the provision of a modern pet hospital space.

72 Statutory consultee responses received:

- **Metropolitan Police** – several recommendations made regarding secured by design. No conditions were recommended.
- **Historic England Archaeology** - recommended conditions to protect onward archaeological interest.
- **Southern Gas Network** – no comment on planning matters direction to their website provided.
- **Natural England** - no objection

Representations summary

73 All the representations received in respect of this application have been made available to the Deputy Mayor however; in the interests of conciseness, and for ease of reference, the issues raised have been summarised in this report as detailed above.

74 The main issues raised by the consultation responses, and the various other representations received, are addressed within the material planning considerations section of this report, and, where appropriate, through the proposed planning conditions, planning obligations and/or informatives outlined in the recommendation section of this report.

Material planning considerations

75 Having regard to the site and the details of the proposed development, relevant planning policy at the local, regional and national levels; and, the consultation responses and representations received, the principal planning issues raised by the application that the Deputy Mayor must consider are:

- Land use principles (including Opportunity Areas, housing, employment, and commercial uses);

- Housing (including affordable housing, housing tenure, mix, density and housing quality);
- Urban design (including layout, landscaping, height and massing, architectural quality and appearance, heritage, fire safety and designing out crime);
- Inclusive design;
- Neighbouring amenity impacts (including privacy/overlooking; noise/disturbance);
- Natural environment;
- Sustainability (including climate change mitigation and adaptation, including flood risk and sustainable drainage);
- Other environmental considerations (including air quality, contaminated land and waste management),
- Transport, including parking provision and;
- Mitigating the impact of development through planning obligations and conditions.

76 These issues are considered within the following sections of the report.

Land use principles

77 Paragraph 11 of the revised NPPF promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development and identifies a core set of land use planning principles, which should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. The following are of particular relevance to the principle of development on the site:

- Deliver a sufficient supply of homes through significantly boosting house building, having regard to the specific housing needs of certain groups and provide on-site affordable housing to meet identified need;
- Build a strong and competitive economy through creating conditions where businesses can invest, expand and adapt and through recognising and addressing specific locational requirements of different sectors;
- Promote healthy and safe communities, through planning policies and decisions that aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places;
- Promote sustainable transport modes through focusing significant development in locations that are, or can be made, sustainable through limiting need to travel and offering a genuine choice; and
- Make an effective use of land through maximising the use of previously-developed or 'brownfield' land.

78 The site lies within the Mayor's Thamesmead and Abbey Wood Opportunity Area, with parts of the site also falling next to the boundary of the Abbey Wood and South Thamesmead Housing Zone. At a local level, Greenwich Council recognise the area as a Strategic Development Location, within its local policy documents. The principle of the redevelopment of the site must be considered in the context of the London Plan, draft London Plan and Greenwich Council Local Plan policies relating to the above designations as well as the NPPF, together with other policies relating to mixed-use development, residential and commercial uses.

Opportunity Area

79 As set out above, the site is located within the Thamesmead and Abbey Wood Opportunity Area. London Plan Policy 2.13 states that development in Opportunity Areas is expected to optimise residential and non-residential outputs and contain a mix of uses. London Plan paragraph 2.58 states that Opportunity Areas are the capital's major reservoir of brownfield land with significant capacity to accommodate new housing, commercial and other development linked to

existing or potential improvements to public transport accessibility, which is echoed in the supporting text to draft London Plan Policy SD1. Paragraph 2.61 of the London Plan confirms that Opportunity Areas are expected to make particularly significant contributions towards meeting London's housing needs. The draft London Plan identifies this Opportunity Area as being within the Thames Estuary corridor, which comprises the largest concentration of Opportunity Areas within the City and an area that continues to be a priority for regeneration and economic development, with the potential for the delivery of over 250,000 new homes and 200,000 new jobs.

80 London Plan Policy 2.13 identifies the Thamesmead and Abbey Wood Opportunity Area as having capacity to accommodate a minimum of 3,000 homes and 4,000 jobs. Through draft London Plan Policy SD1 this is revised to 8,000 homes and 4,000 jobs. The draft London Plan specifically recognises that the area's Housing Zone status and investment by Peabody in estate renewal in the area will improve the quality of the environment and bring new housing opportunities. Draft London Plan Policy SD1 identifies Opportunity Areas as the capital's most significant locations for development capacity and seeks to ensure that this capacity is delivered in a sustainable and integrated way to ensure the successful delivery of the growth targets outlined above. The proposed residential, commercial and pet hospital uses are complimentary to the strategic policy context of the site and would enhance the residential and employment offer in Abbey Wood. High density residential-led redevelopment of this previously developed site is in conformity with the aspirations of the London Plan and draft London Plan, both for the Opportunity Area and generally, in this regard.

81 Paragraph 3.3.51 of the Local Plan recognises the development potential which exists in Abbey Wood recognising that this will largely be unlocked and driven by the arrival of Crossrail. This increased connectivity at Abbey Wood will lead to enhanced development opportunities within its central core and the potential for renewal of the surrounding areas, having positive impacts in both Royal Greenwich and Bexley. These proposals contribute to the realisation of these core strategy aims by establishing higher quality design and contributing to an emerging centre within Abbey Wood.

82 The Thamesmead and Abbey Wood SPD which has been jointly adopted by both Greenwich and Bexley Councils establishes a series of aspirations for the area and provides guidance on how the growth targets outlined above might successfully be achieved. The SPD states with specific reference to Abbey Wood that the area will be defined by a series of attractive centres and neighbourhoods which will become sustainable places, with improved housing and public space. The SPD also recognises the role of improved transport infrastructure in delivering frequent and reliable public transport to the area to support good growth in areas including housing and employment. The SPD recognises the emergence of Abbey Wood, observing the area's potential to be enhanced as a local centre. These proposals seek to introduce high quality residential accommodation which has been well designed alongside a reprovided pet hospital and flexible commercial/retail/community floorspace. Accordingly, the proposals have appropriately recognised the guidance of the SPD.

Community, commercial and retail land uses

83 Policy EA1 of the Core Strategy supports the expansion of existing businesses and increased employment opportunities speaking specifically of supporting the development of small and medium business space. Policy EA(a) seeks to maximise the contribution to employment in Royal Greenwich from sites in existing or previous employment use. Non-employment uses will only be permitted on vacant employment sites where it can be demonstrated that;

- The site is environmentally or physically unsuitable for any employment generating use;
- Marketing on fair price and terms for at least two years indicates there is no realistic prospect of any form of employment arising; or

- Employment is only viable within a mixed use scheme.

84 The application site is not a vacant employment site. It does accommodate employment uses currently in that the site currently benefits from a pet hospital and car wash facility. The proposals include the provision of 792 sq.m of new commercial floorspace split between 570 sq.m of the reprovided pet hospital and 207 sq.m of flexible commercial/community floorspace. The re-provision and expansion (equivalent to 158 sq.m) of the existing pet hospital in new modern facilities on site as part of the proposed mixed-use redevelopment scheme is supported, as is its phased delivery to ensure the continuity of the existing services. The proposed 207 sq.m of new flexible commercial/retail/community floorspace spanning use classes A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1/D2 (in addition to the pet hospital) is estimated to support 16 to 26 new jobs (above the re-provided jobs at the pet hospital) depending on its end use. This would be a significant, positive net increase in the employment yield of the site when compared to the existing mechanical car wash facility (a single job), is supported in line with the employment aspirations of the Opportunity Area. Although some important new land uses would be introduced to the site in addition to employment floorspace, the consequential uplift in jobs and wider regeneration of this site is welcomed. The material level of increased direct employment which the proposals would deliver is considered to accord with the objectives of policy EA1 (and the matter of retail and leisure floorspace is addressed below). Although new land uses are proposed to be introduced, given the provision of employment floorspace and the increase in direct employment which will be generated, no substantial breach of policy EA(I) is considered to arise. The GLA will secure the delivery of the commercial floorspace in conjunction with the housing offer.

Retail and leisure

85 The NPPF, London Plan Policy 4.7, draft London Plan SD6, Greenwich Policy EA1 all set out a town centre first approach to the provision of new town centre uses. The London Plan establishes that edge or out of centre retail development must be subject to an assessment of impact. To ensure the successful functioning of the site, the provision of 207 sq.m of flexible floorspace at the site is proposed which could include retail floorspace. The proposed retail use is intended to satisfy the localised need arising from the proposed new homes and the wider development in the wider area. Given the limited scale of the proposed retail uses at the site it would not prejudice the vitality or viability of the boroughs Town Centre locations and would ensure future residents of the site have access to on-site retail provision. Whilst the site is not located in a town centre, in line with the aspirations set out in the London Plan and draft London Plan for Opportunity Areas the proposed retail uses are acceptable at this site. The total retail provision is significantly below the 2,500 sq.m required to warrant the preparation of an impact assessment, in accordance with paragraph 89 of the NPPF.

86 As detailed above, a maximum of 207 sq.m of flexible floorspace is proposed which includes retail uses. The flexible uses are proposed within the ground floor of Building C, at the northern edge fronting onto the public realm beyond which is Eynsham Drive. The Thamesmead and Abbey Wood SPD sets out that Abbey Wood has significant potential to be enhanced as a local centre which supports the provision of ancillary retail uses to complement the large-scale housing on the site. Given the significant amount of housing proposed on this site and on other nearby sites, the limited quantum of retail floorspace would serve and support the residential uses, promote sustainable development, and are unlikely to adversely impact on the vitality or viability of established town centres. The retail uses are thus acceptable notwithstanding that the site is not located in a town centre.

Community/Social infrastructure

87 London Plan Policy 3.16 and Policy S1 of the draft London Plan seek to protect and enhance social infrastructure provision and resists proposals that would result in the loss of social infrastructure in areas of defined need for that type of facility without realistic proposals for re-provision. Policy S1 states that development proposals that provide high quality, inclusive social infrastructure that addresses a local or strategic need and supports service delivery strategies should be supported. The provision of social infrastructure is also central to the Mayor's Good Growth agenda, as specified in draft London Plan Policy GG5, which underpins the draft London Plan. Policy CH1 of the Core Strategy stipulates that all development must include measures to help secure and maintain cohesive communities acknowledging that accessible, safe and shared community facilities is a critical component of this. The proposed 207 sq.m of flexible space could be used for community uses and this is supported and in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.16, draft London Plan policies S1 and GG5 and Local Plan policy CH1.

Housing

88 The principle of residential development is outlined below. London Plan Policy 3.3 and draft London Plan Policy H1 seek to increase London's supply of housing and, in order to do so, sets each borough a housing target. The 2016 London Plan respectively sets Greenwich's at 2,685 additional homes per year between 2015 and 2025. The draft London Plan updates these figures for the 2019 – 2029 plan period, increasing Greenwich's annual target to 3,204. Policy H1 of the Core Strategy establishes a target across the plan period (2013-2028) to deliver a minimum of 38,925 net additional dwellings over the 15 year plan period. This provides for an annualised target of 2,595. The proposals will contribute positively to the borough's target.

89 London Plan Policy 3.3 and draft London Plan Policy H1 seek to optimise housing potential. Policy 3.3 directs that boroughs identify and seek to enable additional development capacity to be brought forward. Policy H1 states boroughs should optimise the potential for housing delivery on all suitable and available brownfield sites through their Development Plans and planning decisions. At a local level, Greenwich Policy H1 prioritises development on brownfield land stating at 4.1.8 that it is expected that at least 99% of the development built in Royal Greenwich will be on brownfield sites.

90 The proposed development would provide 272 homes. This would equate 10% of the annual target for the Borough as set out in the London Plan. The residential intensification of this accessible, under-utilised site that will provide 272 units in a mixture of one, two, three and four bed units, including affordable family sized accommodation, is strongly supported and in accordance with policies 3.3 of the London Plan and H1 and H12 of the draft London Plan and would also assist Greenwich Council in meeting its London Plan 10 year target of 2,685 units a year. GLA officers note that Greenwich's net housing completions for the monitoring period of 2014-2017 was 80% of the current London Plan target, with only 55% of the affordable housing target achieved. For the monitoring period 2014/15 the Council fell 977 units beneath the target for homes to be delivered, in 2015/16 the Council fell 367 units beneath its target and for the period of 2016/17 the Council fell 242 units beneath its annualised target. GLA officers acknowledge that schemes such as this provide an opportunity to ensure future targets are met or exceeded.

91 The housing element of the proposals is discussed in further detail in paragraphs 93-135.

Land use principles conclusion

92 As set out above, given the site's context as a previously developed site in an accessible location, its location in the Thamesmead and Abbey Wood Opportunity Area, and the strategic priority afforded to housing in the London Plan, the principle of the housing-led redevelopment of

this site is in line with national, strategic, and local policy. GLA officers note that this is a position which is shared by Greenwich Council officers as outlined within the boroughs planning committee report. The application includes the re-provision of both a pet hospital and provision of flexible commercial space which will deliver jobs in excess of the number currently generated on the site and small scale retail/community space to provide activity to the public realm. The proposed land uses are considered, overall, to be acceptable and to be a significant gain arising from the proposal.

Housing

Affordable housing

93 London Plan Policy 3.11 states that the Mayor will, and boroughs and other relevant agencies and partners should, seek to maximise affordable housing provision and ensure an average of at least 17,000 more affordable homes per year in London up to 2031. Draft London Plan Policy H5 goes further by setting a clear strategic target of 50% of all new homes delivered across London to be affordable.

94 London Plan Policy 3.12 requires that the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing should be sought when negotiating on individual private residential and mixed-use schemes. Negotiations on sites should take account of their individual circumstances including development viability, resources available from registered providers (including public subsidy), the implications of phased development including provisions for re-appraising the viability of schemes prior to implementation ('contingent obligations'), and other scheme requirements.

95 In August 2017 the Mayor published his Affordable Housing and Viability Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), which sets out his preferred approach to the delivery of affordable housing, introducing a Fast Track Route for applications that deliver at least 35% affordable housing (by habitable room) on site (subject to tenure and increasing this further through the use of grant funding). The document also sets out detailed guidance to the form, content and transparency of viability assessments and the requirements for review mechanisms. The threshold approach to affordable housing is also set out in draft London Plan policies H6 and H7. In November 2016, the Mayor also launched a new Affordable Homes Funding Programme for the period of 2016-21, which introduced new affordable products, rent benchmarks and grant rates.

96 London Plan Policy 3.11 sets a preferred tenure split of 60% social / affordable rent and 40% for intermediate rent or sale. It also states that priority should be accorded to the provision of affordable family housing. Policy H7 of the draft London Plan and the Mayor's Affordable Housing and Viability SPG sets out a preferred tenure split of the following: at least 30% low cost rent, where that is social or affordable rent at a level significantly less than 80% of market rent; at least 30% intermediate, with London Living Rent and London Shared Ownership being the default products; and the remaining 40% to be determined by the Local Planning Authority and agreed with the GLA.

97 At a local level, Greenwich Core Strategy Policy H3 requires that developments of 10 or more homes or residential sites of 0.5 hectare or more will be required to provide at least 35% affordable housing according to Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (AHVA). The precise percentage, distribution and type of affordable housing will be determined by the particular circumstances and characteristics of the site and of the development, including financial viability. Paragraph 4.1.14 of the Core Strategy states that affordable housing should provide 70% social/affordable rented and 30% intermediate housing.

98 When the Mayor considered the application at Stage 1, the application proposed 95 affordable units consisting of 67 for affordable rent and 28 shared ownership, equating to 36% of the scheme on a habitable room basis. The Mayor noted at the time that the affordable housing

offer was strongly supported and responded positively to the threshold level set out in Policy H6 of the draft London Plan and the Mayor's Affordable Housing and Viability SPG. It was however noted to ensure that the scheme qualified for the Fast Track route, the applicant needed to confirm the tenure and affordability set out above and seek to increase the level of affordable housing above 35% through accessing grant.

99 At Stage 2, the Mayor made clear that all options for increasing on-site affordable housing must be explored. Since the Mayor's decision to take over the application in August 2018 the proposal has been revised with respect to the housing mix. Furthermore, the applicant has engaged with Registered Providers (RP) with a view to increasing the affordable housing provision using grant funding. The applicant has advised that it is likely that provision can be increased above 40% utilising grant funding. It is recommended that the S106 agreement include an obligation to secure grant funding through an RP to maximise affordable housing delivery.

100 The proposed affordable housing meets the Fast Track route as set out within the Mayor's Affordable Housing & Viability SPG and draft London Plan and exceeds Greenwich Council's strategic target for 35% of all additional housing delivered across the borough to be affordable housing as outlined in Core Strategy Policy H3.

101 The Affordable Housing & Viability SPG (para 2.40) sets out the Mayor's preferred tenure split as follows:

- at least 30 per cent low cost rent (social rent or affordable rent). London Affordable Rent should be the default level of rent, and should be assumed by applicants in the absence of alternative guidance from LPAs on the rent levels that they consider to be genuinely affordable.
- at least 30 per cent as intermediate products, with London Living Rent and/ or shared ownership being the default tenures assumed in this category.
- the remaining 40 per cent to be determined by the LPA taking account of the relevant Local Plan policy. Applicants should consider local policies and consult with LPAs to determine the relevant approach.

102 The proposed tenure split is 70.5% (affordable rent)/ 29.5% (intermediate) by unit which is equivalent to 75% social/affordable rent and 25% intermediate by habitable room. This falls marginally outside the Mayor's SPG tenure split requirement and the Council's expected target split outlined at supporting paragraph 4.1.14 of Policy H3, which states that affordable housing that is provided should be provided as 70% social/affordable rented and 30% intermediate housing. However, noting the increased proportion of affordable rent and marginal difference the split is considered acceptable in this instance for the purposes of Fast Track. Furthermore, the affordable rented units will be let at London Affordable Rent which are significantly below 80% of local market rent and the applicant has a good proportion of the unit mix toward the delivery of family sized units within the affordable rented tenure which results in an improved mix of affordable homes onsite. It is acknowledged that the proposed tenure split does not fully comply with all tiers of adopted and emerging policy however, it is recognised in all levels of policy that housing offers should respond to local need. In this instance the increased weight to London Affordable Rent is considered an appropriate response to local need. It is considered therefore that the proposed tenure split is acceptable.

103 Given that the application delivers 35% affordable rented tenure in excess of the minimum requirements of the Mayor's Affordable Housing and Viability SPG and draft London Plan Policy H7, the inclusion of London Affordable Rent and the uplift in affordable housing secured, the application can be considered under the Fast Track Route. As such, in line with draft London Plan Policy H6 an affordable housing review would only be triggered if an agreed level of progress has

not been reached within two years of grant of planning permission, utilising the review formulae within the Mayor’s Affordable Housing and Viability SPG.

104 This affordable housing commitment will be secured in the S106 agreement and comprises the following:

affordable units	number of units	number of hab. room	% by unit	% by hab. room
London Affordable Rent	67	215	70.5	75
Shared ownership	28	70	29.5	25
total (% of scheme)	35%	37%		

Table 1: affordable housing breakdown

Affordability

105 The Mayor’s Affordable Housing & Viability SPG makes clear that in determining tenure, homes are to be genuinely affordable. For the low cost rent element, whilst a local planning authority may specify rental levels they consider to be genuinely affordable, the Mayor expects this to be significantly less than 80% of market rent. For intermediate products for purchase, these should be shared ownership and accord with the London Plan Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) affordability criteria with a clear expectation that a full range is secured below the upper limit.

106 The affordable rented housing would be let at London Affordable Rent which are set annually by the Mayor at levels significantly less than 80% market rent. The rents are set out in the below table, with market rents provided for comparison. The affordable rented homes are therefore considered to be genuinely affordable and accord with the Mayor’s SPG and Policy H7 of the draft London Plan.

107 The income thresholds for the shared ownership units would be subject to a priority cascade meaning in the first three months they would be offered to priority band one which would be capped at household incomes significantly less than £90,000. One-bedroom units are capped at £55,000, two-bedroom units are capped at £71,000 and three-bedroom units are capped at £85,000. The units would then be capped at a gross household income of £90,000, in line with London Plan Policy 3.10 and draft London Plan Policy H7. A range of affordability has been secured, with maximum housing costs at 40% of net household income in line with the latest London Plan Annual Monitoring Report (July 2018). This will therefore ensure that housing is provided at a range of income thresholds below the upper limit to ensure the housing is genuinely affordable, in accordance with the Mayor’s Affordable Housing & Viability SPG.

Conclusion on affordable housing and financial viability

108 In line with the London Plan and draft London Plan, GLA officers worked with the applicant to increase affordable housing provision through the use of grant funding. The affordable housing offer, meets the Fast Track Route threshold target of 35% as set out within the Mayor’s SPG. The rents and income levels specified within the S106 agreement accord with strategic and local guidance on affordability and will ensure that the affordable homes are genuinely affordable. Whilst the tenure split to be secured does not meet the expected tenure split set out in adopted and

emerging strategic and local policy, it is weighted in favour of low cost rent, which is acceptable. On this basis, the affordable housing provision is considered on balance to be acceptable notwithstanding the departure from tenure mix expected by policy.

109 Details of the affordable housing will be secured in the section 106 agreement, should permission be granted. This will include details of affordable housing definitions, fit out, the income thresholds and marketing strategy for the intermediate accommodation and rent levels for the affordable rented units.

Review mechanisms

110 The Mayor’s Affordable Housing & Viability SPG and draft London Plan Policy H6 clearly sets out the requirements for review mechanisms which are necessary to secure the maximum public benefit from schemes and to encourage build out.

111 As noted above, the scheme meets the requirements of the Fast Track Route. As such, in line with the draft London Plan an early implementation review will be secured. This would be triggered if the development has not been substantially implemented within two years of the date of consent. A forward-looking review would take place which will analyse the development costs and values at that time, capturing any uplift in viability towards a maximum of 50% of the total habitable rooms delivered by the scheme.

112 Officers are satisfied that this review mechanism is required to incentivise delivery and accords with draft London Plan Policy H6.

Housing mix and tenure

113 The application, as amended, would provide 272 residential units, 177 of which would be market sale and 95 of which would be affordable products. The housing mix would be as follows:

unit type	market sale	London Affordable Rent	Shared ownership	total	percentage
Studio	2	1	0	3	1
1-bed	81	11	14	106	39
2-bed	77	41	14	132	49
3-bed	16	14	0	30	11
4-bed	1	0	0	1	0
total	177	67	28	272	100%

Table 2, housing mix

114 London Plan Policy 3.8, draft London Plan Policy H12 and the Housing SPG promote housing choice in terms of the mix of housing sizes and types, taking account of the housing requirements of different groups and the changing roles of different sectors in meeting these. London Plan Policy 3.11 and draft London Plan Policy H12 state that priority should be accorded to the provision of affordable family housing. Greenwich Local Plan Policy H2 notes a mix of housing types and sizes will be required in all developments and should contain a proportion of 3, 4 and 4+ bedroom units. The policy notes that the specific mix on each site will be determined by factors including existing housing stock, level of accessibility to public transport, schemes for special needs

groups or where there is a poor external environment. The Policy does not set out indicative borough level proportions for all housing tenures.

115 The proposed housing mix has been amended since Stage 2 to provide; 3 fewer one bed units, 2 additional three bed units and the introduction of a 4 bed unit. This revised mix appropriately acknowledges the guidance set out within strategic and local policy. GLA officers note that the proposed housing mix did not feature as one of the borough's reasons for refusal and was supported at application stage.

116 The 2017 London Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identifies that over the period of 2016/2041 a significant proportion of housing demand will be for one and two bedroom units. In addition, it identifies that future trends such as worsening affordability and changes to planning policies may produce a greater demand for smaller dwellings. The revised housing mix includes; 3 studio units (equivalent to 1%), 106 one bed units (equivalent to 39%), 132 two bed units (equivalent to 49%), 30 three bed units (equivalent to 11%) and 1 four bed unit (equivalent to 0%). This revised mix appropriately acknowledges the need for some larger family sized accommodation whilst being weighted in favour of one and two bed units which provide for 88% of the total proposed units.

117 The scheme provides a good proportion of the proposed three-bedroom units in the affordable rented tenure which is supported by London Plan Policy 3.11 and draft London Plan Policy H12 and a four bedroom unit has been added to the residential offer. In addition, it is noted that the site's environmental constraints and the delivery of commercial uses on the ground floor and results in the delivery of family sized housing being particularly challenging. The highly accessible nature of this site, in an Opportunity Area and neighbouring a Housing Zone, also lends itself to a higher proportion of smaller units.

118 As such, having regard to the strategic and local policy contexts, and the particular characteristics of this site, notably its highly accessible location, Opportunity Area designation, the appropriateness of high density development it is considered that on balance, based on the considerations above the housing mix is acceptable and in accordance generally with London Plan and draft London Plan and Local Plan Policies.

Housing quality and residential standards

Density

119 Paragraphs 122 and 123 of the NPPF provide national guidance on achieving appropriate densities, stating that development should make efficient use of land, taking into account: need for housing; local market conditions; availability and capabilities of existing and proposed infrastructure; area's character as well as promoting regeneration; and good design. London Plan Policy 3.4 and draft London Plan Policy D6 seek to optimise the potential of sites, having regard to local context, design principles, public transport accessibility and capacity of existing and future transport services. The higher the density of a development, the greater the level of design scrutiny that is required, particularly qualitative aspects of the development design, as described in draft London Plan Policy D2 and Policy D4.

120 Greenwich Local Plan Policy H5 states in relation to housing developments the Council will give priority to securing a high-quality environment for residents making the best sustainable use of land, having regard to the location of the site, to the individual characteristics of the site and the character of the surrounding area. Greenwich Council's reasons for refusal stated that the "proposed development represents overdevelopment of the site by reason of its density". GLA officers note that this was not a position taken in the Council's committee report which stated that,

in officers' views, the proposed density was acceptable and in compliance with strategic and local plan policies.

121 The total site area is 0.64 hectares which, once commercial elements are removed, produces a net residential site area of 0.55 hectares and the proposed units (272) and number of habitable rooms (766), the net residential density would be 488 units per hectare and 1,373 habitable rooms per hectare. This is above the indicative density range in the London Plan, and exceeds the threshold for design scrutiny as set out in draft London Plan Policy D6.

122 At present, the site has a PTAL of 4 although this is expected to increase once Crossrail is operational. The London Plan states that urban sites with a PTAL of 4 – 6 should optimise sites with densities of 200-700 habitable rooms per hectare. The draft London Plan Policy states that extra design scrutiny will be required where density exceeds 405 units per hectare in areas of PTAL 4 – 6. In all metrics of measurement, the proposed density exceeds the London Plan's density matrix; and the need for additional design scrutiny, in the draft London Plan.

123 It is considered that the site is suitable for high density development; it is accessible by public transport, and will become highly accessible with the arrival of Crossrail and lies within an Opportunity Area and at the boundary of a Housing Zone, where residential densities are expected to be optimised. The standard of design and residential quality is also high (and these matters are addressed below) and provides an appropriate mix of housing, with affordable housing maximised, and appropriate levels of play and amenity secured. As such, the high-density nature of the proposals represents the optimisation of a currently underutilised site. Given the particular circumstances of the site and the proposed development, the density is considered acceptable notwithstanding its falls outside the indicative ranges in the London Plan and draft London Plan.

Standard of accommodation

124 Policy 3.5 within the London Plan and Policy D4 of the draft London Plan seek to ensure that housing developments are of the highest quality internally, externally, and in relation to their context and to the wider environment. London Plan Table 3.3 and draft London Plan Table 3.1, which supports this policy, sets out minimum space standards for dwellings. The Mayor's Housing SPG builds on this approach and provides further detailed guidance on key residential design standards including unit to core ratios, and the need for developments to minimise north facing single aspect dwellings.

125 Greenwich Local Plan Policy H5 and DH1 seek to ensure that new development achieves a high quality of design and provides for an integrated environment. There is a strong presumption against single-aspect north facing units and a presumption in favour of dual aspect units where possible and in flats, a good-sized balcony, a terrace or enclosed communal gardens should be provided.

126 Internal and external space standards – All proposed units will meet the minimum space standards, as set out in Table 3.3 in the London Plan and Table 3.1 of the draft London Plan. In addition, in accordance with draft London Plan Policy D4 and the Mayor's Housing SPG, all bedrooms will meet the minimum standards, all units will contain complaint storage space and all balconies will be a minimum of 5 sq.m and with an additional 1sq.m for each extra occupant. Further, all buildings will comply with the minimum floor-to-ceiling heights. In accordance with Greenwich Local Plan Policy H5 and Policy DH1 it is considered the compliance with these standards ensures that the development is well designed and functional. Greenwich Council included within their reasons for refusal that the lack of appropriate private and communal amenity spaces would result in the creation of a poor living environment for prospective occupiers. It is noted that since the Mayor took over the application for his own determination the landscaping and playspace proposals have been amended to improve playspace and amenity provision and to ensure

it is more evenly distributed across the site to ensure good access by all residents. The playspace provision is discussed further below.

127 Layout, aspect and daylight – Draft London Plan Policy D4 and the Housing SPG state that residential development should maximise the number of dual aspect units and avoid the provision of single aspect units. Greenwich’s Local Plan states that there is a presumption against single-aspect units. A total of 60% of the total 272 units will be dual aspect, whilst the remainder of the units will be single aspect, it is noted that none of the single aspect units are north facing. Whilst strategic and local policy advises against the inclusion of single aspect units (particularly where north facing), given the quality of internal spaces and access to both communal and private amenity this proportion of dual aspect units is considered acceptable. The scheme generally achieves 8 units per core (or less), except in Building C where 6 floors contain 9 units per core. Whilst this does not accord with the guidance set out in the Mayor’s Housing SPG given the quality of the internal spaces provided across the scheme it is acceptable in this instance. All proposed dwelling sizes will comply with the minimum standards of the Technical Housing Standards and London Plan. It is therefore considered that the scheme complies with draft London Plan Policy D4 and the Housing SPG.

128 Noise – London Plan Policy 7.15, draft London Plan Policy D13 and Greenwich Local Plan Policy H5 and E(a) seek to ensure an acceptable environment in new residential development with regard to noise. The greatest potential for noise arises from the surrounding road network and transport infrastructure. A condition is imposed requiring the applicant to submit for approval detailed design for the noise insulation. The plant and machinery and ground floor uses proposed as part of the scheme are also unlikely to unduly impact on residential amenity, subject to conditions requiring detailed specification of equipment and internal sound insulation measures between ground and first floors to be approved.

129 Outlook and privacy – Greenwich Local Plan Policy DH(b) states that the Council will only permit an application where it can be demonstrated that the proposed development does not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent occupiers by reducing the amount of daylight, sunlight or privacy they enjoy or result in an unneighbourly sense of enclosure. The Mayor’s Housing SPG notes that “in the past, planning guidance for privacy has been concerned with achieving visual separation between dwellings by setting a minimum distance of 18- 21 metres between habitable rooms. Whilst these can still be useful yardsticks for visual privacy, adhering rigidly to these measures can limit the variety of urban spaces and housing types in the city, and can sometimes unnecessarily restrict density.” The proposed design maximises the easterly and southerly outlooks, outlook and privacy for future residents whilst seeking to maintain adequate separation between all residential blocks which is particularly successful at Buildings B and C. Due to the perimeter block typology of the scheme and shared podium which connects all four buildings the separation details above are not achievable in every instance. However, GLA officers are satisfied that there are no issues of lack of privacy and direct overlooking between the blocks. Greenwich officers assessed the proposals and concluded that the proposal did not give rise to an unacceptable adverse window to window relationship due to the differing orientations of the buildings. The privacy of residents whose flats face out onto the podium level communal gardens would be adequately safeguarded by planting, the details of which would be secured through the landscaping condition.

130 In summary, the scheme would deliver high quality residential accommodation, and the standard of the units is in broad compliance with London Plan policy and guidance, and Local Plan policies.

Children’s playspace

131 London Plan Policy 3.5 and draft London Plan Policies D4 and D7 set out expectations in relation to quality and design of housing development, to include public, communal and open

spaces. Policy 3.6 of the London Plan and draft London Plan Policy S4 require developments that include housing to make provisions for play and informal recreation, based on the expected child population generated by the scheme and an assessment of future needs. Guidance on the application of this policy is set out in the 'Shaping Neighbourhoods: Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation SPG', which sets a benchmark of 10 square metres of useable child play space to be provided per child, with under-five's play space provided on-site as a minimum (within 100 metres walking distance from a residential unit). Provision for 5-11 year olds should be provided within 400 metres of residential units and provision for over-12s should be provided within 800 metres.

132 Policy H(e) of the Greenwich Core Strategy requires that in residential developments that include over 50 units of family housing, suitably equipped and well-designed children's play areas are required for different age groups.

133 It is noted that the Council listed on its decision notice that the proposed development due to the lack of appropriate private and communal amenity spaces would result in the creation of a poor living environment. Since the Mayor intervened and took the application over for his own determination the applicant has undertaken revisions to address this reason for refusal. These revisions include the increase of playspace provision at the site (an additional 128 sq.m). This takes the total offer of playspace at the site to 985 sq.m of which of which 545 sq.m is doorstep playable space. This is distributed across Buildings B, C and the communal podium garden representing a more balanced distribution across both the market and affordable housing units.

134 Using the methodology in the Mayor's SPG and in view of the revised housing offer, the scheme would now generate a child yield of approximately 87 children, of which 47 would be under five. As such, to meet the requirements set out in the SPG, 867.6 sq.m of playspace should be provided, including 433.8 sq.m. of dedicated doorstep play space for under-fives. A site-wide landscaping plan indicates that a total of 985 sq.m playspace will be provided within the development for children aged 11 and under, 545 sq.m will be provided as doorstep playable space. This exceeds the overall total required by the Mayor's SPG.

135 As such the proposal makes acceptable provision for play space in accordance with strategic and local policy. Further consideration of the landscaping proposals is contained in the urban design section below.

Urban design

136 The NPPF (at paragraph 124) states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning. Paragraph 131 states that, in determining applications, outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings. In achieving the Mayor's vision and objectives relating to neighbourhoods and architecture, chapter 7 of the London Plan and chapter 3 of the draft London Plan sets out a series of policies about the places and spaces in which Londoners live, work and visit. London Plan Policy 7.1 (Lifetime neighbourhoods) sets some overarching design principles for development in London as does Policy D2 of the draft London Plan (delivering good design). Other relevant design policies in this chapter include specific design requirements relating to: inclusive design (London Plan Policy 7.2/ draft London Plan Policies D3 and D5); designing out crime (London Plan Policy 7.3/ draft London Plan Policy D10); local character (London Plan Policy 7.4/ draft London Plan Policy D1); public realm (London Plan Policy 7.5/ draft London Plan Policy D7); architecture (London Plan Policy 7.6 and draft London Plan Policy D2); tall and large scale buildings (London Plan Policy 7.7 and draft London Plan Policy D8) and heritage assets (London Plan

Policies 7.8, 7.9 and 7.10 and draft London Policies HC1, HC2 and HC3). These are discussed more specifically below.

137 Greenwich's Local Plan Policy H5 and H1 detail the expectations for housing design and seek to achieve a high quality of housing design and an integrated environment. Policy H5 expects all developments to achieve high quality design, be consistent with the Mayor's Housing SPG, be appropriate in terms of noise insulation and layouts of buildings and spaces and specifically it states that developments should: offer safety and security for residents and the public in accordance with Policies CH1, DH2, DH3, DH(b) and DH(g).

138 The scheme has been considered in detail at pre-application stage, during the initial Stage 1 consideration by the Mayor, and the Council in reporting the application to Committee. The scheme was also the subject of two pre-application meetings with Greenwich Council officers and presented to the Council's Design Review Panel in February 2017.

Layout

139 The proposed layout is an improvement on the existing buildings on site, which have a poor relationship with Eynsham Drive and presents an inefficient use of the available space. The comprehensive approach taken to redeveloping the site is strongly supported and allows for a perimeter block typology with podium undercroft servicing and parking. Creating a well activated ground floor is considered fundamental in good urban design and the Eynsham Drive and Harrow Manorway frontages are successful in this regard and will be well activated by the new pet hospital facilities, the flexible commercial unit and residential lobbies. Since the Mayor intervened to take over the application for his own determination the applicant has undertaken amendments to increase the activation along the southern elevation of the development. Activation at this elevation has been increased through the introduction of duplex units with front doors off the street. These duplex units are located at the lower floors of the proposed buildings and benefit from generous floor to ceiling heights at ground level. The facades of these buildings have been redesigned at the ground level to ensure active frontages which allow adequate light and natural surveillance of the new street.

140 The single podium layout arrangement assists in concealing a significant quantum of car parking from public view and the overall approach to layout is a significant improvement on the existing situation and has the potential to respond well to the future context at surrounding development sites. The proposals have been developed with consideration to the wider emerging context which is undergoing a considerable amount of change and is supported in accordance with the good design principles set out in the London Plan and draft London Plan.

141 The proposal is arranged in four residential blocks above the single storey podium. The residential blocks are orientated to minimise single aspect north facing units and reduce overlooking between blocks and open out long views to the wider context. The podium provides generous communal amenity space which acts to connect all four residential blocks at podium level.

Landscaping

142 The scheme provides a good level of planting for an urban development in line with the objectives of London Plan Policy 5.10 and draft London Plan Policy G5, including tree planting and raised planters within the public spaces. The proposals represent a significant improvement above the existing situation which comprises a largely hard paved site with no established mature trees or vegetation. Subject to details of planting, hard surface treatments and greening (to be secured by condition), this would ensure a high quality setting for the buildings proposed. The planting here

will help to address air quality and urban greening objectives. The impact of the development on trees and urban greening is addressed in more detail in paragraphs 228-230 below.

Summary of layout

143 The proposed building layout and landscaping proposals optimise the development capacity of the site whilst responding well to its constraints, notably providing active frontage, urban greening and rationalised access. The proposed site layout is therefore supported in line with the policy context set out above.

Height and massing

Tall buildings policy

144 The following section will establish and outline the layers of policy which apply to the tall buildings assessment which will follow below.

145 London Plan Policy 7.7 (Location and design of tall and large buildings) and draft London Plan Policy D8 set out the strategic policy with regard to tall buildings and establish that the Mayor will promote the development of tall buildings where they create attractive landmarks enhancing London's character and help to provide a catalyst for regeneration where they are acceptable in terms of design and impact on their surroundings. Suitable locations for tall buildings may include the Central Activities Zone and Opportunity Areas, and areas of good access to public transport. The policies recognise that the impact of tall buildings in sensitive locations such as conservation areas and the setting of listed buildings needs particular consideration.

146 The Thamesmead and Abbey Wood SPD states that specific opportunities for taller buildings should be investigated through masterplanning exercises in Thamesmead town centre and Abbey Wood. The SPD goes on to acknowledge the improved accessibility to be occasioned by the arrival of Crossrail and the opportunity for higher density development this will deliver. The SPD states that Abbey Wood has the potential to be enhanced as a local centre. This, alongside the increased accessibility of the site supports the use of the site for higher density development and taller buildings. The SPD is clear that it expects the tallest elements of Abbey Wood to be concentrated around the Abbey Wood Crossrail station. GLA officers note that there are a number of high density tall buildings consented in the surrounds of the site, notably the Abbey Place scheme (LPA reference: 16/2878/F) which falls immediately north of Abbey Wood rail station at its highest point will be 21 storeys (72.2 metres AOD). The reduced height of this scheme follows the rationale of grading the building heights towards the station and would maintain a stepped hierarchy away from the station.

147 The site lies immediately north of the abbey Wood Station area, which is identified in the Greenwich Local Plan at Policy DH2 as being appropriate for tall buildings. The Local Plan at paragraph 4.4.16 identifies tall buildings as any building, including all types of structures such as masts, pylons, chimneys etc, which is noticeably taller than its surroundings, has a significant impact on the skyline or is larger than the threshold size set for the referral of planning application to the Mayor. Importantly, what is considered tall in one area would not necessarily be considered tall in another. The massing strategy positions the lowest elements of the buildings to the north and south of the site in order to acknowledge the existing low rise contexts and maximise light to the podium amenity space. The tallest element of the scheme is located to the south east of the site, this ensures that sunlight into the shared gardens and complements the massing strategy of the Peabody scheme which neighbours the site and which also steps down away from the junction.

148 The adjacent Peabody scheme on the eastern side of Harrow Manor Way was granted an outline and full planning permissions in 2016 for Tall Buildings at Sedgemere Road, Coraline Walk and Binsey Walk. The heights of the outline permissions range from 15 to 16 storeys, with AOD heights of 57.5 to 58 metres. Block A adjacent to Eynsham Drive is proposed to have a maximum height of 59.1 metres. The additional height at Eynsham Drive is not considered to detract from the visual amenities of the surrounds.

149 The Council's Local Policy DH2 states that applications for tall buildings would be supported in identified locations which accord with the principles of sustainable development. It is acknowledged that this site is not identified in this policy or in the Thamesmead and Abbey Wood SPD as a site for a tall building. However, the site's location within an Opportunity Area and the changing immediate context including the consented Peabody scheme development suggests that taller buildings could nonetheless be appropriate on this site. Furthermore, the site is separated from lower rise residential development, sits at an important road junction and would not erode the suburban character of Abbey Wood. GLA officers acknowledge that the proposals conflict with Policy DH2 falling outside of a preferred location explicitly listed. However, given its location within an Opportunity Area, the precedent established by recently granted planning consents at neighbouring sites and the principles outlined in the more recently adopted London Plan with regard to tall buildings and appropriate locations GLA officers consider the principle of a tall building at this site acceptable.

150 The Council's Tall Building Assessment (2011) echoes many of the principles of the Thamesmead and Abbey Wood SPD and also adds weight to the consideration of the arrival of Crossrail in the consideration of tall buildings in the existing and emerging context of Abbey wood.

Tall buildings assessment

151 Greenwich Council, in contrast to the officer recommendation in the committee report sought to refuse the scheme citing the impact of the proposals height, scale and massing on local character as a reason for refusal, this was a matter they also raised as part of the applications reconsultation. GLA officers have had regard to this reason for refusal and consultation response when assessing the height and massing of the proposal against the relevant policies.

152 In terms of the visual impact of the height and massing on the identified townscape and visual receptors, the proposals would have a noticeable impact on the local townscape. However, the significance of the degree of change does not necessarily indicate that the proposals are harmful. In this case, the proposals would involve the redevelopment of an underutilised car wash and pet hospital for a scheme of high quality architecture, which will improve the quality of the townscape, provide a significant quantum of affordable housing and will complement the wider regeneration of the Thamesmead and Abbey Wood Opportunity Area.

153 The proposal would act as a landmark, aiding wayfinding in Abbey Wood and form a component of the emerging higher density development within this Opportunity Area with a distinctive high quality design. In more distant views the proposal would appear in the emerging context including buildings of up to 21 storeys which form the Abbey Place scheme. Although the site is not within a location where the current Local Plan expressly supports tall buildings, the proposal is considered to conform to the relevant assessment criteria set out within Local Policy DH2 and the site's location within an Opportunity Area (Thamesmead and Abbey Wood) recognises that this is an area that will undergo significant change in townscape. Policy DH2 of the Local Plan states that Tall Buildings will be assessed against its own policy asks and that of London Plan Policy 7.7 which requires that tall buildings are;

- located in appropriate areas with good access to public transport including opportunity areas,
- located in areas whose character would not adversely be affected,
- relate well to the surrounding buildings,
- urban grain and public realm, improve the legibility of an area,
- incorporate the highest standards of architecture and materials,
- have ground floor activities that provide a positive relationship to the surrounding streets contribute to improving the permeability of the site and wider area, where possible,
- incorporate publicly accessible areas on the upper floors where appropriate,
- make a significant contribution to local regeneration.

154 The form of the buildings would respond positively to the emerging townscape and landscape features and would have a positive effect on the skyline. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to identified designated heritage assets as set out in paragraphs 160-168 below. However, the proposal would deliver a number of public benefits including affordable housing and an appropriate mix of uses, including new employment and flexible retail/community space.

155 To conclude, the height and massing of the scheme is considered appropriate on this site. The high quality of the architecture and the distinctive form of the tall buildings would create a landmark residential-led development.

156 Subject to detailed design and architectural quality, which is considered below and will be secured by condition, the principle of height and massing is acceptable in line with the policy context set out above. The impact on heritage is considered separately in paragraphs 160-168 below.

Detailed design and architecture

157 Four distinct architectural treatments are proposed for each building and the design rationale remains the same following the recent amendments to reconfigure the ground floor frontages to increase activation. Building A is light in colour with a white brick finish which minimises its prominence in longer views and benefits from inset balconies and winter gardens which present clean lines of façade. Building B is darker in colour with a dark textured brick than Building A and consist of simple repeating vertical and horizontal features which create a greater solidarity in the buildings mass. Buildings C and D introduce a residential scale townhouse to reflect the lower density residential Thistlebrook Estate and are finished in a red/buff brick.

158 Whilst each component of the scheme will benefit from its own unique character, all of the buildings will benefit from black metal panels, window frames and railings which ensure each component of the scheme is read as a component of the larger piece. The expression of the individual blocks through variance in material colour and tone creates a distinct identity. The robust composition of contrasting brickwork proposed across the blocks provides visual interest and relief in the facades created by stepped and angled elements. It is considered that the architectural appearance of the buildings would result in a development of good design quality when viewed from all aspects including in long distance views.

159 Planning conditions will ensure that a high quality of detailing and materials will be used in the completed development and retention of the scheme architects in the construction process. Council officers concluded that the design and architecture of the proposal, which has not materially changed with the amendments submitted, was acceptable, and GLA officers concur with this assessment.

Heritage

160 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out the tests for dealing with heritage assets in planning decisions. In relation to listed buildings section 66 of the Act states that all planning decisions should “have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”. Pursuant to section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, planning decisions must also give special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation areas which may be affected by the proposed development. GLA officers note that as part of the original consultation for the application Historic England commented that the proposed development would adversely affect the setting of the scheduled monument of Lesnes Abbey. Both the Council (in its reasons for refusal) and Historic England commented on the cumulative impact of this scheme alongside the surrounding consented schemes. The Councils planning report concluded that the scheme would result in less than substantial harm which, it was considered would be outweighed by public benefit including the provision of much needed new homes.

161 The NPPF identifies that the extent and importance of the significance of the heritage asset is integral to assessing the potential impact, and therefore acceptability. The definition of significance in this context is the value of the heritage asset in relation to its heritage interest and this may be archaeological, architectural, cultural or historic. The significance of a heritage asset may also derive from a heritage asset’s physical presence as part of the townscape or its setting. Where a proposed development will lead to ‘substantial harm’ or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss. Where a development will lead to substantial harm, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

162 London Plan Policy 7.8 states at criterion D that “development affecting heritage assets and their setting should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail”. The supportive text explains that development that affects the setting of heritage assets should be of the highest quality of architecture and design and respond positively to local context and character. These sentiments are also stated in Policy HC1 of the draft London Plan.

163 At a local level, Greenwich Local Plan Policy DH3 seeks to protect the historic environment, conservation areas and listed buildings. Stating the Royal Borough will protect and enhance the heritage assets and settings of Royal Greenwich, applying a presumption in favour of the preservation of statutory listed buildings and their settings, giving substantial weight to protecting and conserving locally listed buildings.

164 The site does not lie within a Conservation Area and does not contain any statutorily or locally listed buildings. The application site lies within the setting of the remains of Lesnes Abbey, which is a Scheduled Monument, and Grade II Listed. Given the scale of the proposed development it is acknowledged that the upper floors would be visible in some views from the setting of this heritage asset.

165 The Council noted in their reasons for refusal that the proposed development and would cause less than substantial harm to the setting of Lesnes Abbey which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument and Grade II listed building. The listing for the Lesnes Abbey ruins consist of the footings of walls and in some places portions of wall up to approximately 8 feet high, of Kentish ragstone, flint and chalk, and consist of the remains of the abbey church and the monastic buildings to the north. There is one pointed stone doorway and several lancet windows. The listing does not note any views from within or around the asset as being in themselves significant or contributing to

the significance of the asset. The submitted Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment demonstrates that the proposed building would be similar in scale to the existing Thamesmead towers that are also visible within the view from Lesnes Abbey and that the proposals would be substantially screened by the emerging Thamesmead estate renewal development in the cumulative context. In the existing context the scheme would be visible, but would reflect the approved height context for the area. It is accepted that the proposals would have an impact on the setting of the asset in isolation and within the wider suite of urban renewal projects in Greenwich and Bexley. When viewed in isolation this impact is limited, and the proposals would not significantly affect the Abbey's evidential value as it is located approximately 600 metres from the site, the asset's communal value would not be harmed as it will remain open to the public. In the cumulative context the building would be largely screened.

166 The NPPF at paragraph 193 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). As outlined above the listing for Lesnes Abbey relates to the low-lying ruins consisting largely of footings walls which in places are up to 8 feet high. GLA officers acknowledge that the development, which will sit 600 metres from the site would result in visual intrusion to the wider setting of the ruins. The slender form of the towers means that the degree of intrusion occasioned by the scheme is minimal and the impact of the proposed development, and harm to the significance of the heritage asset, is limited. Moreover, when considered within the cumulative context the scheme will be largely obscured by emerging developments. Overall, GLA officers consider the level of harm to be less than substantial and clearly outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme, principally the delivery of 95 genuinely affordable housing units, along with wider regeneration benefits for the Opportunity Area, a policy compliant mix of uses and improved public realm. Accordingly, the proposals are considered to comply with London Plan Policy 7.8, draft London Plan Policy HC1, Greenwich Local Plan Policy DH3 and the NPPF.

Local views

167 The proposal would not affect any strategic views, but the site falls within the viewing corridor of Local View 4 (Eaglesfield Recreation Ground towards Bexley and the Lower Thames). Local Plan Policy DH(g) states that planning permission will only be given for development which would not have a materially adverse effect on the overall perspective and essential quality of the Local Views. The applicant has provided a Visual Impact Assessment within the application documents which assesses the impact of the proposed development on this view. This concludes that the proposed development and future baselines would not be visible, due to the receptor being orientated away from the site and the intervening vegetation. GLA officers concur with the view of planning officers taken in Greenwich's planning committee report which found that the proposed development would not have a negative impact on this locally protected view.

Archaeology

168 London Plan Policy 7.8 and draft London Plan Policy HC1 seek to ensure that development proposals identify assets of archaeological significance and use this information to avoid harm or where harm is unavoidable, minimise it through design and appropriate mitigation. Greenwich Local Plan Policy DH(m) expects applicants to cooperate in the excavation, recording and publication of archaeological finds before development takes place by use of planning conditions/legal agreements as appropriate. The Council noted in their committee report the site is known to be within an area where the prehistoric landscape is buried below the modern ground surface as demonstrated by a geo-survey recently published as part of the Crossrail publication series 'A journey through time: Crossrail in the lower Thames floodplain. This potential is therefore the focus of the archaeological interest. When originally consulted by the Council Historic England

recommended a series of conditions which will be applied to protect the onward archaeological interest in this area.

Fire safety

169 In the interests of fire safety and to ensure the safety of all building users, Policy D11 of the draft London Plan seeks to ensure that development proposals achieve the highest standards of fire safety.

170 The applicant has included a fire statement within the Design and Access Statement prepared by a suitably qualified third-party assessor. The accompanying detail confirm the evacuation proposals, the means of escape from each block, limited internal and external fire spread in each block and the fire service access and facilities for each block. It is, therefore, demonstrated that detailed work is being undertaken as central to the design process.

171 The fire evacuation strategy put forward would ensure safe evacuation of the building if needed. The submitted fire statement demonstrates that the proposal would deliver the highest standard of fire safety in accordance with draft London Plan Policy D11.

Designing out crime

172 Policy 7.3 of the London Plan and draft London Plan D10 seeks to ensure that measures to design out crime are integral to development proposals and considered early in the design process. A number of criteria are set out in this policy regarding reducing opportunities for criminal behaviour and contributing to a sense of security without being overbearing or intimidating. Greenwich Local Plan Policies DH1, H5 and CH1 all seek to secure developments which contributes to a safe and secure environment for users and the public and which aim to discourage crime.

173 The scheme has carefully considered the interaction of the buildings with the public realm; streets have continuous frontages to pavements and roads, with residential properties and habitable rooms overlooking shared communal spaces to ensure passive surveillance.

174 A condition is recommended to be imposed to ensure that the scheme achieves Secured by Design accreditation. As such, the proposals are acceptable with respect to designing out crime and comply with London Plan Policy 7.3 and Greenwich Local Plan Policies DH1, H5 and CH1.

Conclusion on urban design

175 GLA officers consider that the design of the scheme is well-considered, responds to the development principles outlined in the site allocation, strategic and local policy contexts and achieves a high quality of place making. The massing strategy responds to the site characteristics and the existing and emerging context. The tall buildings are well designed and justified in the context of the relevant criteria set out in the London Plan and would cause less than substantial harm to heritage assets clearly outweighed by public benefit. GLA officers acknowledge that the proposals conflict with Policy DH2 of the Local Plan but is supported in other, more recently adopted policy instruments which on balance adequately justify the height and massing strategy. The quality of the design, architecture and materials will ensure a distinctive and high-quality development which will contribute positively to the wider regeneration of this part of the Thamesmead and Abbey Wood Opportunity Area. The development will thus comply with the relevant development plan policies set out above.

Inclusive design

176 London Plan Policy 7.2 and draft London Plan Policy D3 requires that all future development meets the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion, and that the design process has considered how everyone, including those with disabilities, older people, children and young people, will be able to use the places and spaces that are proposed. London Plan Policy 7.6 requires that buildings and structures meet the principles of inclusive design, and London Plan Policy 3.8 and draft London Plan Policy D5 require that ninety percent of new housing meets Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' and ten per cent of new housing meets Building Regulation requirement M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings' – which means to be designed to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users. The Mayor's SPG "Accessible London: Achieving and Inclusive Environment" provides guidance on the implementation of these policies.

177 Greenwich's Local Plan Policy H5 requires that 10% of the dwellings be built to full wheelchair accessible standards or be easily adaptable for wheelchair users. Details of accessible and inclusive design have been provided within the Design & Access Statement which focuses on the inclusive design measures within the public realm and buildings. The application drawings and landscape drawings also show how key inclusive design features would be incorporated.

Accessible homes

178 All residential units in would meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2). A total of 27 units would meet Building Regulation M4(3), representing 10% of the units. These are split with 16 units within the private element of the development and 11 units within the affordable element. Detailed layouts for the M4(3) units are included as part of the submitted drawings and will ensure that the scheme delivers accessible homes of an acceptable standard in accordance with London Plan and Local Plan policy. A condition is recommended to ensure that the units meet the relevant Building Regulations requirement.

Public realm

179 The submitted drawings and landscape drawings demonstrate that appropriate levels and gradients can be provided across the site to ensure an inclusive environment throughout. The vehicle route around the periphery of the buildings footprint is a shared surface. The low vehicle movements and low speeds associated with the access would not give rise to an unacceptable conflict between pedestrians and vehicles, subject to detailed hard landscape design. The wider public realm has been designed to be inclusive to all users.

Car parking

180 The overall development would include 49 car parking spaces, of which 17 would be reserved as Blue Badge accessible parking spaces for residential units. Whilst the accessible car parking provision falls short of London Plan policy requirements, in this instance it is considered acceptable given the constraints of the site and level of accessibility by public transport. A car parking management plan, secured through the S106 agreement, will set out measures to monitor and increase this provision, if necessary. This will be secured within the S106 agreement.

Inclusive Design Conclusion

181 For the reasons set out above, the proposal would achieve a high level of accessible and inclusive design and would comply with London Plan Policies 3.8, 6.13, 7.1, 7.2, 7.5 7.6, draft London Plan Policies GG1, D3, D5, T6.1, T6.5, the Accessible London SPG, Greenwich H5.

Neighbouring amenity impacts

182 A core principle of the NPPF is to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. London Plan Policy 7.6 and draft London Plan Policy D2 state that the design of new buildings should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential buildings in relation to privacy, overshadowing, wind and microclimate. London Plan Policy 7.7 and draft London Plan Policy D8 state that tall buildings should not affect their surroundings adversely in terms of microclimate, wind turbulence, overshadowing, noise, reflected glare, aviation, navigation and telecommunication interference. London Plan Policy 7.15 and draft London Plan Policy D13 seek to reduce and manage noise associated with development.

183 At a local level, Greenwich Local Plan Policy DH(b) DH(b) states that developments will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the proposal does not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent occupiers by reducing the amount of daylight, sunlight or privacy they enjoy or result in an un-neighbourly sense of enclosure or loss of outlook. Local Plan Policy E(a) seeks to protect neighbouring amenity by stating that planning permission will not normally be granted for developments unless it can be demonstrated (or secured by appropriate planning condition) that the proposals will not result in unacceptable emission of noise, light, vibrations, odours, fumes, dust, water and soil pollutants or grit.

184 Due to the former nature and uses of the site and its surroundings, the proposed development is presently visually and physically separated from existing residential properties, with the closest being at the south of the site within the Thistlebrook Estate. To the north beyond Eynsham drive is another area of housing which is accessed from Godstow Road. The closest elevation of this estate is some 24 metres from the boundary of the site, the Eynsham Drive scheme then benefits from setbacks from the highway of up to 15 metres. East of the site is an emerging residential context through the Peabody Estate and Coraline Walk with residential consents in place, which is 15 metres from the site (boundary to boundary).

185 The borough cited as a reason for refusal and within their consultation response that the proposed development due to its height, scale, orientation and relationship with adjoining properties would result in a loss of residential amenity for the occupiers of Thistlebrook Estate which comprises a complex of single storey caravans to the south, in terms of loss of privacy due to overlooking. This potential for a loss of privacy has also been noted in objections received as part of the application consultation. It is noted that the Council officer's committee report did not raise this as a concern. Since the Mayor took over the application for his own determination the applicant has worked to address this reason for refusal by updating the boundary treatment at the southern edge of the site which is shared with the Thistlebrook Estate. Greenwich Council in its consultation response have noted that the revisions to the boundary treatment at this edge of the site do not overcome their previous concerns and will add a sense of enclosure for the residents of the Thistlebrook Estate.

186 The applicant is proposing to replace the existing boundary fence which measures 2 metres above ground level with a masonry construction and trellis detail above which will measure 2.5 metres in height. The increase in height at the boundary from 2 metres to 2.5 metres will serve to screen views from first floor level into the Thistlebrook Estate protecting neighbouring amenity and increasing security to both sites. The applicant is also proposing planting along the wall's edge to soften its visual impact. These proposals also need to be considered in the context of the single storey caravan's orientation, which ensures there are limited windows in the northern facades of the caravans and thus facing toward the development site (the majority of windows are located along the caravans flanks face east and west), the proposed separation distance of 10 metres from Building D to the application boundary which neighbours the Thistlebrook Estate and the increasing

separation distance which occurs further up the development. These circumstances and the proposed measures ensure that the privacy of the existing residents at the Thistlebrook Estate will not be unduly compromised. The proposals offer a 0.5 metre increase above the existing situation, which would not be overbearing, and because the treatment is at the northern edge of the Thistlebrook Estate it will not reduce daylight and sunlight into the neighbouring caravans.

Noise

187 London Plan Policy 7.15 and draft London Plan Policy D13 seek to reduce and manage noise to improve health and quality of life and support the objectives of the Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy. The draft London Plan outlines that residential development proposals should mitigate and minimise the existing and potential adverse impacts of noise on, from, within, as a result of, or in the vicinity of new development without placing unreasonable restrictions on development. Policy H5 of the Greenwich Local Plan states that new residential developments must achieve an acceptable level of noise insulation being achieved by means of sensitive design, layout and in developments vulnerable to transportation noise and vibration.

188 During the construction phase, there will inevitably be some abnormal noise caused to nearby residential properties caused by construction activities and vehicles. These impacts will be temporary, confined to normal working hours and can be controlled through the implementation of mitigation measures outlined in a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) (covering hours of works, use of Best Practicable Means, "quiet piling" techniques, erection of hoardings etc). The submission and implementation of the CEMP will be secured by condition.

189 The applicant has submitted an Acoustic Assessment which establishes typical existing incident noise levels at the proposed residential led development. The report finds that whilst the majority of habitable rooms within the scheme will experience suitable internal noise levels there are "hot spots" across the scheme where additional noise mitigation measure will be necessary to protect residential amenity. In these instances, it will be required that there is the provision of an enhanced acoustic design, these "hot spots", will also contain embedded design features (including winter gardens) to ensure that acceptable noise levels at outdoor private amenity spaces are met, this will be secured via a suitable planning condition. The report also concludes that the impact of the atmospheric plant noise emissions to neighbouring residential premises is unknown at this stage due to lack of information. Therefore, a condition will be required to control the magnitude of plant noise and its impact.

190 During the operational phase, potential noise impacts from the development on existing neighbouring properties are likely to be confined to noise from plant and services, as there are no inherently noisy activities proposed. A condition is imposed requiring details of plant and machinery associated with the development to be approved. This will ensure that noise from plant will be at least 5dB below background noise level, measured at the nearest residential premises, along with other mitigation such as screening.

191 Given the urban location and specific context of the site, adjacent to major roads it is accepted that additional noise mitigation measures would be required to safeguard future residents from noise and disturbance. Further details regarding the proposed sound insulation to the dwellings and details of any plant noise would be requested by condition to ensure an acceptable standard of accommodation for the future residents and to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants.

192 Whilst the Acoustic Assessment has not specifically considered the impact on the future residents from noise from commercial uses on the site, officers note that the proposed small scale commercial uses are compatible with residential uses and consider that any noise impacts can be

adequately controlled via the imposition of conditions limiting the opening hours for any commercial, flexible retail/community uses.

193 On balance, the proposed development is considered acceptable subject to the imposition of appropriate planning conditions to secure details of sound insulation to residential dwellings and further information with respect to any plant noise in accordance with Greenwich Local Plan Policy H5 and London Plan Policy 7.15.

Agent of change

194 The draft London Plan introduces Policy D12, which seeks to place the responsibility for mitigating impacts from existing noise-generating activities or uses on the proposed new noise-sensitive development. The proposed development is predominately residential and is therefore noise-sensitive; however, due to separation distances and mitigation measures, it will not impact upon the functioning of the industrial land to the south west of the site. Furthermore, the design of the development has sought to buffer the residential units from the road network and industrial uses through the mitigation measures incorporated within the design. It is considered that the scheme is compliant with draft London Plan Policy D12.

Wind

195 London Plan Policy 7.7 and draft London Plan Policy D8 state that tall buildings should not adversely affect their surroundings in terms of (amongst other things) microclimate and wind turbulence. The Mayor's Sustainable Design and Construction SPG identifies the Lawson Comfort Criteria as a means for identifying suitability of wind conditions. The applicant has modelled the impact of the proposals on the local wind conditions. In doing so, the applicant studied the existing wind condition, the wind speeds in designations were predicted and then the probability of these being exceeded were compared against the Lawson Criteria, which is used to gauge pedestrian wind comfort. The analysis indicates that the proposed development is unlikely to have an adverse impact on the wind conditions to the surrounding areas. The results show that the wind conditions, with the proposed development in place, correspond to the intended use of the majority of external spaces tested. 31 receptors tested were found to experience an adverse impact compared to their intended use; however, ten of these showed no change to the baseline existing case. The 21 remaining receptors highlighted the requirement for on-site mitigation measures against increased microclimate wind speeds which would be secured by planning condition. The proposed development is not expected to have any significant impact on wind conditions with regards to pedestrian safety and is thus acceptable.

Daylight, sunlight and light pollution

196 Policy 7.6 of the London Plan requires new development to avoid causing 'unacceptable harm' to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly in relation to privacy and overshadowing and where tall buildings are proposed. An appropriate degree of flexibility needs to be applied when using BRE guidelines to assess the daylight and sunlight impacts of new development on surrounding properties, as well as within new developments themselves. Guidelines are to be applied sensitively to higher density development, especially in Opportunity Areas, town centres, large sites and accessible locations, where BRE advice suggests considering the use of alternative targets. This should take into account local circumstances; the need to optimise housing capacity; and scope for the character and form of an area to change over time. The degree of harm on adjacent properties and the daylight targets within a proposed scheme should be assessed drawing on broadly comparable residential typologies within the area and of a similar nature across London. decision makers should recognise that fully optimising housing potential on large sites may

necessitate standards which depart from those presently experienced, but which still achieve satisfactory levels of residential amenity and avoid unacceptable harm.

197 GLA officers note that the potential impacts on daylight/sunlight were raised through the consultation of this application but did not feature as a reason for refusal when the Council drafted its decision notice. The applicant has prepared a daylight and sunlight report which included a detailed assessment of the likely impacts of the proposed development on both the existing properties to the north at Eynsham Drive, as well as indicative layouts of the forthcoming Bexley Schemes to the east of Harrow Manor way. The methodology set out in this report is in accordance with BRE's "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, A Guide to Good Practice" by PJ Littlefair (2011) which is accepted as good practice by Planning Authorities.

198 The analysis is based on Building Research Establishment (BRE) Guidelines with specific reference to Vertical Sky Component for assessing daylight and Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) for assessing sunlight.

199 Vertical Sky Component (VSC): This method of assessment is a "spot" measurement of daylight, taken at the mid-point of a window. It represents the amount of visible sky that can be seen from that reference point from over and around the obstruction in front of the window. That area of visible sky is expressed as a percentage of an unobstructed hemisphere of sky and therefore represents the amount of daylight available for that particular window. The maximum VSC value is almost 40% for a completely unobstructed vertical wall or window. A window may be adversely affected if its VSC measured at the centre of the window is less than 27% and less than 0.8 times is former value.

200 It should also be noted however that the 27% VSC recommended guideline is based on a low density suburban housing model and in an urban environment it is recognised that VSC values in excess of 20% are considered as reasonably good, and that VSC values in the mid-teens are deemed acceptable.

201 Average Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH): In relation to sunlight and overshadowing, the assessment sets out an analysis of APSH of windows which face the site and are located within 90° of due south (as per the application of the BRE Guidelines). A window may be adversely affected if a point at the centre of the window receives for the whole year less than 25% of the APSH, including at least 5% of the APSH during the winter months (September 21 to March 21) and less than 0.8 times its former sunlight hours during either period, and for existing neighbouring buildings, if there is a reduction in total APSH which is greater than 4%.

202 To confirm, the BRE Guidance is intended for building designers, developers, consultants and local planning authorities. The advice it gives is not mandatory and should not be used as an instrument of planning policy. Of particular relevance, the Guidance states: "*This guide is a comprehensive revision of the 1991 edition of Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice. It is purely advisory and the numerical target values within it may be varied to meet the needs of the development and its location.*" As stated above, the Guidance is based on a suburban model, and in urban areas such as this one, VSC values of less than 27% would be considered to maintain reasonable daylight conditions.

203 Daylight: The assessment sets out an analysis of 50 windows in the residential properties surrounding the site, using the VSC criteria. The assessment concludes that from 50 windows 44 achieved VSC's greater than 27% and that the remaining 6 achieved relative VSC values over 0.8 of their former values, thereby meeting BRE Guidance criteria in regard to VSC. As such, the impact is considered to be acceptable.

204 Sunlight: The scheme's impact on sunlight to surrounding properties was assessed for both annual probable and winter probable sunlight hours. The assessment concludes that of the 50 windows from the surrounding context assessed 40 satisfied the BRE criteria for annual probable sunlight hours and winter probable sunlight hours. The assessment notes that the 10 windows which fall short of the BRE sunlight criteria these windows currently have poor access to sunlight by virtue of their westerly orientation and the geometry of the existing balconies.

205 Cumulative case: For the emerging context, a total of 50 windows from buildings surrounding the site were assessed for sunlight access. A total of 46 the 50 windows satisfied the BRE criteria for annual probable sunlight hours and winter probable sunlight hours. GLA officers note that the emerging context within the Peabody Estate and Coraline Walk to the east have been approved in outline only and thus the external appearance and fenestration arrangement has not been confirmed.

206 The Council's planning officers confirmed in their committee report that they considered the impact on neighbouring properties in terms of daylight and sunlight to be acceptable, and GLA officers concur with this view. The limited losses of daylight and sunlight that would occur to certain windows in surrounding residential properties are within the levels of acceptability and where they fall beneath the guidance exceptional circumstances exist. In this urban environment and given that the existing site is occupied by low-rise buildings, the scheme achieves a very good level of compliance with relevant BRE Guidance.

Neighbouring amenity impacts conclusion

207 The proposals would not have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of existing residents in the vicinity of the site, and the proposals are considered to comply with relevant strategic and local policies.

Natural environment

208 London Plan Policy 7.19 and draft London Plan Policy G6 require developments to make a positive contribution to the protection, enhancement and creation of biodiversity. Locally, Greenwich Policy OS4 stating biodiversity enhancements will be encouraged particularly in areas that are currently deficient in accessible wildlife sites. Greenwich policies OS(e) and OS(f) emphasise the importance of development optimising and supporting wildlife and the benefit to biodiversity.

209 The site does not fall within the boundaries of any statutory or non-statutory sites of nature conservation and is not designated for any nature conservation purposes. A preliminary ecological assessment and bat survey have been carried out. This assessment and survey concluded that the buildings on site had a negligible potential for supporting roosting bats and the trees on site had have a low potential for supporting nesting birds. Several recommendations aimed at enhancing biodiversity on the site, including native and non-native planting within the development, small trees to border the site, suitable border plants and green roof provision. Details of these measures will be approved by condition, and accordingly it is considered the scheme would be in accordance with strategic and local policy on ecology and biodiversity.

210 On the basis that the above design and mitigation measures would be secured by condition, officers are satisfied that the proposals would avoid harmful impact on wildlife, the ecology and biodiversity, and would provide for the suitable protection and enhancement of the natural environment.

Sustainability and climate change

211 London Plan climate change policies, as set out in Chapter Five, collectively require developments to make the fullest contribution to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change, and to minimise carbon dioxide emissions. London Plan Policy 5.1 (Climate change mitigation) sets out the strategic approach to reducing carbon emissions in London, and Policy 5.2 (Minimising carbon dioxide emissions) sets out an energy hierarchy for assessing applications. Policy 5.2 sets a minimum target for carbon dioxide emissions reduction in new buildings of 35% beyond Part L of the Building Regulations (as amended 2013) for commercial buildings and zero-carbon for residential buildings. London Plan Policy 5.3 (Sustainable design and construction) requires future developments to meet the highest standards of sustainable design and construction, and London Plan Policies 5.9-5.15 promote and support the most effective climate change adaptation measures including passive thermal regulation, urban greening, and water management.

212 Draft London Plan climate change policies are set out in chapter 9 and also collectively require developments to make the fullest contribution to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change, minimise carbon dioxide emissions and meet the highest standard of sustainable design. The policies go further than the current London Plan setting more stringent standards regarding air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, energy infrastructure, water infrastructure and waste and the support for the circular economy. Draft London Plan Policy G5 (Urban Greening) states that all major development proposals should contribute to the greening of London.

213 The Mayor's Sustainable Design & Construction SPG sets out how these policies should be implemented.

214 At a local level, Greenwich Policy DHI requires all developments to meet the highest standard of sustainable design and construction, whilst Policy E1 seeks to minimise CO2 emissions and states that Carbon emissions should be reduced in accordance with the Mayor's energy hierarchy.

Energy

Energy strategy

215 The applicant has submitted an energy strategy for the site and is proposing to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 35% beyond the 2013 Building Regulations, in compliance with the London Plan and draft London Plan target. In reporting the application at Stage 1, it was observed that the scheme followed the London Plan energy hierarchy, with a range of passive design features and demand reduction measures proposed, Combined Heat and Power system (CHP) and renewable energy sources, and that the carbon savings met the London Plan's targets. The applicant has sought to address the concerns raised at Stage 1 and 2 since the Mayor took over the application for his own determination and provided additional information to the GLA. Further information/clarification has been provided across a range of issues including; energy efficiency, district heating and the combined heat and power network have been provided.

216 Energy efficiency (Be Lean): A range of passive design features, including orientation of dwellings and location of balconies, and demand reduction measures are proposed to reduce the carbon emissions of the proposed development. Both air permeability and heat loss parameters would be improved beyond the minimum backstop values required by Building Regulations. An overheating analysis, its results demonstrate compliance under the DSY01 weather file.

217 District heating (Be Clean): The applicant carried out an investigation into whether there were any existing or proposed district heating networks within the vicinity of the proposed

development. It was confirmed there are no existing or confirmed proposed district heating networks within the vicinity of the proposal. The applicant is proposing to install a site heat network connecting all the proposed uses. This system would enable future connection to an area wide network and the applicant will be required to continue to prioritise connection through a S106 obligation.

218 Renewable technology (Be Green): The applicant has investigated the feasibility of a range of renewable energy technologies and has identified photovoltaics (PV) as well as Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHPs) as the most suitable renewable technologies. A total of 560 sq.m of PV panels is proposed.

219 Overall savings: With regard to the domestic elements, based on the energy assessment submitted, an on site reduction of 94 tonnes of CO₂ per year in regulated emissions is expected, compared to a 2013 Building Regulations compliant development, equivalent to an overall saving of 35%. To achieve 'zero carbon' for the residential portion of the scheme, 172 tonnes per annum of regulated CO₂, equivalent to 5,160 tonnes over 30 years, from the new-build domestic portion should be offset offsite. A total of £315,000 will be due in offset payment if further reductions cannot be achieved on site.

220 The non-domestic elements will achieve a reduction of 11 tonnes per annum, which is equivalent to 36%. The carbon dioxide savings the target set within Policy 5.2 of the London Plan and draft London Plan Policy SI2. The carbon dioxide savings exceed the target set within Policy 5.2 of the London Plan.

221 A condition is also recommended to be imposed requiring details of the final energy strategy to be submitted and approved prior to occupation. In this respect, the proposals comply with London Plan and borough policies on energy efficiency and carbon savings.

Flood risk and drainage

222 London Plan Policy 5.12 (Flood risk) and draft London Plan Policy SI12 seeks to ensure that developments address flood risk and incorporate flood resilient design. Policy 5.13 (Sustainable drainage) and draft London Plan Policy SI13 states that developments should use sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) and should ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible in line with the London Plan drainage hierarchy. London Plan Policy 5.13 and draft London Plan Policy SI13 seek to ensure new developments proposals achieve greenfield run-off rates and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible in line with the following drainage hierarchy. Due to the sites location in Flood Zone 3 the NPPF requires that a sequential test is carried out.

223 Greenwich Policy E2 states that development should ensure that the consequences and probability of flooding will be reduced, where possible, and that there will be no increased risk of flooding elsewhere. The policy seeks that development will be safe through the layout, form and floor levels of the development and mitigation measures. Greenwich Policy E3 requires, because of the site's location within an area protected by flood defences but with a high residual risk classification should implement risk reduction measures with the primary aim of reducing risk to life.

224 The application is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which assesses any likely significant effects of flooding and drainage and a sequential test to demonstrate the suitability of the site. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 in an area benefitting from River Thames tidal defences. The applicant has adequately satisfied the requirement of the NPPF in relation to the sequential and exceptions test. The submitted flood risk assessment (FRA) by Shear Design, dated December 2017, was reviewed by Environment Agency (prior to the Mayor's decision to take the application over for his own determination), who were satisfied it complies with the requirements

set out in the NPPF Planning Policy Guidance. GLA officers recommend that the submission of further information on flood resilience measures, and a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan be secured by condition.

225 A sustainable drainage plan has been prepared in respect of the revised scheme. Surface water would be managed by below ground attenuation tanks and green roofs on the building would also contribute to reducing surface water run-off. The report states that the development will meet the London Plan requirements in relation to surface water run-off. The surface water drainage strategy for the proposed development is generally compliant with London Plan policy 5.13 and draft policy SI.13. Submission of further drainage design details will be secured by condition. In view of the above considerations it is considered that the development can be made safe and that it will not result in increased flood risk elsewhere.

226 The general aims of the drainage strategy respond well to the requirements of London Plan Policy 5.13 and, in order to ensure that the scheme fully complies, a condition has been secured which requires a detailed drainage strategy to be approved and implemented, which achieves greenfield run-off rates.

Sustainability strategy

227 The applicant has submitted a Sustainability Statement for the site, which sets out many climate change adaptation measures proposed in the design and construction process. The statement advises that the key sustainability objectives for the development revolve around promoting sustainable communities, health and wellbeing, energy, water, waste, materials, travel, climate change adaptation and ecology and biodiversity. These objectives will underpin the detailed design, construction and operational stages of the development. In terms of water consumption, the development is anticipated to achieve a water consumption target of less than 105 litres per person per day or less for all domestic properties and this is secured by planning condition. The target design consumption will be achieved through the use of water efficient fittings. In addition, the non-residential component will be designed to achieve a minimum Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) 'Excellent' rating. The application is accompanied with an indicative pre-assessment which demonstrates that this is achievable.

Trees and urban greening

228 London Plan Policies 5.10 and 7.21 seek to retain existing trees of value, or mitigate their loss, and require developments to incorporate urban greening measures. Draft London Plan policies G5 and G7 go beyond the London Plan policies by embedding urban greening measures and retention of existing trees of quality into the planning process. As set out in draft London plan Policy G5 the Mayor has developed a generic Urban Greening Factor model to assist boroughs and developers in determining the appropriate provision of urban greening for new developments. This is based on a review of green space factors in other cities. The factors outlined in Table 8.2 of the policy are a simplified measure of various benefits provided by soils, vegetation and water based on their potential for rainwater infiltration as a proxy to provide a range of benefits such as improved health, climate change adaption and biodiversity conservation.

229 The site currently benefits from no mature trees and is largely covered by hardstanding or developed land. The applicant prepared an Ecological Appraisal to assess the sites current biodiversity/ecological value. It concluded that the proposed development will result in a significant improvement on the biodiversity value of the development site. The proposed development would result in the loss of 6 juvenile/semi-mature trees which are to be replaced by 56 new trees. The proposals represent a significant habitat improvement including the planting of native trees, shrubs and wildflowers as part of the wider soft landscaping proposals for the site as well as green roofs. The ecology on site will be improved via the introduction of landscaped areas within the proposed

amenity spaces, private gardens and site boundary areas. The intended planting strategy for these areas is simple low-level flora, with a target of 75% native to 25% non-native species. This will help to attract invertebrates, birds and other fauna to the area. Small trees are proposed to border the site and are recommended to include key species identified within the Greenwich Biodiversity Action Plan. The detailed landscaping strategy will be secured by condition to ensure that the proposals meet London Plan Policy 5.10, Policy 7.21 and draft London Plan Policy G5 and G7.

230 The proposals involve the hard and soft landscaping at ground floor level as part of the public realm, at a communal woodland style garden with casual play areas at the podium level, and formalised gardens and seating areas on the roofs of the Buildings B and C. The Urban Greening Factor has been calculated as 0.407; as such, it is considered that the proposals comply with draft London Plan G5 which sets a target of 0.4 for this location and will ensure that the proposals provide for sufficient urban greening.

Conclusion on climate change and sustainability

231 The proposed development would minimise carbon dioxide emissions to meet London Plan and draft London Plan targets and local policy regarding climate change. The development would not increase flood risk and would deliver sustainable urban drainage benefits over the existing situation at the site. The development has committed to achieve high standards in sustainable design and construction. In these respects, the development is in compliance with relevant planning policies regarding sustainability and adapting to climate change.

Other environmental issues

Air quality

232 London Plan Policy 7.14 (Improving air quality) seeks to ensure that new development minimises increased exposure to existing poor air quality and makes provision to address local problems of air quality (particularly within Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs)) and be at least “air quality neutral”. Draft London Plan Policy SI1 goes further to state that development within Opportunity Areas should propose methods of achieving an ‘air quality positive’ approach. Greenwich Local Plan Policies E(a), E(b) and E(c) all seek to minimise pollution by ensuring all new development does not result in unacceptable emissions of noise, light, vibrations, odours, fumes, dust, water and soil pollutants or grit. The local plan establishes that housing or other sensitive uses will not normally be permitted on sites adjacent to existing problem uses, unless ameliorating measures can reasonably be taken and which can be sought through the imposition of conditions.

233 Greenwich has designated the entire borough an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) due to exceedances of NO₂ (nitrogen dioxide) and PM₁₀ (a particulate matter which is 10 micrometres or less in diameter). During construction, the proposals may create dust and mitigation is recommended to suppress this. With mitigation in place, it is considered that the construction impacts are not significant. Once operational, the report also concludes that, in the worse-case scenario, air quality will be acceptable for future residents (and therefore also existing residents) without further mitigation. The proposed development has been assessed as air quality neutral with respect to building-related emissions.

234 Objections were received which made reference to increases in pollution and car usage. The results of air quality assessment found that the proposed new development and the construction phase activities relating to emissions would be “not significant” and conditions will be imposed to protect air quality subject to approval.

235 The applicant's original assessment and addenda detail the impact of the proposals, both during construction and operation, on existing receptors as well as proposed.

236 Construction Phase. The primary impact during construction will be dust annoyance and locally elevated concentrations of PM10; however, it is noted that these are most notably in a 100-metre vicinity of the source, due to the dispersion of particles as the distance from the source increases. The applicant's ES confirms that the impacts of the construction on air quality can be suitably mitigated, such as through dust suppression systems, and, as such, are not considered to be significant in impact. These measures will be required and secured by condition.

237 Operational Phase. Comments were received as part of the consultation of this scheme which noted the potential for a reduction in air quality as a result of increased car usage. The road traffic generated by the development is not considered to be significant. Further, it is not considered that the development will have a negative impact upon air quality for existing residents once operational.

Waste

238 London Plan Policy 5.17 requires adequate provision for waste and recycling storage and collection and Policy 5.18 requires applicants to produce site waste management plans to arrange for the efficient handling of construction, excavation and demolition waste and materials. Draft London Plan Policy SI7 seeks to reduce waste and increase material reuse and recycling and promotes a circular economy. The policy also sets several waste targets including a strategic target of zero biodegradable waste or recyclable waste to landfill by 2026.

239 Construction waste: The submission of a Site Waste Management Plan, as part of the Construction Environment Management Plan, will be required by a condition and will seek to encourage resource efficiency and material management during construction, directing construction waste away from landfill.

240 Operational waste: In this regard, the application proposes that the duplex units will be served by wheelie bins securely located within the front garden area and the apartments will be served by 1,100 litre general waste bins, 1,100 litre mixed dry recycling bins/WEEE containers/Textiles recycling and a 500 litre organic bin securely located at ground floor level. The pet hospital is provided a specific loading bay below their podium adjacent to their service access. The flexible use unit has been provided a bin store fronting onto the public realm in the northern elevation.

241 The Council's waste officer has provided comment on the previous scheme design and suggested the imposition of conditions to secure a detailed refuse management plan. It is noted that waste storage and collection arrangements were not cited as a reason for refusal by Greenwich Council. To ensure that adequate waste management facilities are provided, and it is necessary to impose a condition requiring a detailed waste strategy to be submitted and approved by the Council.

Contaminated land

242 London Plan Policy 5.21 (Contaminated land) supports the remediation of contaminated sites and bringing contaminated land back in to beneficial use. Greenwich Policy E(e) states that A preliminary site investigation, prior to the determination of a planning application, will normally be required if a site is known to be, or is likely to have been, in contaminative uses. Where contamination is found, the Royal Borough will need to be assured that the development can be built and occupied safely without any adverse environment or health impacts, otherwise conditions requiring full remedial action will be imposed.

243 A contaminated land assessment has been carried out by Ground and Water Ltd Dated December 2017 which assesses the potential impacts arising from the previous industrial uses on the site. The results of the assessment show that there is a low to moderate risk of significant contamination at the site and the soil conditions are considered to provide a potential source of soil gas. There is also a medium risk of unexploded ordnance being present on the site. Mitigation measures are recommended in the report to address the identified risks. The compliance with these recommendations has been required as part of condition of consent.

244 Given that the proposed uses would be particularly vulnerable to the presence of contamination, conditions to ensure a thorough investigation of the ground conditions and likely sources of contamination, appropriate remediation if necessary, and a validation report if necessary to confirm that all potential contamination has been removed from the site prior to its first use would be secured.

245 The Environment Agency has identified that the proposal may have an impact upon groundwater within underlying secondary aquifers. A condition is recommended in relation to piling to ensure that there is no unacceptable risk to groundwater.

246 Neither the Council, nor the Environment Agency raised objections to the application subject to the above conditions, which are necessary to ensure the new development poses no health risk to construction workers, future occupiers or controlled waters.

Aviation safety

247 Greenwich Policy Core Strategy Policy IM(d) states all applications to develop sites within the outer safeguarding boundary for London City Airport will be determined having regard to the advice received from the Civil Aviation Authority.

248 The relevant safeguarding consultee (London City Airport) has been consulted and has raised no objection subject to a condition requiring details to be submitted in relation to cranes or scaffolding which extend above the height of the proposed building. London City Airport also wish to be consulted in relation to proposed plant species for the site to ensure that any issues relating to the local bird population and the risk to air safety can be addressed. Appropriate conditions are included in the recommendation.

Conclusion on other environmental issues

249 The proposed development has committed to achieve high standards in air quality and dust management during construction and operation. Conditions will ensure a best practice approach to construction waste management and remediation conditions and secure that any contamination, expected or unexpected, is appropriately mitigated against. In these respects, the development is in compliance with relevant planning policies regarding air quality, waste and contaminated land.

Transport

250 At paragraph 102, the NPPF states that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that:

- potential impacts of development or on transport networks can be addressed;
- opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated;

- opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;
- the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and
- patterns of movements, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes and contribute to making high quality places.

251 London Plan Policy 6.1 applies these principles within the strategic approach for transport in London. Other relevant strategic transport policies in this case include: Providing public transport capacity and safeguarding land for transport (Policy 6.2); Assessing effects of development on transport capacity (Policy 6.3); Enhancing London’s transport connectivity (Policy 6.4); Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure (Policy 6.5); Better streets and surface transport (Policy 6.7); Cycling (Policy 6.9); Walking (Policy 6.10); Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion (Policy 6.11); Road network capacity (Policy 6.12); Parking (Policy 6.13); The Mayor’s priorities for planning obligations (Policy 8.2); and, Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (Policy 8.3).

252 The Mayor’s Transport Strategy (2018) (MTS) looks to put people’s health and quality of life at the very heart of planning the city’s transport with an aim that by 2041, 80% of all Londoners’ trips will be made on foot, by cycle or by public transport. The MTS seeks to impose high expectations on developers to deliver transport solutions that will promote sustainable mode shift, reduce road congestion, improve air quality and assist in the development of attractive, healthy and active places. It will also seek to restrict car parking provision within new developments, with those locations more accessible to public transport expected to be car free or car-lite. Provision for car parking should be minimised and designed for alternative uses in the future as car dependency decreases.

253 The aspirations of the Mayor’s Transport Strategy are embedded in the policies of the draft London Plan particularly the policy approaches such as ‘Healthy Streets’, ‘Good Growth’ and the Mayoral mode share targets. Draft London Plan Policy T1 sets the Mayor’s strategic target of 80 per cent of all trips to be made by foot, cycle or public transport by 2041. Draft London Plan Policy T2 seeks to ensure that development proposals deliver patterns of land use that facilitate residents making shorter, regular trips by walking or cycling. Draft London Plan Policies T3-T6 seek to enable the achievement of the Mayor’s strategic target.

254 Greenwich Local Plan Policy CM4 states that all development in Royal Greenwich should contribute to improved accessibility and safety and reduce the use of the private car and the need to travel. Development should be designed for the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users first and intense uses should be close to public transport, cycling and pedestrian nodes and interchanges to enhance connectivity. Local Plan Policy IM5 seeks to minimise the impact of the movement of goods and materials on the road network by encouraging sustainable freight practices. The Policy states that London Plan standards should be applied to new parking proposed in the borough.

255 Issues with respect to transport were considered by the Council as having been satisfactorily addressed, subject to agreement of appropriate planning conditions and section 106 obligations to secure necessary mitigation measures. Transport does not feature in the Council’s proposed reasons for refusal. The Mayor’s Stage 1 comments concluded that some further work was required on car parking, cycle hire, public realm and arrangements for access and servicing, construction logistics as well as the adequacy of supporting measures including the travel plan.

256 These matters have been satisfactorily resolved subject to planning conditions and section 106 obligations.

Public transport accessibility

257 The Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) for the site has been identified as 4 on a scale of 0-6b where 6b represents the most accessible. GLA officers note that this rating is expected to increase to 5 once the operation of Crossrail commences. There are frequent and well-connected bus services which run along both Eynsham Drive which bounds the northern edge of the site and a further 5 bus services which operate along Manorway which is located south of the site. Abbey Wood is the closest National Rail station to the station at approximately 550 metres to the south. Southeastern operate a regular service along this line into central London at either Cannon Street or Charing Cross. It is noted that the site falls within the Thamesmead and Abbey Wood Opportunity Area and that Opportunity Areas are expected to contribute to delivering the Mayor's mode share targets of 80% of all trips in London to be made by walking, cycling or public transport by 2041.

Trip generation

258 The proposal will result in a reduction in vehicle trips to and from the site, in line with London Plan Policy 6.11 and Policy T2 of the draft London Plan. At Stage 1 the applicant was required to, thorough multi-modal analysis of expected trip generation assess the impact on the capacity and/or operation of nearby public transport. The applicant has provided additional information and TfL is satisfied that the impact on the public transport network does not warrant further mitigation.

Car parking

259 The proposed development includes the provision of 49 car parking spaces for both the residential and commercial elements of the development combined. The residential provision totals 19 spaces which includes 17 accessible spaces and 2 car club spaces; this equates to a car parking ratio of 0.07 spaces per dwelling. This is an improvement compared to the original proposal, that proposed 29 residential car parking spaces which equated to a car parking ration of 0.11 spaces per dwelling. The commercial element of the development has an allocation of 2 spaces whilst the pet hospital has provision for 28 spaces for visitors and staff. It is understood that the provision of car parking spaces for the pet hospital is part of a contractual agreement regarding the replacement of the facilities. Whilst the public transport accessibility of the site presents an opportunity for a car free residential development (with the exception of Blue Badge provision), the level of parking proposed is considered acceptable. In line with draft London Plan policy T6.1, a minimum of 8 accessible spaces (3% of 272 dwellings) should be provided from the outset. The same policy requires an additional 7% to be demonstrated on plan to show how it could be implemented through the Parking Design and Management Plan if required. This will be required by planning condition.

260 The proposals seek to reduce car parking for the pet hospital from 29 spaces to 28 spaces, which are considered to be the minimum operational requirement. The applicant has submitted car parking accumulation surveys which demonstrates that the car park is fully occupied by staff and visitors (average 21-22 vehicles) and 6 animal ambulances on a typical day. GLA officers are satisfied that the provision of 28 spaces is appropriate. The provision of parking for the pet hospital and usage will be monitored as part of the travel plan and car park management plan. This monitoring will be secured in the S106. A requirement will be included to remove all 28 spaces should the PDSA vacate the site.

261 The London borough of Bexley raised concerns regarding the additional parking demand arising from the scheme. In order to ensure this is appropriately mitigated the car parking management plan to be secured via S106 agreement will be required to include a mechanism whereby demand for disabled parking is monitored and should demand arise the provision will need to be increased. In line with draft London Plan parking standards, 20% of the parking spaces will be provided with electric vehicle charging points (EVCP) and with the remainder to have passive provision, this will be secured by planning condition.

262 A car parking management plan along with the provision of two car club spaces and two years free car club membership will be secured through the S106 agreement. In order to prevent parking overspill and to encourage the use of sustainable modes, the development will be subject to an appropriate legal restriction whereby occupiers will be exempt from accessing parking permits for the surrounding Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs). It is noted that this legal agreement was also recommended within the Greenwich committee report. The London Borough of Bexley requested within their consultation response that the CPZ is extended into Bexley given the proximity of the proposed development to the borough boundary. This will be secured. The layout of the proposed parking spaces within the site is acceptable. A condition is recommended to ensure that spaces are allocated through a Car Park Management plan. A further condition is recommended to secure the provision of EVCPs to 20% of the car parking spaces in line with the recommendations of TfL.

Cycling

263 Draft London Plan Policy T5 would require 506 cycle parking spaces to be offered across the entirety of the scheme (with the commercial element assumed B1). The applicant is proposing 550 cycle parking spaces comprising; a residential provision of 487 long stay spaces and 7 short stay spaces, the commercial elements of the scheme will have access to 3 long stay spaces and 11 short stay spaces, the pet hospital will have provision for 4 long stay spaces and 6 short stay spaces. The cycle stores are positioned in a variety of locations including at basement, ground floor levels and within the public realm. The overall level of cycle parking proposed is acceptable and would exceed the minimum standards set by London Plan Policy 6.13 and Table 6.3 also exceeding the minimum standards set by draft London Plan Policy T5 and Table 10.2. The details of the cycle parking provision will be secured by condition.

Public transport

264 As noted above the site is in close proximity to Abbey Wood which is 500 metres south of the site and which will benefit from Crossrail once the service is operational. The nearest bus stop is located outside the site along Eynsham Drive, this stop is served by routes 177 and 469. There is a further bus stop south of the site along Harrow Manorway, which offers an additional 5 services. It has been confirmed by Transport for London (TfL) officers that the impact on the public transport network does not warrant further mitigation.

Highway access, public realm works and Pedestrian and cycle routes

265 The site benefits from a private one way road accessed from the north western edge of the site along Eynsham Drive. From there vehicles will enter a one way system which wraps the western and southern edges of the development and lead to the service areas beneath the podium and disabled parking provision. The site is exited at the site's south eastern edge onto Harrow Manorway where vehicles must turn left. At consultation stage the Mayor raised concerns regarding the safety of larger vehicles exiting the site onto Harrow Manorway. The applicant has provided tracking plans for a refuse vehicle and TfL are satisfied with the visibility and egress onto Harrow Manorway.

266 The public realm will be robustly surfaced and geometrically laid out to permit vehicle access to all areas for emergency services and servicing/deliveries to all commercial/retail and residential lobby areas. The details and implementation of the proposed shared space surfaces will be secured by planning condition in order to ensure compliance with London Plan Policy 7.5 and draft London Plan Policy D3.

267 The proposed development will result in a reduction in vehicle trips to and from the site and an increase in pedestrian and cycle trips to and from the site and the local area. A dedication of land to the east of the site forming Harrow Manor Way will contribute towards improvements to local cycle routes and nearby junctions will be sought through a S106 agreement, together with a contribution towards cycle training for residents of the development.

268 The applicant has provided details of highway improvements along Harrow Manorway and Eynsham Drive. Those planned highway improvements include cycle lanes along Harrow Manorway which would enhance active and sustainable modes of travel to and from the site by residents and staff. The S.106 agreement includes a dedication of land required for these improvements to take place and the land to be transferred to Royal Borough of Greenwich. The applicant is also making financial contributions to public realm improvements and cycling training for future residents of the scheme to further promote active travel. This is welcomed.

269 The high-quality pedestrian and cycle environment proposed will contribute to the Mayor's "Healthy Streets" agenda for encouraging active travel and mode shift away from the private vehicle.

Delivery, servicing, construction and travel planning

270 Servicing is to be carried out from within the site from the internal access road, and is subject to the submitted delivery and servicing plan. The proposals include satisfactory provision for the turning of vehicles within the site. A condition is recommended to secure the Delivery and Servicing Plan. It is proposed to provide refuse storage areas on the ground floor of each block. Refuse vehicles will visit the site via the internal access road. Management arrangements will be put in place to deal with the transfer of the refuse containers to a holding area prior to collection. Greenwich's Waste Management Team commented during the Council's consultation and stated that The Waste Services team has been consulted and has confirmed that these details are acceptable. A condition is recommended seeking the submission and approval of a detailed refuse management plan. Furthermore, a Deliveries and Servicing Plan (DSP) is secured by condition. The DSP would set out how delivery and servicing movements will be controlled, managed and adhered to by all occupiers.

271 London Plan Policy 6.14B promotes the uptake of construction logistics plans (CLP) and the TfL Fleet Operators Recognition Scheme (FORS), to minimise the impact and safety risks of construction activities on people and the transport network. This will be secured by condition.

272 A full Travel Plan must be prepared for the development prior to occupation. This will be secured, monitored, reviewed and enforced through the S106 agreement.

Conclusion on transport

273 The proposals for a residential-led mixed-use scheme in a location that will benefit significantly from the commencement of Crossrail, enhancing its accessibility, accords with the London Plan policy of encouraging such development in locations that give rise to patterns of development that minimise the need to travel, particularly by car.

274 Subject to a suitable framework of controls and mitigation as identified above being secured through the S106 agreement and use of appropriate planning conditions, the transport impacts of this development are in accordance with strategic and local transport policies in the London Plan, draft London Plan and Greenwich Local Plan.

Mitigating the impact of development through planning obligations

275 At paragraph 54, the revised NPPF states that “Local planning authorities should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition.”

276 At the regional level, London Plan Policy 8.2 sets out the Mayor’s priorities for planning obligations, and states “Affordable housing; supporting the funding of Crossrail where this is appropriate (see Policy 6.5); and other public transport improvements should be given the highest importance”. Draft London Plan Policy DF1 recognises that the most critical areas for investment, required to achieve the step change in housing delivery that London needs, are increased investment in transport infrastructure and fundamental changes to the housing market.

277 At a local level, Greenwich Council Policy IM1 establishes that the Royal Borough will ensure, through the use of conditions and planning obligations attached to planning permissions, that all qualifying development provides for the infrastructure, facilities, amenities and other planning benefits that are necessary to support and serve it and to offset any consequential planning loss to the local area in a way that secures the best use of land and a properly planned, well designed, accessible and integrated environment provides guidance on obligations within the Greenwich Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The SPD lists the range of planning benefits that will be sought in relation to development proposals via s106 agreements include affordable housing; local employment and training; and non-strategic transport.

278 Pursuant to the consideration within the previous sections of this report, and in line with the policy context set out above, GLA officers propose to secure a number of planning obligations required to appropriately mitigate the impact of this development. Where appropriate, GLA officers have provided an additional commentary below to support the consideration within this report and to inform the detailed drafting of a section 106 legal agreement.

Affordable housing

279 As discussed in the housing section of this report, 95 affordable units would be secured, comprising 67 London Affordable Rent units and 28 London Living Rent units. Details of affordable housing definitions, fit out, transfer/lease to a Registered Provider, the income thresholds for the intermediate accommodation, rent levels for the affordable rented units and the retention of the affordable units at the proposed rent levels, would be set out in the section 106 agreement. All affordable rent units would be secured at London Affordable Rent (LAR), which is set out in the housing section. With regard to the Intermediate tenure, all London Living Rent units will be let at the appropriate ward rent and the first priority of the shared ownership properties would be offered to eligible purchasers on household incomes of significantly less than £90,000 starting at £55,000 for one bed units, £71,000 for two bed units and £85,000 for three bed units. There will also be an agreement protocol for the Council to advertise to individuals living and /or working in the Borough in the first instance; to use reasonable endeavours to keep service charges for affordable tenants to a minimum and the formation and operational requirements of a Management Company.

280 GLA officers propose an early review mechanism, which would be triggered if the development has not been substantially implemented within two years of the date of consent. The

review would establish whether, in the light of increasing viability, additional affordable housing can be accommodated on-site or, if necessary, as a payment in lieu to the Councils. Any payment or additional affordable housing will be apportioned between the boroughs based upon the number of units proposed within each borough. Any review must be submitted to the GLA for robust review and verification.

Transport

281 The following transport mitigation and improvement measures would be secured:

- a) Travel Plans and monitoring;
- b) Car Club – a commitment to extending the existing car club, provision of car club spaces and payment of a period of initial membership;
- c) Monetary contribution to facilitate the investigation and implementation of the extension of the CPZ zone to include the surrounding area, including within LB Bexley;
- d) Parking permit exemption for future residents;
- e) Dedication of land at Harrow Manor Way to facilitate road network upgrade works;
- f) Cycle training contribution of £5,440;
- g) Car parking management and monitoring of spaces, including the requirement to remove PDSA parking should they vacate);
- h) Public realm improvement contribution

The above will be secured to in order to ensure that the site functions efficiently, minimises transport impacts on surrounding sites and the road network and promotes sustainable transport principles and travel.

Employment and training

282 The following employment and training measures would be secured:

- b) Commitment and participation towards GLLaB and business support including financial contribution of £401,927.00.

This will be secured to ensure that the scheme adheres to the requirements of the Council's Planning Obligations SPD and recognises the importance of employment and training assets for the local community.

Other obligations

283 Other obligations would be secured as follows:

- a) Carbon offset contribution – £315,000.
- b) £50,000 towards public realm improvements to the Thistlebrook Estate;
- c) Entering into Section 278 Agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980;
- d) Payment of legal, engineers cost;
- e) Payment of S106 monitoring costs.

These requirements will be secured to appropriately off-set any harm arising from the scheme which has not been appropriately mitigated through planning conditions.

Legal considerations

284 Under the arrangements set out in Article 7 of the Order and the powers conferred by Section 2A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the Deputy Mayor, acting under delegated authority, is the Local Planning Authority (LPA) for the purposes of determining this planning application (LPA ref: 17/4080/F).

285 Section 35 of the Greater London Authority Act 2007 inserts section 2F into the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 a requirement that for applications the Mayor takes over, the Deputy Mayor must give the applicants and the LPA the opportunity to make oral representations at a hearing. He is also required to publish a document setting out:

- who else may make oral representations;
- the procedures to be followed at the hearing; and,
- arrangements for identifying information, which must be agreed by persons making representations.

286 The details of the above are set out in the Mayor's Procedure for Representation Hearings which reflects, as far as is practicable, current best practice for speaking at planning committee amongst borough councils.

287 In carrying out his duties in relation to the determination of this application, the Mayor must have regard to a number of statutory provisions. Listed below are some of the most important provisions for this application.

288 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) provides that in dealing with such an application the authority shall have regard to:

- a) The provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application;
- b) Any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application; and
- c) Any other material consideration.

289 Section 70(4) defines "local finance consideration" as:

- a) A grant or other financial assistance that has been, or will or could be, provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown; or
- b) Sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of Community Infrastructure Levy.

290 In this context "grants" might include the Government's "New Homes Bonus" - a grant paid by Central Government to local councils for increasing the number of homes and their use.

291 These issues are material planning considerations when determining planning applications or planning appeals.

292 Furthermore, in determining any planning application and connected application, the Mayor is required by section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to determine the application in accordance with the Development Plan (i.e. the London Plan and the adopted Local Plan) unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

293 Other guidance, which has been formally adopted by Greenwich Council and the GLA (e.g. Supplementary Planning Documents and Supplementary Planning Guidance), will also be material

considerations of some weight (where relevant). Those that are relevant to this application are detailed in this Representation Hearing report.

294 Officers are satisfied that the current report to the Deputy Mayor has had regard to the relevant provision of the Development Plan. The proposed section 106 package has been set out and complies with the relevant statutory tests, adequately mitigates the impact of the development and provides necessary infrastructure improvements.

295 As regards Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) considerations, a Mayoral CIL payment will be required.

296 Where the Deputy Mayor takes over an application, he becomes responsible for the section 106 legal agreement, although he is required to consult the relevant borough(s). Both the Deputy Mayor and the borough are given powers to enforce planning obligations.

297 When determining these planning applications, the Deputy Mayor is under a duty to take account of the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 as they relate to the development proposal and the conflicting interests of the applicants and any third party affected by, or opposing, the application, in reaching his decision. Planning decisions on the use of land can only be taken in line with the Town and Country Planning Acts and decided in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

298 The key Articles to be aware of include the following:

- (a) Article 6 - Right to a fair trial: In the determination of his civil rights and obligations... everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law.
- (b) Article 8 - Right to respect for private and family life: Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.
- (c) Article 1 of the First Protocol - Protection of property: Every person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions.

299 It should be noted, however, that most Convention rights are not absolute and set out circumstances when an interference with a person's rights is permitted i.e. necessary to do so to give effect to the Town and Country Planning Acts and in the interests of such matters as public safety, national economic well-being and protection of health, amenity of the community etc. In this case this Representation Hearing report sets out how this application accords with the Development Plan.

300 Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 states that a section 106 planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. These are now statutory tests.

301 The Equality Act 2010 provides that in exercising its functions (which includes the functions exercised by the Mayor as Local Planning Authority), that the Deputy Mayor as a public authority shall amongst other duties have due regard to the need to a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited under the Act; b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

302 The protected characteristics set out in the Equality Act are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. The Equality Act acknowledges that compliance with the duties set out may involve treating some persons more favourably than others, but that this does not permit conduct that would otherwise be prohibited under the Act.

303 Officers are satisfied that the application material and officers' assessment has taken into account the equality and human rights issues referred to above. Particular matters of consideration have included provision of accessible housing and parking bays, the provision of affordable and family housing and the protection of neighbouring residential amenity.

Conclusion

304 As detailed above Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compensation Act 2004 requires the decision to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

305 When assessing the planning application, the Deputy Mayor is required to give full consideration to the provisions of the Development Plan and all other material considerations. He is also required to consider the likely significant environmental effects of the development and be satisfied that the importance of the predicted effects and the scope for reducing them, are perfectly understood.

306 When considering the proposals, GLA officers have had special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed Lesnes Abbey (also a scheduled monument) in the vicinity of the proposed development and great weight has been given to the asset's conservation. Less than substantial harm to the significance of the asset will arise, but this is clearly outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme.

307 This report has considered the material planning issues associated with the proposed development in conjunction with all relevant national, regional and local planning policy, and has found that the proposed development is acceptable in terms of land use principles (including housing, employment, community and retail uses); housing (including affordable housing, housing tenure, mix, density and housing quality) urban design (including layout, landscaping, height and massing, architectural quality and appearance, heritage, fire safety and designing out crime); inclusive design; neighbouring amenity impacts (including privacy/overlooking; noise/disturbance); natural environment; sustainability (including climate change mitigation and adaptation, including sustainable drainage); other environmental considerations (including air quality, contaminated land and waste management), transport, including the provision of parking, and; mitigating the impact of development through planning obligations and conditions.

308 Taking the development plan as a whole, it is considered that the proposals accord overall with the development plan and it is not considered that there are any material considerations indicating that the proposal should be refused, notwithstanding its overall compliance with the development plan. Accordingly, the recommendations set out at the beginning of this report are proposed.

for further information, contact GLA Planning Unit:

Juliemma McLoughlin, Chief Planner

020 7983 4271 email Juliemma.McLoughlin@london.gov.uk

John Finlayson, Head of Development Management

020 7084 2632 email: John.Finlayson@london.gov.uk

Nick Ray Team Leader – Special Projects

020 7983 4178 email Nick.Ray@london.gov.uk

Connaire O’Sullivan, Strategic Planner (Case Officer)

020 7983 6589 email Connaire.OSullivan@london.gov.uk
