

Development Management Delegated Report



**Directorate of Regeneration,
Enterprise & Skills**
The Woolwich Centre, 5th Floor
35 Wellington Street
London, SE18 6HQ

Case Ref No:	22/1299/F
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission
Location:	51 CHARLTON CHURCH LANE, CHARLTON, LONDON, SE7 7AE
Ward:	CHARLTON - NO LONGER EXISTS
Proposal:	Subdivision of the entire site into seven (7) residential units (Use Class C3), proposed retention of all structures on site, proposed re-instatement of front lightwell, part-retrospective loft conversion incorporating installation of three (3) and rooflights to the main building [existing rear mansard extension to be replaced], excavation and lowering of floor level of rear extension building to allow for an additional storey, and other associated external alterations and landscaping works (Resubmission).

Recommendation		Refuse	
Expiry Date	09/06/2022	EOT	

Case Officer	Luke Sapiano	Date:	09 June 2022
Report Agreed By		Date:	
Authorising Officer's Signature		Date:	

Listed Building:	<u>No</u>	Flood Zone	Main Sewer
Conservation Area:	N/A		
CIL Liable	<u>Yes</u>	LDD	London Development Database

Site Notice		13/05/2022			
Press Notice		N/A			
Objections	1	Support	0	Comments	1

Description of Site Context

The application site is located on the eastern side of Charlton Church Lane south of its junction with Floyd Road and comprises a three-storey building (plus basement level) fronting on to Charlton Church Lane which also features a two-storey rear return. The rear of the site is accessed via a pedestrian access to the north side of the four-storey building.

The surrounding area comprises predominantly terraced housing and flatted residential accommodation as well as a neighbourhood shopping frontage.

The site is not located within a Conservation Area or an area of special character. The application site does not form part of a neighbourhood parade.

The site has a PTAL rating of 4 (good), on a scale of 0-6b with 6b being the highest. Charlton Station is located 90m from the site and there is an existing bus stop adjoining the station which is serviced by bus no. 486. There are also numerous other bus stops and routes located further to the north along Woolwich Road. The site is also located within the Charlton Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).

Proposed Development

Planning permission is sought for the subdivision of the entire site into seven (7) residential units (Use Class C3), proposed retention of all structures on site, proposed re-instatement of front lightwell, part-retrospective loft conversion incorporating installation of three (3) dormer roof extensions and rooflights to the main building [existing rear mansard extension to be replaced], excavation and lowering of floor level of rear extension building to allow for an additional storey, and other associated external alterations and landscaping works (Resubmission).

This proposal has been submitted as an alternative consent to 15/0321/F which although not fully implemented, works to implement this consent have commenced (please see planning history section below for further information). The supporting information submitted with this application states that the applicant does not intend building out this consent and this proposal is an alternative consent to that previously approved. The main differences between this proposal and that which was previously granted is that the residential units to the rear are no longer proposed and the proposed demolition of the middle building, as approved under consent no. 15/0321/F, is now to be retained and extended to facilitate the residential accommodation proposed. It would also appear from a review of the approved drawings for 15/0321/F that whilst the replacement building would provide 3 floors of residential accommodation within the 'middle building', this was facilitated through a taller replacement building rather than excavation to provide a new ground level below the existing footprint, as is proposed within this application.

The main building and the middle building are therefore to be extended within the existing footprint to provide the following residential mix of accommodation:

- 2x3 bed 5 person units
- 2x 2 bed 3 person units
- 2x 1 bed 2 person units
- 1 x 1 bed 1 person unit

The proposed rear dormer roof extensions would each have a depth of 3.88m, a width of 1.56m, a height to the eaves of 1.95m and a maximum height of 2.61m.

The development also brings forward significant plans to install new and revised windows to serve the subdivided units.

There are limited details of any of the proposed materials to be used in the development set out within the submissions, though the drawings do set out that the materials would generally match those used in the existing building on site.

It is noted that this application is a direct resubmission of previous planning application 21/4428/F at this site. The main differences between this proposal and the previously refused planning application is as follows:

- Revised mix of residential accommodation
- Re-organised internal layouts.
- Implementation of new private external amenity space to Unit R1 and associated new communal access route to rear communal amenity area.
- Altered obscure louvres to the northern side of the proposal.

Relevant Planning History;

14/0760/F - Demolition of the clubhouse and the construction of 7x1 bed, 2x2 bed and 1x3 bed apartments. Including the construction of 6x3 bed houses in a terrace at the rear. (Amended Description) (Re-consultation). Refused on 26 September 2014.

15/0321/F - Demolition of, the rear hall for hire, rear bar, billiard hall and refurbishment of the former clubhouse to provide one x 2-bed flat and one x 3-bed maisonette together with the erection of a new block of three x 2-bed flats, and construction of a terrace of 4 x 2-bed houses on land to the rear. Approved on 11 December 2015.

Officer Comment: It is understood that although not fully implemented, works to implement this consent have commenced. It is noted that the applicant has indicated that the applicant does not intend building out this consent. This is discussed in greater detail elsewhere within this report.

16/1665/SD - Submission of details pursuant to condition 11 (Construction Management Plan) of planning permission dated 02/12/2015 Ref: 15/0321/F. Approved on 7 October 2020.

18/2043/SD - Submission of details pursuant to the discharge of condition 6 (Hard and Soft Landscaping), condition 7 (Asbestos Survey), condition 17 (Cycle Storage) and condition 19 (Travel Plan) of planning permission dated 11/12/2015 (Reference: 15/0321/F). Approved on 14 August 2020.

18/2343/SD - Submission of details pursuant to condition 2 (Facing Materials and Finishes), condition 5 (Means of Enclosure), condition 9 (Internal Noise Levels), condition 12 (Energy Performance), condition 14 (Landscape Management Plan), condition 16 (Surface Water Drainage Scheme) and condition 18 (Refuse Storage) of planning permission dated 11/12/2015 Ref: 15/0321/F. Refused on 3 September 2018.

Reason(s) for refusal:

Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate how internal noise levels comply with the British Standard 8233 (BS8233:2014). As such, is contrary to Policy E(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies adopted 30th July 2014.

No details have been submitted to demonstrate how the development would minimise future carbon dioxide emissions and mitigate climate change. As such, would be contrary to London Plan 2016 Policy 5.2 (Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions) and Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies adopted 30th July 2014 Policy E1.

The omission of a landscape management plan with cross-section as required under Condition 14 (b), would fail to be in accordance with the requirements of the condition. As such, the details fail to adequately demonstrate the protection of wildlife and supporting habitat and to secure opportunities for the enhancement of the ecological value of the site in line with Policies 5.11 and 7.19 of the London Plan March 2016 and the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies adopted 30th July 2014 Policy OS4.

Insufficient waste and recycling details have been submitted to demonstrate how the development would ensure appropriate refuse facilities are provided as part of the development and ensure compliance with Policy 5.16 of the London Plan March 2016 and Policy DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies adopted 30th July 2014.

18/3290/SD - Submission of details pursuant to the discharge of condition 2 (Facing Materials), condition 5 (Means of Enclosure), condition 13 (Ecological Appraisal & Bat Survey), condition 14 (Landscape Management Plan) & condition 18 (Refuse & Recycling Facilities) of planning permission dated 11/12/2015 Ref:15/0321/F. Approved 22 November 2018.

18/4245/SD - Submission of details pursuant to the discharge of Condition 9 (Internal Noise Assessment) of planning permission dated 11/12/2015 (Reference: 15/0321/F). Approved on 29 January 2019.

19/0618/SD - Submission of details pursuant to the discharge of Condition 16 (Surface Water Drainage Scheme) of planning permission dated 15/12/2015 (ref. 15/0321/F). Approved on 16 April 2019.

20/1166/F - Planning permission is sought for development comprising a 26 room 49 person HMO (Class Sui Generis), including a full width rear dormer to the front building, new roof lights to front roof pitch, a new mansard roof extension to the existing rear building, front lightwell reinstated, reinstatement of windows to front bay, replacement timber sash windows, a new fire escape staircase to the rear elevation, basement to rear building and new rear lightwells, landscaping, refuse and cycle stores and other associated works. Withdrawn 20/10/2020.

20/3923/PRE1 – 51 Charlton Church Lane, Charlton, London, SE7 7AE - Proposed development comprising '25 single person 'co-living units', including a 70 degree mansard to the rear of the front building, new roof lights to front roof pitch, a new mansard roof extension to the existing rear building, front lightwell reinstated, reinstatement of windows to front bay, replacement timber sash windows, a new fire escape staircase to the rear elevation, basement to rear building and new rear lightwells, landscaping, refuse and cycle stores etc'.

Officer Comment: Further information and justification is required from the applicant in order to clarify whether the proposal should be assessed against only H16 of the London Plan (March 2021) and/or the HMO guidance. If it is concluded that the proposal is for co-living accommodation and not an HMO, the applicant will be required to meet all of the requirements of H16, including those regarding affordable housing. Concerns are raised in design terms on the scale and suitability of both the mansard roof extension to the main building to the front of the site as well as the extension to the building to the rear and the escape access. Concerns are also raised in regard to the quality of accommodation proposed and the impact on the amenity of adjoining owner/occupiers. It is considered that irrelevant on whether the proposal is for co-living accommodation or a HMO, the proposed capacity and scale of the development should be further reduced prior to the submission of any formal application.

21/4428/F – 51 Charlton Church Lane, Charlton, London, SE7 7AE - Subdivision of the entire site into seven (7) residential units (Use Class C3), proposed retention of all structures on site, proposed re-instatement of front lightwell, part-retrospective loft conversion incorporating installation of three (3) and rooflights to the main building [existing rear mansard extension to be replaced], excavation and lowering of floor level of rear extension building to allow for an additional storey, and other associated external alterations and landscaping works. Refused on 18/02/2022 for the below reasons:

- The proposed development, by reason of the inadequate GIA provided to units F3 and F4, the inadequate bathroom provision provided to unit F1, the lack of privacy afforded to unit R1, and the unacceptable outlook available to the habitable rooms within units R1, R2 and R3, would not provide an acceptable quality of accommodation for prospective residents. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan

(2021) and Policies H5 and DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and the Mayor of London Housing SPG (2016).

Pre-Commencement & Planning Enforcement	
Had works commenced on site (all or in part) in relation to that proposed on the date upon which the application was submitted?	YES
<i>It is understood that as some demolition at the application site has taken place that 15/0321/F is now a partially implemented consent. Notwithstanding this, works over and above this approval have been undertaken at the application site which include the implementation of the rear mansard roof extension.</i>	
Is the development proposed the subject of a related enforcement case?	YES
<p><i>E/20/0677 - Commencement of works being carried out in relation to planning application 20/1166/F without a decision being issued – Enquiry now closed (no breach found).</i></p> <p><i>E/18/0245 – Multiple planning conditions have not been submitted and/or discharged – Enquiry Remains Open.</i></p>	

Neighbour Notification
<p>Ninety two (92) neighbouring properties, three (3) councillors, the Charlton Central Residents Association and the Charlton Society were notified on the 3rd of May 2022.</p> <p>In addition, a site notice was erected on the 13/05/2022.</p> <p>One (1) representation was received in objection to the proposal. A summary of the objections is provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that the proposed development is partially retrospective and that construction works have already caused distress and disruption to neighbouring properties. <p><i>Officer Comment:</i> This application is seeking to approve the retrospective works. Disruptive building works should be taken up with the Environmental Health Department and the local authorities planning enforcement department, where relevant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that the proposed development would set a precedent for retrospective planning applications <p><i>Officer Comment:</i> This is not a planning consideration as all applications are determined on their own merits with respect to policy only.</p>

- Concern that the proposed development is different to that which has already been approved on the site.

Officer Comment: This is not a planning consideration as this application would exist as an entirely separate planning consent should the proposed development go ahead.

- Concern that the applicant has already breached conditions of previous planning applications at this site.

Officer Comment: This is not a planning consideration as all applications are determined on their own merits with respect to policy only. There are ongoing enforcement enquiries with respect to the separate non-conforming of the site to previously requested planning conditions.

- Concern that the development is larger than previous applications which have been previously approved at the site.

Officer Comment: This is not a planning consideration as all applications are determined on their own merits with respect to policy only. The design merits of the proposed development are considered in the relevant section of the report below.

- Concern that the proposed development would result in unacceptable impacts on the amenity enjoyed by neighbouring properties, specifically with respect to noise pollution and overlooking impacts.

Officer Comment: This aspect of the proposed development is assessed on the “impact on neighbouring amenity” section of the report below.

- Concern that the developments would not be acceptable in terms of quality of accommodation and fire safety.

Officer Comment: As a conversion application, the requirements for a fire strategy do not apply in this instance, and fire safety measures would be enforced at building control stage. An assessment of the proposal in terms of quality of accommodation is set out in the relevant section of the report below.

- Concern that the extreme occupancy of the building would bring forward unacceptable impacts on the highway network.

Officer Comment: This aspect of the proposed development is assessed in the relevant section of the report below.

- Concern that the extreme occupancy of the building might result in a fire hazard.

Officer Comment: The submitted fire statement sets out that the development

would be in accordance with relevant fire related building regulations.

Internal and Statutory Consultation	
Waste Department:	<i>"We are satisfied with the above planning proposal."</i>
Metropolitan Police (Crime Prevention Officer):	<p><i>"As the development is less than 10 units the MPS Designing Out Crime Group will not generally comment, as the size of the development is not within our policy. I have however looked over the plans for this development and do not see a reason why it should not be granted planning permission."</i></p> <p><i>We will continue to comment on all applications above this size. Where Secured By Design is added to planning approval conditions we will continue to assist all applicants in achieving SBD accreditation."</i></p>
Transport and Highways:	<p><i>"Comments made for a previous similar application, 21/4428/F, are still applicable"</i></p> <p>Previous comments set out below:</p> <p><i>"Being close to Charlton railway station and within walking distance of several bus routes, the site is considered to have good access to public transport having a PTAL index of 4."</i></p> <p><i>Located within the vicinity of Charlton station the site is within the Charlton CPZ with waiting restrictions in place between 9am and 6.30pm Monday to Saturday along with commensurate levels of enforcement. Further waiting restrictions are in place outside the premises from 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Saturday."</i></p> <p><i>Policy T1 of the London Plan (2021) states that development proposals should facilitate the delivery of the strategic target of 80% of all trips in London to be made by foot, cycle, or public transport by 2041. It requires all developments to make the most effective use of land, reflecting their connectivity and accessibility by existing and future public transport, walking, and cycling routes, and ensure that any impacts on London's transport networks and supporting infrastructure are mitigated. Policy T4 requires proposals to reflect and be integrated with current and planned transport access, capacity, and connectivity. Where appropriate, mitigation, either through direct provision of public transport, walking and cycling</i></p>

facilities and highways improvements or through financial contributions, will be required to address adverse transport impacts that are identified.

While no car parking is provided, it is noted that relevant policy T6 is considered in the London Plan which requires developments to be car free in areas of good access to public transport supported by CPZ's. It is considered in such areas that car parking provision can undermine cycling, walking and public transport use. These developments should provide only enough parking to meet the needs of disabled residents and operational requirements for deliveries. The parking provision is therefore in line with the London Plan standards/policies which encourage a mode shift to alternate modes of transport, i.e., public transport, walking and cycling

Policy IM4 of the Core Strategy also notes that developments should prioritise the needs of pedestrians, disabled users and cyclists over car users, stating that developments should not go above the requirements set out in the London Plan.

While there is heavy demand for parking in the area, there is limited opportunity for parking and is therefore considered to be at a premium where additional demand will exacerbate existing problems for residents, businesses and visitors. As there is no parking provided on site as part of the proposal any demand would have to be met by kerbside availability.

As the development is proposed to be car free, it is recommended that if the proposal were allowed, that it does not affect existing residents. This can be achieved by amending the existing Traffic Order (at developer expense) controlling the CPZ to ensure that no future occupiers are eligible for parking permits as any additional demand will create parking problems for existing residents and businesses in the area. A condition or s106 is therefore sought requiring this.

It is recommended that adequate cycle provision is made in line with Policy T5 of the London Plan. In order to comply with the London Plan, adequate cycle provision will require 1 cycle parking space be provided for all studio or 1 bedroom dwellings, 1.5 spaces per 2 person 1

	<p><i>bedroom dwelling and 2 spaces for all other dwellings as part of a long term parking requirement. Additional short term spaces are required for 2 visitor spaces.</i></p> <p><i>To comply with policy T5 (Cycling) the long and stay cycle parking mix should be provided to ensure compliance with TfL's London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS) guidance, (available at: http://content.tfl.gov.uk/lcds-chapter8-cycleparking.pdf).</i></p> <p><i>The cycle storage needs to be provided within a storage unit of sufficient size to accommodate the required cycle spaces. It is unclear if sufficient space is available. Transport for London provides Cycle Design standards indicating the design of cycle parking including the width of stores to ensure that they are functional and easy to use. The store should also accommodate non-standard cycles, which include recumbent and cargo bikes. The Council's preference is for Sheffield stands rather than vertical or stacked cycle racks, in order to enable use by all age ranges and to accommodate different types of cycles.</i></p> <p><i>A minimum of 1 long stay space should be for adapted/larger bikes. The spacing between enlarged bays for the adapted/larger cycles should comply with figure 8.1 (Recommended cycle parking space requirements) of the LCDS. TfL LCDS guidance is available at: http://content.tfl.gov.uk/lcds-chapter8-cycleparking.pdf</i></p> <p><i>The cycle design standards also include requirements in respect of the access doors and gates. They need to be a minimum of 2m wide and be automated to ensure that all cyclists can easily use them. There should be no obstacles on route and there should be no more than 2 sets of doors between the public realm and the cycle parking space. Ramps should be at preferred gradients.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, a Construction Management/Logistics Plans should be secured via planning conditions.</i></p> <p><i>On balance, subject to the above, no highway objection is raised."</i></p>
Environmental Health:	No response received.
Housing Occupational	No response received.

Therapy Department:	
Transport for London (TfL):	<i>"Having assessed the proposals, I can confirm that TfL Spatial Planning has no strategic comments to make on this planning application other than to emphasise the development should comply with the transport policies set out in The London Plan 2021. In particular the car and cycle parking standards in tables 10.2 – 10.6 (inclusive). Cycle parking should comply with the London Cycling Design Standards (https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/streets-toolkit)."</i>
EDF:	No response received.
London Fire Brigade:	<i>"The London Fire Brigade (LFB) has been consulted with regard to the above-mentioned premises and have no further observations to make. It should be ensured that if any material amendments to this consultation is proposed, a further consultation may be required."</i>

Development Plan Context:	
National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (NPPF)	Chapter 5 – Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes Chapter 9 – Promoting Sustainable Transport Chapter 12 – Achieving Well-Designed Places Chapter 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
The London Plan (2021).	<p><u><i>Good Growth Policies</i></u></p> <p>Policy GG2 – Making the best use of land Policy GG4 – Delivering the Homes Londoners Need</p> <p><u><i>Design Policies</i></u></p> <p>Policy D3 – Optimising site capacity through the design led approach Policy D4 – Delivering Good Design Policy D5 – Inclusive Design Policy D6 – Housing Quality and Standards Policy D7 – Inclusive Design Policy D11 – Safety, security and resilience to emergency Policy D14 – Noise</p> <p><u><i>Housing Policies</i></u></p> <p>Policy H1 – Increasing Housing Supply Policy H2 – Small Sites</p>

	<p>Policy H10 – Housing Size Mix</p> <p><u><i>Sustainable Infrastructure Policies</i></u></p> <p>Policy SI1 – Improving Air Quality Policy S12 – Minimising greenhouse gas emissions Policy S15 - Water Infrastructure Policy SI7 - Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy Policy SI8 – Waste Capacity and Net Waste Self Sufficiency</p> <p><u><i>Transport Policies</i></u></p> <p>Policy T2 – Healthy Streets Policy T4 – Assessing and mitigating transport impacts Policy T5 - Cycling Policy T6 - Car Parking Policy T6.1 – Residential Parking</p>
Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies “Core Strategy” (July 2014)	<p><u><i>Housing Policies</i></u></p> <p>H1 New Housing H2 Housing Mix H5 Housing Design</p> <p><u><i>Design and Heritage Policies</i></u></p> <p>DH1 Design DH(a) Residential Extensions DH(b) Protection of Amenity for Adjacent Occupiers</p> <p><u><i>Environment and Climate Change Policies</i></u></p>

	E1	Carbon Emissions
	E(a)	Pollution
	OS(f)	Ecological Factors
	<u>Infrastructure and Movement Policies</u>	
	IM4	Sustainable Travel
	IM(a)	Impact on the Road Network
	IM(b)	Walking and Cycling
	IM(c)	Parking Standards
Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standards (March 2015)		
Mayor of London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016) (SPG)		
New Developments: Guidance Notes for the Storage and Collection of Waste and Recycling Materials for the Royal Borough of Greenwich (May 2018)		

Principle of Development

The overriding objective of the Royal Greenwich policy framework is to deliver high quality development which improves the quality and distinctive identity of places and contributes to their success and the area's popularity as somewhere to live, work and stay.

Loss of Existing Use -

The applicant has indicated that the existing use is C3 Use Class as approved by consent no. 15/0321/F in 2015. This consent approved the change of use of the property from Class D1 (Now Use Class F2) to Class C3 for the main building to the front of the site, the demolition of the middle and rear extensions buildings, the replacement of the middle two storey element to provide 3 flats and the construction of 4 new terrace dwellings at the rear of the site.

Officers note that consent no. 15/0321/F has not been fully implemented given that the construction of the 4 houses at the rear of the site and the demolition and replacement of the middle building (traditionally the snooker hall) has not been completed. The demolition of the rear building (traditionally the rear hall) has

however been completed.

All pre-commencement conditions of consent no. 15/0321/F have also been discharged, apart from Condition 4 (Lifetime Home Standards).

Given that the rear hall has been demolished and that the internal works have commenced, albeit unlawfully as Condition 4 has not been discharged, officers consider that the traditional D1 Use Class (Now Class F2) at the site no longer exists and that the lawful use of the site is now C3 Use Class following the part-implementation 15/0321/F.

Creation of new residential units

The Royal Borough of Greenwich makes a major contribution to London's Housing provision and Policy H1 of the CS sets out the housing targets for the plan period are to deliver 2595 new homes each year. The NPPF supports development including more efficient use of land in accessible locations.

Policy H1 of the London Plan (2021) (LP) highlights the pressing need for more homes in London and states that Boroughs should seek to achieve and exceed relevant minimum borough annual average housing targets. Table 4.1 of Policy H1 lists the 10-year targets for net housing completions (2019/20 -2028/29) for the Royal Borough of Greenwich as 28240 which is the 3rd highest in London.

Policy H2 of the LP related to small sited such as the current one and the Policy Boroughs should pro-actively support well-designed new homes on small sites (below 0.25 hectares in size) through both planning decisions and plan-making in order to significantly increase the contribution of small sites to meeting London's housing needs, and to achieve the minimum targets for 10 years housing completions on small sites set out in Table 4.2 of Policy H2 which lists a target for the Royal Borough of Greenwich as 3010.

As such, it is recognised that the development would bring the public benefit of the formalised implementation of seven (7) dwellinghouses across the site would work to meet the housing targets in the borough and London in general.

Housing Mix

It is stated within Policy H2 of the Core Strategy (2014) (CS) that a mix of housing types are required in all developments including conversions and should contain a proportion of 3, 4 and 4+ bedroom units.

In relation to the proposed housing mix, given that the overall mix would include 2x3 bedroom dwellings and 3x2bedroom dwellings, the mix of accommodation proposed is considered to be acceptable in this regard.

Design and appearance:

Policy D3 of the LP states that development proposals should be of high quality,

enhancing local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

Policy D4 of the LP sets out that design and access statements submitted with proposals should demonstrate how proposals meet the design requirements of the London Plan. This policy also sets out that where appropriate, modelling and digital imagery can be used to inform planning decisions.

Policy DH1 of the CS requires all developments to be of a high quality of design and demonstrate that they positively contribute to the improvement of both the built and natural environments.

Policy H5 of the CS states that 'new residential development will be expected to achieve a high quality of housing design and an integrated environment. The council will take into account the key relationship between the character of the area, site location and housing densities and expects the design of the development is consistent with policy DH1'.

Ground Floor Excavation to the "middle-building"

The primary alteration of the site from the existing situation is the bringing forward of significant excavation works to lower the ground level of the rear garden area so as to allow for the creation of a new below ground storey of the existing "middle-building". Examining how this proposal would not increase the height of the middle-building beyond the existing situation, it is considered that this change would not result in an unacceptable impact on the character of the site or the surrounding area.

Dormer roof extension and associated front rooflights

It is noted that the proposed development brings forward the installation of three (3) rear dormer roof extensions. It is also noted that the existing situation exhibits a rear mansard roof extension, which was constructed without the benefit of planning permission. As such this aspect of the development is assessed from the basis of the previously existing lawful situation on site (that of an unaltered roofslope to the main building).

The Council's Residential Extensions, Conversions and Basements Supplementary Planning Document (December 2018) require loft conversions to be small scale with minimal impact. Full width dormer extensions are also discouraged. Windows should be of an appropriate design considering the existing windows in the house.

The local area is characterised by properties which have largely retained their original roof forms. Within the adjoining terrace no rear dormers have been

constructed, however, there are some along Floyd Road which back on to the application site. A search of the application history indicates these dormers were constructed prior to current policies or via permitted development. As the current site is not a traditional dwelling it does not benefit from permitted development rights for the construction of roof extensions such as a rear dormer. No mansard roof style types are located nearby to the property.

Having regard to roof extensions, the SPD states that 'roof extensions should be proportionate to the size of the original house, and any proposals that change the roof form should seek to preserve or enhance the existing appearance in terms of height, scale and visual interest'. In addition, it states that 'there is a danger that in achieving adequate headroom the new form of the roof could give the house a top-heavy look, damaging the character of the house and the street'. Specifically, 'dormer extensions should be small scale and the windows should be of an appropriate design considering the other windows in the house...full width dormer extensions will be discouraged on any roof face as they do not integrate well with pitched roof houses'.

The proposed rear dormers are considered to be generally small scale and would ensure that the original roof form of the building would remain intact should the proposed development go ahead. The proposed rear dormer roof extensions would not exist as dominating features on the original building and would remain secondary and subservient to the character of the application site.

Given their small scale, the proposed front lights are considered to be acceptable in design terms and would not bring forward an unacceptable impact on the character of the application site or the surrounding area.

As such, these aspects of the proposed development are considered to be acceptable in design terms.

Balcony railings and skylight on connecting building and air source heat pump installation

It is noted that the development also brings forward plans to retain some balustrading on the connecting section of building which links the main building to the "middle-building" as it was previously known, which also houses an air source heat pump and appears to house an upwards entrance stairwell to this section from the roof of the middle-building. It is noted that these features appear to have been implemented without the benefit of formal planning consent.

It is noted that the triangular shaped upwards stairwell which appears present on digital imagery is not shown on the existing or proposed drawings, and the number and positioning of the air source heat pumps as shown on the existing and proposed drawings appears to be incorrect with respect to their existing positioning. Whilst it is noted that the applicants Planning Statement states that these inconsistencies have

been addressed since the previous submission, it is not considered that these inaccuracies have been fully addressed.

Had this application been considered to be acceptable, the error on the existing submissions would have been corrected prior to the issue of any approval. The assessment of the proposal is based on those works described on the proposed drawings, not the retention of the structures which currently exist on this part of the site.

The proposed skylight on this section of the roof is not considered to be so uncharacteristic in this location that it would warrant a reason for refusal.

The proposed balustrading would be positioned on the northern side of the connecting building and would have a height of 0.85m. Air source heat pumps are proposed on this section of the roofscape, with a depth of 1.04m, a width of 0.76m and height of 0.95m. Whilst balustrading and air heat source pumps are not characteristic of the surrounding area, given that these are not readily visible within the wider area, these elements are considered to be acceptable in design terms for both the host property and the surrounding area.

Other design aspects and considerations

The proposed landscaping works are considered to not bring forward any unacceptable impacts on the character of the surrounding area or application site, and so are acceptable in this instance.

The proposed installation of new windows to the rear and side elevation of the existing “middle building” are not considered to be unacceptable in principle and the window design would be generally acceptable.

The proposed lightwell would not bring forward an unacceptable impact on the character of the application property in this instance, particularly given its positioning on a site with sloping topography. It is also noted that the principle of similar lightwell works has already been established as part of previous application 15/0321/F.

Limited material details are brought forward as part of the submissions. Had this application been recommended for approval, these would have been sought via a condition attached to the decision notice.

Conclusion

Overall, the proposed development, is considered to be acceptable in design terms and would be in compliance with Policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan (2021), and Policies DH1 and H5 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014).

Quality of accommodation and unit sizes:

Policy D6 of the LP and Policies H5 and DH1 of the CS require that all new housing developments achieve a high quality of design. These policies also refer to the Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (Technical Housing Standards) and are supported by the Mayor of London Housing SPG (Mayor’s Housing SPG).

Unit Sizes

The following sets out the relevant ‘Minimum Space Standards for New Dwellings’ as per the Technical Housing Standards and Table 3.1 of the London Plan.

GIA Size Requirements						
Unit	Unit size	Size (m ²)	S i z e R e q . (m ²)	Storage Provision (m ²)	Storage Req. (m ²)	Complies ?
Unit F1	1 b 2 p (2storeys)	66sqm	58sqm	--	1.5sqm	Yes
Unit F2	2 b 3 p (1storeys)	65sqm	61sqm	--	2sqm	Ye
Unit F3	2 b 3 p (1storeys)	61.2sqm	61sqm	--	2sqm	Yes
Unit F4	1 b 1 p (1storeys)	37.45sqm	37sqm	2.25sqm	1sqm	Yes
Unit R1	1 b 2 p (1storeys)	60sqm	50sqm	--	1.5sqm	Yes
Unit R2	3 b 5 p (1storeys)	128sqm	86sqm	--	2.5sqm	Yes
Unit R3	3 b 5 p (1storeys)	128sqm	86sqm	--	2.5sqm	Yes

As set out in the table above, the proposed development would be in accordance with the relevant GIA standards.

Whilst it is noted that many of the new dwellings feature storage “cabinets” as oppose to dedicated storage rooms, it is considered that the required amount of internal storage could be provided without unacceptably impacting the operation of the proposed new units.

Bedroom Sizes

Pursuant to the Technical Housing Standards, a dwelling with two (2) or more bedspaces must have at least one (1) double (or twin) bedroom. A double or twin bedroom with two (2) bed spaces is required to have a minimum floor area of at

least 11.5m² and a width of 2.75m. A single bedroom with one (1) bed space is required to have a minimum floor area of 7.5m² and be at least 2.15m wide.

Examining the submitted floor plans, it is considered that the development would be compliant with this requirement.

Bathroom Provision

The Technical Housing Standards require two and three storey dwellings to account for one (1) bathroom and one (1) *additional* WC/shower room.

The proposed development would not be compliant with this requirement.

Floor to ceiling heights

It is noted that the Technical Housing Standards states that the minimum floor-to-ceiling height is 2.3m for at least 75% of the GIA. Standard 31 of the Mayor's Housing SPG however 'strongly encourages' a minimum ceiling height of 2.5m for at least 75% of the GIA. However, the recently adopted LP sets out in Policy D6 that new dwellings should ensure that units have a minimum floor to ceiling height of 2.5m across 75% of the GIA.

Examining the submitted section drawings, it is clear that the proposed development would be in accordance with the relevant standards as set out in the London Plan (2021).

Outdoor space provision

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

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

Unit R1 would have access to its own private external amenity space which would be in accordance with the above requirements.

However, it is noted that Flats F1, R3 and R2 would be able to offset this lack of private external amenity by providing additional internal floorspace.

Whilst it is noted that the other units in the development would not be able to provide this, the provision of a communal garden space to the rear of the application property is considered to be an appropriate provision in this regard which would

mitigate the lack of private space being brought forward as part of the proposal. This aspect of the development is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Other amenity considerations

Other standards within the Mayor's Housing SPG focus on the internal amenity of future residents. Standard 28 requires that habitable rooms benefit from an adequate level of privacy, Standard 29 promotes dual aspect dwellings in order to optimise daylight, sunlight, natural ventilation, thermal control, pollution mitigation, views and internal flexibility/adaptability, and Standard 32 requires that at least one (1) habitable room (preferably kitchen, dining and living spaces) should receive direct sunlight for part of the day.

With the exception of Unit F1 and F2, the proposed dwellings would all be dual-aspect. Given that Unit F1 and F2 would be single aspect west facing, it is considered that all of the dwellings brought forward in the proposals would receive a satisfactory amount of daylight and sunlight should the proposed development go ahead. All habitable spaces would receive direct sunlight for part of the day.

As set out elsewhere within this report, this proposal has been submitted as an alternative consent to 15/0321/F and in this regard, one of the key differences between this proposal and that which was previously granted is that the proposed demolition of the middle building, as approved under consent no. 15/0321/F, is now to be retained and extended to facilitate the residential accommodation proposed. Previously, this middle building was to be re-constructed within a smaller footprint than that which was previously demolished and was also to contain residential accommodation. The implications of this proposal seeking to retain the existing building rather than demolishing and rebuilding it with a smaller footprint is that the northern flank wall is now closer to the northern boundary of the application site than what was previously approved. These differences between this revised proposal and that which was previously approved has resulted in a number implications in terms of the quality of accommodation proposed.

In an effort to overcome concerns raised with respect to lack of outlook in the previously refused application (21/4428/F), this submission has removed the previously proposed opaque louvres to the northern elevation bedrooms on units R2 and R3. Obscure glazing louvres remain in northern positioned living rooms where they are also served by other openings facing towards the rear of the site.

Bedrooms 1 and 2 of Unit R2 and R3 are still considered however to suffer from an unacceptable level of outlook and would also suffer from a lack of privacy should the proposed development go ahead. Should the proposed development be implemented, the traditional openings serving these bedrooms would exist just 3.5m away from the neighbouring 4 storey rear outrigger element that exists at No. 47

Charlton Church Lane adjacent. It is also noted that this outlook would immediately observe extract flues and a large obscure glazed window.

Whilst officers acknowledge that the side window at No. 47 has been constructed from obscure glazing, it is within extremely close proximity to Bedrooms 1 and 2 of Unit R2 and R3. It is also from the appearance of this sash window that it would be at least partially openable, and so should this window be opened, direct site lines into the bedrooms within the development would be available. It is also noted that no details of the room that this window serves have been provided.

Whilst it is noted that residential windows were cited on this elevation within the approved scheme at this site (15/0321/F), it is noted that the relationship of these windows with the building to the south would allow for a far better quality of accommodation than that which is proposed within this application.

Conclusions

The proposed development, by reason of the lack of privacy and unacceptable outlook afforded Bedrooms 1 and 2 of Units R2 and R3, would not provide an acceptable quality of accommodation for prospective residents. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies H5 and DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and the Mayor of London Housing SPG (2016).

Inclusive Design

Policy D5 of the LP requires developments to achieve the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design.

Policy D7 of the LP also sets out that all new dwellings should meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'.

CS Policy H5 supports the principles of inclusive living environment and Policy DH1 also states that all new developments should achieve accessible and inclusive environments. The proposed new dwellings at the application site are therefore expected to comply with Part M4(2) of the approved Building Regulations.

Standard 11 of the Mayors Housing SPG (2016) further states that:

"90 per cent of new build housing should meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' with the remaining 10 per cent meeting Building Regulation requirement M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings'."

As this application is for the conversion of an existing building, it is unreasonable for these policies to be complied with in this instance.

Impact on neighbouring amenity:

Policy DH(b) of the CS requires new development to demonstrate that there would be no significant loss of amenity to adjacent or nearby properties, by reducing the amount of daylight, sunlight, privacy or outlook they enjoy, by creating an unneighbourly sense of enclosure, or by unacceptably impacting the wind environment or microclimate.

Additionally, Policy E(a) of the CS states that proposals which have an adverse effect on the amenity of adjacent occupiers or uses, and especially where proposals would be likely to result in the unacceptable emission of light, vibrations, odours, fumes, dust, water and soil pollutants or grit, will be refused.

The proposed new roof extension, given its scale and its positioning, would not result in any unacceptable loss of daylight/ sunlight or increased sense of enclosure to neighbouring properties beyond the previously existing lawful situation. Examining how the new windows within the dormer roof extension would view an outlook already examined by the other windows within the building, it is considered that this aspect of the development would not bring forward any unacceptable privacy or overlooking impacts to neighbouring properties.

As the development does not bring forward any extension works to the existing site beyond the lowering of the ground level to allow for lower ground floor dwellings within the “middle-building,” it is considered that the development would not bring forward any unacceptable loss of daylight/ sunlight or increased sense of enclosure impacts to neighbouring properties.

On the northern boundary, the development brings forward a number of habitable bedroom windows (Bedrooms 1 and 2 of Unit R2 and R3) which would be positioned to directly examine the side windows on the rear outrigger at No. 47 Charlton Church Lane. Whilst it is accepted that the side window at No. 47 has been constructed from obscure glazing, the habitable windows at No. 51 Charlton Church Lane would be positioned just 3.5m away from this window. The submissions provide no information so as to demonstrate that the relevant side window at No. 47 is not a habitable window. As such, and with respect to this point, it is considered that the development would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to No. 47 Charlton Church Lane. The implementation of obscure glazing or similar screening louvres to the relevant proposed windows would not be an acceptable approach in this instance as this would bring forward unacceptable impacts to the outlook enjoyed by these proposed habitable spaces. As such, the proposed development is considered to be unacceptable in this regard.

No details are brought forward with respect to the proposed noise which is created by the retention of the air source heat pump on site. Had this application been considered acceptable, further details on the potential noise impact would have been sought prior to any formal determination.

It is noted that objections have been received raising concerns on the impact that the use of the rear communal area for amenity space would have on the amenity of adjoining owner/occupiers. Whilst this is acknowledged, it is noted that the previously approved and implementable scheme (15/0321/F) also benefited from a communal area to the rear. Given this, it is not considered that the capacity proposed within this development would result in an unacceptable increase in noise disturbance over and above this fall-back position. For the same reasoning, it is not considered that the number of units proposed would result in an unacceptable increase in noise disturbance to adjoining owner/occupiers.

Had this application been recommended for approval, a condition would have been attached to the decision notice ensuring that Construction Method statement is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority to properly assess any disruption to neighbours that may result from the demolition and construction phases and to ensure that these aspects of development would not result in significantly detrimental impacts to neighbouring amenity.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would be contrary to Policy DH(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014).

Transport and Highways:

Policy T2 of the LP states that development proposals should deliver patterns of land use that facilitate residents making shorter, regular trips by walking or cycling. This policy also states that development proposals should reduce the dominance of vehicles on London's streets whether stationary or moving.

Policy T6 of the LP states that car-free development should be the starting point for all development proposals in places that are (or are planned to be) well-connected by public transport, with developments elsewhere designed to provide the minimum necessary parking.

Policy T6.1 further sets out that maximum parking provision for residential development should be in accordance with Table 10.3. For a residential development of this size, the London Plan sets out that the development should be car free.

The requirements of these LP Policies are supported by Policy IM(c) of the CS.

The site has a good access level (PTAL) of 4 (on a scale of 1-6, where 1 is the lowest possible level of public transport accessibility). This indicates that the site has as an above average level public transport accessibility. The site is located within the Charlton Church Lane Controlled Parking Zone.

The proposed development would not provide any off-street car parking spaces, which is within the limits of the LP requirements.

Had this application been recommended for approval, a condition would have been added removing the ability of new properties to be able to apply for a parking permit.

This aspect of the proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable, and this stance is supported by the Local Authorities Transport and Highways internal consultee, who has raised no objection to the submissions.

Cycle Storage:

Policy T5 of the LP states that development proposals should help remove barriers to cycling and create a healthy environment in which people choose to cycle. The policy is clear that proposals should do this by meeting providing cycle parking at least in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Table 10.2 and Figure 10.3. The cycle parking should be fit for purpose, secure and well-located.

This is supported by Policy IM(b) of the CS.

Internal cycle storage is provided on the lower floors. Had this application been recommended for approval, full details would have been sought through condition.

Waste and Recycling Storage:

Policy H5 of the CS identifies that development needs to minimise the production of waste, to promote the reuse and recycling of waste materials and to ensure that waste disposal is environmentally responsible. As such residential schemes should incorporate measures for community recycling that minimises waste disposal and should provide refuse bins and recycling boxes. This is supported by LP Policies SI7 and SI8.

The plan drawings bring forward proposals to install 1no 500L organic waste bin and 2no 1100L general waste bins. This is considered to be an appropriate provision. The proposed location of the bins within the front forecourt is considered to be acceptable. Had this application been considered to be acceptable, full details of the appearance of the waste storage unit would have been sought via a condition attached to the decision notice.

Sustainability:

Policy DH1 of the adopted CS sets out Council's expectations for all development to maximise energy conservation and minimise future carbon dioxide emissions and

mitigate climate change, and to comply with LP Policy S12 and Policy E1 of the CS.

Policy S12 specifically sets out that non-major residential development such as that which is proposed in this application should achieve a minimum reduction of carbon emissions of at least 10 percent beyond those requirements set out in the building regulations. Where it is clearly demonstrated that the zero-carbon target cannot be fully achieved on-site, any shortfall should be provided, in agreement with the borough, either:

- 1) through a cash in lieu contribution to the borough's carbon offset fund, or
- 2) off-site provided that an alternative proposal is identified and delivery is certain.

Carbon emissions are to be reduced in accordance with the Mayor's energy hierarchy;

1. Be lean: use less energy
2. Be clean: supply energy efficiently; and
3. Be green: use renewable energy

The Greener Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document provides guidance on how new development in the borough should be designed and built so that it has a positive impact on the environment and achieves the highest standards of sustainable design and construction.

The above is not a requirement for a development of this scale, however the development as a whole should strive to meet these standards and applicants are encouraged to submit a report that addresses the requirements set by the Greener Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

LP Policy S15 requires development to minimise the use of mains water by incorporating water saving measures and equipment and designing residential development so that mains water consumption would meet a target of 105 litres or less per head per day. This is captured under the Greener Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Had this application been recommended for approval, conditions would have been attached to the decision notice to ensure that the above policies and recommendations are adhered to.

Other Material Planning Considerations:

It is noted that the previous application 15/0321/F (decided 11/12/2015), has been granted and partially implemented on the site, including the demolition of the original "rear building" at the site.

It is asserted within the submitted planning statement that *"The Applicant cannot implement the previously approved scheme [alongside this one] as it would need to be implemented fully and in accordance with previously approved drawings."*

The above is not the case – given their lack of connection, there is no reason why the proposed development could not theoretically be implemented and then the part-implemented permission for four (4) terraced dwellings be implemented towards the eastern side of the application site. Had this application been approved, a legal agreement would have been sought so as to set out in legal terms that the terraced buildings approved as part of application 15/0321/F could not be implemented should this application be sought to be implemented.

Tilted Balance and 5YHLS:

At present the Council is able to demonstrate a housing land supply of 3.1 years. This means that Royal Greenwich is not meeting the NPPF requirement for a five-year housing land supply (5YHLS). In the circumstances where the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5YHLS, under footnote 8 of the NPPF, the presumption in favour of sustainable development in accordance with paragraph 11d of the Framework applies – ‘the tilted balance’. ‘tilted balance’ refers to the presumption in paragraph 11 (d) ii of the NPPF that, where the presumption applies, planning permission should be granted unless there are “adverse impacts which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework as a whole.

In this instance it is considered that the harm identified in the report is namely:

- The proposed development, by reason of the lack of privacy and unacceptable outlook afforded Bedrooms 1 and 2 of Units R2 and R3, would not provide an acceptable quality of accommodation for prospective residents. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies H5 and DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and the Mayor of London Housing SPG (2016).
- The proposed development, by reason of its positioning of a number of non-obscured windows so close to side windows at the neighbouring No. 47 Charlton Church Lane, would result in unacceptable loss of privacy impacts to this property.

In this instance, it is considered that the above harm significantly and demonstrably outweigh the limited benefits of the scheme, when assessed against the Framework, in terms of delivering new homes.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL):

The development is liable for this requirement the Mayor’s Community Infrastructure Levy 2 (CIL2).

The development is liable for the Greenwich Community Infrastructure Levy.

Conclusions:

The proposal is considered to be unacceptable and is therefore recommended to the delegated officer for refusal for the reasons set out in the decision notice.