
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by David Walker MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 17th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/16/3162753

Plot M0119, Land South of West Barge Walk, Greenwich, London

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr A Donnelly of Kier Construction against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 16/1712/SD, dated 6 May 2016, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 16 of a planning permission Ref 13/2822/F granted on 31 March 2014.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 30 August 2016
 - The development proposed is a mixed use development comprising non-residential floorspace.
 - The details for which approval is sought are facilities for the parking of cycles for the development.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and the details submitted in pursuance of condition No 16 attached to planning permission Ref 13/2822/F dated 31 March 2014 are approved.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is whether the proposal would provide adequate parking facilities for cyclists.

Reasons

3. The proposed development would rely upon cycle parking stands that would be effectively off-site. As these would be accessible to other developments the proposal would be short of the cycle parking requirements set out at Table 6.3 of the London Plan.
 4. It is apparent, however, that cycle parking facilities at completed developments in the vicinity are experiencing relatively low levels of patronage. Survey data provided in support of the proposal illustrates that low patronage is not confined only to day time hours when cyclists are likely to be away from home. That generous cycle parking availability continues into the evening is not contested by the Council.
 5. I have nothing before me to explain how the proposal fits into the wider Greenwich Peninsula development or masterplan. Nonetheless, it is self-evident that as more development occurs and becomes occupied that demand for cycle parking will increase. In the circumstances any dilution of the cycling
-

facility requirements set out within Policies 6.9 and 6.13 of London Plan would be premature. The requirements are furthermore endorsed at Policies IM(b) and IM(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 (the Core Strategy).

6. However, the proposed development is intended to provide very local facilities that, given the density of the surrounding development, are likely to be within easy walking distance of their target users. These journeys would be less likely made by cycle as they would be more convenient on foot. Nonetheless, facilities for 20 cycle parking spaces would be provided, being 10 short of the London Plan requirement.
7. Given the nature of the proposed development and the demonstrable levels of cycle parking facility usage I conclude that the proposal would provide adequate parking facilities for cyclists. Therefore while there would be a conflict with the standards of the London Plan it would be minor under the circumstances, and the details provided would remain in accord with Policy IM4 of the Core Strategy and its requirement that development be designed for the needs of cyclists.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Walker

INSPECTOR