

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS****MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE****HELD AT 5.30 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 24 AUGUST 2011****COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE CRESCENT,  
LONDON, E14 2BG****Members Present:**

Councillor Helal Abbas (Chair)

Councillor Kosru Uddin  
Councillor Marc FrancisCouncillor Peter Golds  
Councillor Ann Jackson**Other Councillors Present:**

Councillor Rania Khan

**Officers Present:**

Pete Smith	– (Development Control Manager, Development and Renewal)
Ila Robertson	– (Applications Manager Development and Renewal)
Beth Eite	– (Planning Officer Development and Renewal)
Fleur Brunton	– (Senior Lawyer - Planning Chief Executive's)
Zoe Folley	– (Committee Officer, Democratic Services Chief Executive's)

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Shiria Khatun, Craig Aston for whom Councillor Peter Golds was deputising and Councillor Helal Uddin for whom Councillor Ann Jackson was deputising.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Item(s)</b>	<b>Type of interest</b>	<b>Reason</b>
Peter Golds	7.1	Personal	Ward Member. Knew objectors

	7.3	Personal	<p>speaking however they had not approached him.</p> <p>Attended a meeting of the Association of Island Community where a presentation on the project was given. However left the meeting during the consideration of the item.</p> <p>Knew objectors speaking however they had not approached him</p>
--	-----	----------	--

### 3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2011 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### 4. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee **RESOLVED** that:

- 1) In the event of changes being made to recommendations by the Committee, the task of formalising the wording of those changes is delegated to the Corporate Director, Development and Renewal along the broad lines indicated at the meeting; and
- 2) In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/informatives/planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Corporate Director, Development and Renewal is delegated authority to do so, provided always that the Corporate Director does not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision.

### 5. PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS

The Committee noted the procedure for hearing objections, together with details of persons who had registered to speak at the meeting.

## **6. DEFERRED ITEMS**

Nil Items.

## **7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION**

### **7.1 The Watermans Arms Public House, 1 Glenaffric Avenue, London, (PA/11/00998)**

Pete Smith, (Development Control Manager) introduced the report and tabled update report concerning the Watermans Arms Public House, 1 Glenaffric Avenue, London.

The Chair then invited registered speakers to address the meeting.

Sandra Island spoke in objection to the application. The application breached policy on many counts. Residents were pleased at the recommendation to refuse. The scheme with its 24 hour opening times was totally unsuitable in this quiet residential area. There would be late night noise nuisance disturbing residents peace. For example there would be people smoking and drinking alcohol from cans late at night outside and dumped rubbish. The bar doors would be open. This was a safe area but not any more due to this. The boundaries of the premises lead directly onto a narrow strip of pavement adjacent to private housing. Therefore, there would be overcrowding and inadequate living space. The fire escape plans were poor and the waste storage facilities inadequate. The site wasn't in a designated town centre area. The application should be refused in accordance with the Officer's report.

Ben Stackhouse spoke in support of the application. Steps had been taken to engage with residents to address the contentious issues. The Applicant had also requested a noise statement from the Council to prove no complaints about noise had been made since they took over the premises a year ago. They did apply for a certificate of lawful development and had gone through the proper channels in consultation with the Council. A number of the customers lived close by and they had not made any complaints. Many purchased coffee from the premises rather than alcohol. The capacity on opening was 60 bed spaces and this would be increased to 83 under the application. This was the maximum that could be provided. Mr Stackhouse praised the quality of the accommodation. It compared favourable to similar establishments as demonstrated by customer feedback and tourist guides. A further selling point was its close proximity to Greenwich. It attracted many customers, over 6,000 to date, with no complaints.

Ila Robertson (Planning Applications Manager) made a detailed presentation of the report and update. She explained the location, residential in nature and the views from the surrounding area. The application was subject to a public consultation generating 6 objecting letters and a petition with 40 signatures.

There was also representations in support. Ms Robertson explained the recommendation to refuse. The scheme contradicted policy, would have an unacceptable impact on amenity and would result in overdevelopment given the number of bedspaces. The refuse storage plans were also not acceptable.

In response, the Committee sympathised with the concerns. In particular the objections regarding fire safety given the age of the building and the number of guests. Members noted the process for dealing with fire issues, dealt with by Building Control and Fire Services.

On a unanimous vote the Committee **RESOLVED**

That planning permission be **REFUSED** for change of use of the upper 1st and 2nd floors of The Watermans Arms from ancillary public house accommodation (Use Class A4) to a backpackers' hostel accommodation (Sui Generis), comprising 8no. dormitories with a total of 83no beds for the reasons set out in the circulated report.

## **7.2 Brimsdown House, Stanstead House, Newmill House and Stanborough House, Devas Street, London, E3 3LW (PA/11/01110)**

Pete Smith, (Development Control Manager) introduced the report and tabled update report concerning Brimsdown House, Stanstead House, Newmill House and Stanborough House, Devas Street.

The Chair then invited registered speakers to address the meeting.

Councillor Rania Khan spoke in objection to the proposal. Whilst supporting the idea in principle, she had serious concerns about the operation of this system. Many of the residents of the flats opposed the scheme. 90/150 had signed the petition against. Many were also excluded from the survey. The staff on the ground believed it would not work. Whilst they had held discussions with the elderly who may find using the system difficult, the Applicant had not come up with anything to help them especially during the bad weather. There were no lifts so disabled persons cannot use this system. Other blocs in Coventry Cross have conventional systems. This worked well so why change. There would also be a loss of parking and green space.

In reply to questions, Councillor Khan reiterated her concerns. The plans lacked an appropriate strategy for assisting vulnerable residents in using the system. The distance they would have to travel would be too great.

Mr Enamul Goni spoke in support of the application as the agent. He referred to the successful operation of similar schemes on other estates welcomed by residents. The benefits were numerous. All waste would be stored underground creating a cleaner, more hygienic environment and less problems with rodents. The bins would be well maintained and cleaned frequently. The plans included a support service to assist vulnerable people not able to reach the bins. He noted the challenges but believed that residents would appreciate the benefits in the long term.

Mr Goni then answered questions from the Committee. He stressed that the Applicant would consult residents to ascertain those in need of help in using the system. Details of the support services were included in the application, prepared following discussions with residents. It was intended that the residents would be sent letters detailing the support available. Poplar HARCA also had an Anti Social Behaviour team to deal with dumped rubbish which would be classified as such behaviour. There would also be a robust cleaning service in place with regular maintenance checks.

Beth Eite (Planning Officer) made a detailed presentation of the report and update. She explained the proposals showing photographs of the proposed underground refuse system (URS). The application was subject to public consultation generating responses in support and against. The main issues were the carrying distances to the URS's, loss of car parking, pedestrian and highway safety and amenity. The scheme was considered acceptable on all these ground. It should also facilitate recycling and reduce the level of visible waste.

Accordingly, given the benefits and the success of similar systems, the application was recommended for approval.

In reply to Members, Ms Eite referred to the previous application withdrawn due to objections. A key difference now was the provision of the support service for vulnerable residents. The Committee were keen to ensure that details of this service were submitted for approval in writing and that this be drawn out as a specific condition. Accordingly Councillor Marc Francis moved an amendment to the conditions seconded by Councillor Ann Jackson requiring that details of the plans for assisting vulnerable residents be submitted for approval. On a unanimous vote this was **Agreed**.

Support was also expressed for a usage plan to ensure refuse were properly discarded and to facilitate recycling. It was anticipated that the Applicant would take steps to ensure this. Accordingly Councillor Jackson moved a further amended seconded by Councillor Marc Francis regarding the completion of a correct usage plan. On a unanimous vote this was **Agreed**.

On a unanimous vote the Committee **RESOLVED**

1. That planning permission be **GRANTED** to remove and de-commission the existing refuse chutes that exist within the four blocks and provide URS's (Underground Refuse Systems) to be installed in their place subject to the conditions set out in the circulated report.
2. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to impose conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the matters set out in the circulated report and the additional condition in the update Tabled requiring that:

Details of the method for cleaning and disinfecting the URS's to be submitted

3. That the following conditions be imposed requiring that:
  - That the policy for assisting vulnerable residents be submitted for approval.
  - Submission of a correct usage plan to ensure the proper disposal of waste and recycling.

### **7.3 Former St. Luke's House and Church, 36 Strafford Street, London E14 PA/11/00475**

Pete Smith, (Development Control Manager) introduced the report concerning Former St. Luke's House and Church, 36 Strafford Street.

The Chair then invited registered speakers to address the meeting.

Peter Brouwer spoke in objection to the application as a local resident. He considered that there was a lack of consultation with residents. The consultation was carried out during the holiday period when many people were away. Also some could not access the internet. The drawings on the website were not clear and did not fully show the proposals. The previous scheme was bitterly opposed by residents. The building was incomplete with critical elements missing. It was still unclear how this would be addressed. There would be a loss of sunlight affecting the adjacent properties due to the large wall. There would be noise and parking issues. The latter could not effectively be managed during the weekend. The size and bulk was also inappropriate. There would also be construction inconvenience.

Councillor Zara Davis also spoke in objection. Whilst many residents supported the scheme in principle, this application had generated opposition due to its size and scale. A key concern was the impact on Strafford Friendship Club in terms of loss of light and overlooking. As a result use of the club would decrease. The club was a valuable community facility and should be protected. The scheme was also too large for the site and would be overbearing given it would be right on the boundary. She urged that a compromise be sought.

Brendon Phelan spoke in favour as the applicant's agent. The Applicant had held meetings with the interested parties and had consulted the objectors, sending them the drawings of the scheme. He explained the improvements on the previous scheme including the reduction in height, provision of 7 housing units and boundary changes. The concerns had been overcome. He provided reassurances regarding day light levels which complied with policy. He explained the noise reduction steps. In reply to Members he explained the change to provide 7 residential units.

Reverent Tom Pyke also spoke in support. He referred to the Church's promises to the community to provide leadership, valuable community and religious facilities for all. The proposals would enable this and the Church to

operate in an efficient way. It had worked hard to consult the residents locally. The scheme was supported locally and nationally by key figures in the church and business and held up by such representatives as an example of good practice.

Ila Robertson (Planning Applications Manager) made a detailed presentation of the report and update. She addressed the remarks about the 2008 approved scheme. Whilst this was relevant, the Committee must consider this scheme on its own merits. She explained the differences in the two schemes in terms of size, residential provision, car parking, storage and size of community space. The application was subject to public consultation which exceeded the statutory requirements as reflected by the scale of responses. She addressed the main issues as set out in the circulated report. Overall it was a high quality scheme offering multi faith facilities for all. The application should be granted.

Members then debated the application. Remarks were made about the quality of the design and the operation of the car free agreement. Assurances were also sought about the impact on Trafford Friendship Club and 46 Trafford Street. In reply Ms Robertson explained the design measures included in the scheme to prevent overlooking and to protect the amenity of these properties. It was reported that these design measures would prevent any significant adverse impacts on these properties.

On a vote of 4 in favour and 1 against the Committee **RESOLVED**

1. That planning permission be **GRANTED** for the demolition of existing Church and Community Hall and erection of a new 3/4 storey building consisting of a church and Community Hall on first floor together with a training/meeting room on the ground floor with associated facilities; provision of 1 x 2 bed maisonette on the ground and first floors for parsonage use together with associated office; creation of seven residential units (1 x 2 bed maisonette (ground and first floors), 1 x 1 bed, 3 x 2 bed and 2 x 3 bed) for private housing. The existing war memorial will be carefully removed, refurbished and incorporated into the new building. Installation of a church spire at roof level together with the creation of brown roofs.
2. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to impose conditions [and informatives] on the planning permission to secure the matters set out in the circulated report.
3. Any other informative(s) considered necessary by the Corporate Director Development & Renewal.

## **8. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS**

### **8.1 Planning Appeals Report**

Mr Pete Smith, Development Control Manager, presented the report. The report provided details of appeals, decisions and new appeals lodged against the Authority's Planning decisions.

On a unanimous vote, the Committee **RESOLVED**

**RESOLVED**

That that details and outcomes of the appeals as set out in the report be noted.

The meeting ended at 7.10 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Helal Abbas  
Development Committee