

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON TUESDAY, 10 JANUARY 2012**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE CRESCENT,  
LONDON, E14 2BG**

**Members Present:**

Councillor Helal Abbas (Chair)

Councillor Kosru Uddin

Councillor Craig Aston

Councillor Md. Maium Miah

Councillor Shiria Khatun (Vice-Chair)

**Other Councillors Present:**

Nil

**Officers Present:**

Richard Murrell	– (Deputy Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Jen Pepper	– (Affordable Housing Programme Manager, Development and Renewal)
Pete Smith	– (Development Control Manager, Development and Renewal)
Mary O'Shaughnessy	– (Planning Officer)
Fleur Brunton	– (Senior Lawyer - Planning Chief Executive's)
Alan Ingram	– (Democratic Services)

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were submitted on behalf of Councillors Marc Francis and Helal Uddin, who were attending a conflicting meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made.

**3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES**

Members commented that Councillors Abdul Asad and Alibor Choudhury and Mayor Lutfur Rahman had been present during the meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2010.

Referring to item 8.2 of the minutes (Land at Virginia Quay off Newport Avenue, London, E14), Mr Pete Smith, Development Control manager, reported that the application was due to be considered by the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation on 9<sup>th</sup> February 2012 and he would update Members at the appropriate time.

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That, subject to the addition of the names of Councillors Abdul Asad and Alibor Choudhury and Mayor Lutfur Rahman to the list of those present, the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14<sup>th</sup> December 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 Carriageway and Footway Opposite 70-74 Cadogan Terrace, E9 (PA/11/02440)**

At the request of the Chair, Mr Pete Smith, Development Control Manager, introduced the report concerning carriageway and footway opposite 70-74 Cadogan Terrace, London, E9. He added that the application had been put before the Committee due to objections received.

The Chair then invited registered speakers to address the meeting.

Mr Martin Tilling, a local resident, stated that he had lived in Cadogan Terrace for over 20 years. He was not against the use of cycles or the Cycle Scheme as such but many residents were opposing the application because it would result in a significant loss of local car parking. 10 homes would be affected and the number of car parking spaces would effectively be reduced from 13 to 4. A number of residents, including women, were shift workers and would accordingly experience parking problems near their homes at night. Residents could not park north of the site as this lay within L.B. Hackney and the use of Cadogan Close was not feasible. There would be road safety issues for people using the cycle scheme as Cadogan Terrace was a narrow, single carriageway with passing places and there would be problems with cyclists seeing and being seen by other traffic. He felt that there were other more logical sites for the cycle docks elsewhere, such as St Mark's Gate or Hackney Wick rail station. Cyclists in addition would be unable to gain access to Victoria Park and this would be easier from a site near Hackney Wick.

In response to queries from Members, Mr Tilling stated that nine car parking spaces, which were constantly in use, would be lost. There had been little consultation of residents on the matter.

Ms Laura Stritch, the applicant's Agent, stated that a total of 24 metres of parking space would be lost, which equated to 4 bays, although individual bays were not actually delineated. This was not considered significant in view of parking provision in the locality and would be mitigated by the benefits provided by the docking for alternative transport. The location of the cycle docks would not impede road users, pedestrians or cycle users themselves. The docking arrangements took the usual form that had been approved in numerous locations and it was felt that cyclists and other road users would apply commonsense in sharing road space. It was normal to find a reduction in accidents when additional cyclists were brought into road conditions and the TfL traffic audit in March 2010 had raised no risk issues. Other sites had been considered but Cadogan Terrace was felt to be the most suitable in the area and would contribute to the London-wide cycle scheme.

At the request of the Chair, Mr Richard Murrell, Deputy Planning Team Leader, made a detailed presentation of the application as contained in the circulated report. He added that about 140 such cycle docking points were being rolled out Borough-wide and he referred to public consultation measures that had been undertaken. Cadogan Terrace was a single track road with passing places, with a relatively low rate of traffic at low speeds. The design of the dock was considered good and of low impact to the Conservation Area. It was sited a short distance from Cadogan Gate into Victoria Park and also from Hackney Wick station to tie into the transport

network. Residents could park along both sides of Cadogan Terrace and the overall impact was acceptable and no worse than in other approved docking sites.

In response to queries from Members, Mr Murrell indicated that:

- The aim was to provide cycle docking points every 300-400m in the Borough and the design was considered appropriate for Victoria Park Conservation Area.
- Many cycle docking points backed onto carriageways but traffic speeds tended to be particularly low along Cadogan Terrace.

On a vote of 1 for and nil against (with 4 abstentions), on the Chair's casting vote, the Committee **RESOLVED**

- (1) That planning permission be **GRANTED** at the carriageway and footway opposite 70-74 Cadogan Terrace, E9 (PA/11/02440), for the installation of a Barclays Cycle Hire docking station, containing a maximum of 24 docking points for scheme cycles plus a terminal, subject to the conditions set out in the circulated report.
- (2) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated power to impose conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the matters listed in the circulated report and any other conditions considered necessary.

## 7.2 101-109 Fairfield Road, London (PA/11/00890)

At the request of the Chair, Mr Pete Smith, Development Control Manager, introduced the planning application concerning the vacant site at 101-109 Fairfield Road, London, as set out in the circulated report and **Tabled** update. He added that the scheme had been amended and, therefore, needed to be considered as a fresh application despite prior approval of a similar scheme.

At the request of the Chair, Mr Richard Murrell, Deputy Planning Team Leader, made a detailed presentation of the application, stating particularly that a previously proposed pedestrian link between Fairfield Road and Primrose Close had been removed in accordance with the wishes of Primrose Close residents and in line with a condition on the previous permission which required this to be designed out. At the close of his presentation, Mr Murrell responded to questions from Members, commenting that:

- Skills training as provided by the S106 agreement was usually directed to residents Borough-wide. Any other specific projects that required funding would have to come forward through a Project Implementation Document.
- The previous scheme had been amended to provide 49 (from 46) housing units, with one more affordable unit despite an overall 5% reduction in affordable habitable rooms. The slight increase in density under London Plan guidelines was not significant enough to affect the scheme.

- Children's playspace was to be a rooftop amenity garden secured by the S106 agreement, along with provision in space alongside the development. In addition, all the family units had quite generous rear gardens that could also generate playspace.

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

- (1) That planning permission be **GRANTED** at 101-109 Fairfield Road, London (PA/11/00890), for the erection of a six storey building to provide 49 residential units (26 x 1 bedroom, 12 x 2 bedroom, 7 x 3 bedroom, 4 x 4bedroom), together with the provision of cycle parking, bin stores and rooftop amenity space, subject to the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure planning obligations and to the planning conditions and informatives as set out in the circulated report and amended by the update report **Tabled** at the meeting.
- (2) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated power to negotiate the legal agreement indicated in resolution (1) above.
- (3) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated power to impose conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the matters listed in the circulated report.
- (4) That, if within one month of the date of this Committee the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated power to refuse planning permission.

## 8. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

### 8.1 Appeals Report

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

#### **RESOLVED**

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

The meeting ended at 7.50 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Helal Abbas  
Development Committee