

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 5 APRIL 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 Helal Uddin

Councillor Shiria Khatun (Vice-Chair)

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Peter Golds

Councillor Gloria Thienel

Officers Present:

Jerry Bell – (Applications Manager, Development and
Renewal)

Fleur Brunton – (Senior Lawyer - Planning Chief Executive's)

Pete Smith – (Development Control Manager, Development &
Renewal)

Alan Ingram – (Democratic Services)

COUNCILLOR HELAL ABBAS (CHAIR) – IN THE CHAIR

At the commencement of the meeting, the Chair indicated that there would be a brief adjournment before consideration of agenda item 8.1 to await the arrival of Councillor Shiria Khatun (Vice-Chair) who had been delayed by traffic conditions.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Md. Maium Miah and Councillor Marc Francis and for lateness from Councillor Shiria Khatun.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor	Item(s)	Type of interest	Reason
Helal Abbas	8.1	Personal	Had received emails concerning the application but had not made any response or commented and had not opened the emails.
Kosru Uddin	8.1	Personal	He was a Board member of London Thames Gateway Development Corporation.

3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 8th March 2012 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.

The Chair added that he had used his discretion to allow Councillor Peter Golds to address the meeting, although his request to do so had been out of time, in view of the large amount of public interest in the application and Councillor Golds' position as a Ward Member.

6. DEFERRED ITEMS

Nil Items.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

Nil Items.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7.05 p.m., as explained earlier, to allow for the arrival of Councillor Shiria Khatun (Vice-Chair). The meeting reconvened at 7.10 p.m., when Councillor Khatun arrived. At this point, Councillor Shiria Khatun confirmed that she had no declarations of interest to make.

8. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

8.1 Land at Virginia Quay off Newport Avenue, Newport Avenue, London, E14 (PA/11/01426)

Mr Pete Smith, Development Control Manager, introduced the circulated report and **Tabled** update regarding the application for planning permission for land at Virginia Quay off Newport Avenue, London, E14.

Mr Smith confirmed that the application had been heard by the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation (LTGDC) on 9th February 2012 with the Corporation's Officers recommending the application for approval. Members of the Board had resolved to defer the application so that officers could consider possible reasons for refusal and a further report on this basis be prepared. Mr Smith advised that following the meeting on 9th February 2012 the applicants had revised the application and provided further information in support. The amendments and information had been considered by Officers and Mr Smith recommended that the Committee resolve to ratify Officers' view that the reasons for objection formerly put forward should be amended to read as follows:

"1. The proposal constitutes over-development of the site by virtue of impacts associated with excessive density, these being loss of daylight and sunlight as well as increased overshadowing for existing residents and poor levels of public transport accessibility. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 3.4 and 3.5 of the London Plan (2011), SP10 of the Core Strategy Development Plan (2010), saved policy DEV2 of the Unitary Development Plan (1998) and policy DEV1 of the Interim Planning Guidance (2007).

2. The proposal provides an unacceptable amount of affordable housing. As such, the proposal does not accord with policies 3.8 and 3.12 of the London Plan (2011), saved policy HSG7 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan (1998), policies HSG2 and HSG3 of the Council's Interim Planning Guidance (2007) and policy SP0 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2010) which seek to ensure that new developments offer a range of housing choices."

Additional consultation had resulted in further objections from the public as detailed in the update report.

The Chair then invited registered speakers to address the meeting.

Mr Cliff Prior, speaking in objection to the application, stated that some 800 objections had been received from 80% of households in the area of the proposed development. It was unclear to local residents and Councillors as to why the scheme was again put forward for consideration. LTGDC had arranged another meeting to consider the matter in Easter week, without awaiting the Borough's further comments, and would not release details of legal advice sought by them. The application now contained further information regarding car parking but it was not helpful that concierge staff did not live on the estate. There would be severe problems as a disabled space was needed and all six proposed spaces were actually owned by another block. The PTAL score of 2 meant that the site was hard to access by public transport. The proposal was felt to be a piecemeal, infill development that would take away a prime and very important site from the Borough.

In response to queries from a Member, Mr Prior added that the applicants had put forward a parking pressure survey that was full of errors, especially relating to statements from concierges who had stated that there would be no problems although they were not actually residents on the estate.

Councillor Peter Golds, speaking in objection to the application, indicated that he was representing the overall number of residents of the estate and Jim Fitzpatrick, MP, who had supported the objection at all stages. Councillor Golds expressed the view that the application constituted garden-grabbing and would not add to the Borough or provide enough family housing. He felt that this was speculative land-grabbing aimed only at the developer being able to make money. There was currently an unobstructed view from East India DLR to the O2 but, if the application was granted, this would only be a view of a 12 storey block. It would not be possible to divert the DLR and buses could not give proper access to the site, resulting in people having to negotiate dangerous roadways. He concluded that the Committee should again raise objections to the proposals.

The Chair stated that there were no speakers registered in support of the application.

Mr Jerry Bell, Applications Manager, made a detailed presentation of the proposals and commented that the application was not for determination by the Committee but had been submitted so that Members could give a view on

the revised scheme. The revisions applied only to the internal layout of the building and the mix of the residential units and reasons for not supporting the application should be amended in the light of the latest report (as set out above in these minutes).

The Chair remarked that discussion when the application had been first considered demonstrated Members' strength of feeling.

Members then put questions relating to:

- Possible affordable rents.
- Inadequacy of daylight/sunlight levels.
- Possible additional public transport contributions for the improvement of buses.

Officers' responses included information that:

- The rent level for four bed units should be at or below the Pod research recommended level of £242 per week.
- There had been no physical changes to the building that would improve the daylight/sunlight position.
- It was not felt that there was any possibility of obtaining further contributions for bus improvements given the relatively limited amount of units proposed.

On a unanimous vote the Committee **RESOLVED**

(1) That the officers' views in objecting to the revised proposals for land at Virginia Quay, off Newport Avenue, London, E14, (PA/11/01426) be agreed for the reasons set out in the circulated report.

(2) That, if LTGDC are minded to approve the application, officers seek to secure an affordable rent level of £242 for the 4 bed affordable rent unit, as well as the conditions as set out in the circulated report.

9. APPEALS REPORT

Mr Pete Smith, Development Control Manager, introduced 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