

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2012

Members Present:

Councillor Helal Abbas (Chair)

Councillor Shiria Khatun (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Kosru Uddin

Councillor Md. Maium Miah

Councillor Peter Golds

Other Councillors Present:

Officers Present:

Jerry Bell	– (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Fleur Brunton	– (Senior Lawyer - Planning Chief Executive's)
Benson Olaseni	– (Deputy Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Mandip Dhillon	– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Zoe Folley	– (Committee Officer, Democratic Services Chief Executive's)
	–

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Anwar Khan and Craig Aston for whom Councillor Peter Golds was deputising.

2. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made.

3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 22nd August 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.

6. DEFERRED ITEMS

Nil Items.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

7.1 12 Hanbury Street, London (PA/11/01488) - Withdrawn

It was noted that the application had been withdrawn from the agenda due to issues with the Certificates of Ownership.

The application would be reported to a subsequent Development Committee meeting once the issues had been addressed.

7.2 Site at the South West Junction of Glenworth Avenue and Saunders Ness Road, Glenworth Avenue, London (PA/12/01646)

Update Report Tabled.

Jerry Bell (Applications Manager) introduced the proposal regarding Site at the South West Junction of Glenworth Avenue and Saunders Ness Road, Glenworth Avenue, London (PA/12/01646). Mandip Dhillon (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report with a power point presentation. Ms Dhillon

explained the site location and the proximity of the nearby conservation area, St Lukes School, St Johns Church listed building and the local Police Station. She explained the current conditions of the site and the unlisted status of the lighthouse. The Council's Conservation team were satisfied with the plans and the demolition. She detailed the plans to relocate the Memorial plaque to a suitable alternative location and to replace the Rowan tree. The height and design mirrored the surrounding area. Each of the units would have private amenity space. The scheme was car and permit free. Overall, it would deliver much needed housing on a Brownfield site without any adverse amenity impact so should be granted permission subject to conditions.

Questions were raised about the relocation of the memorial plaque and tree. Members were keen to ensure that they were adequately relocated and to identify the new location in the plans. Members also questioned: the impact of the car free plans given they were family units; the policy support for this; the heritage value of the lighthouse; the measures to prevent the contamination of the neighbouring site from Japanese Knotweed and the history of the site as a burial site.

In response, Officers confirmed the plans to relocate the memorial site to Saunders Ness Road (at the front near number one). The tree would be located near by it. The Council's permit transfer scheme only applied to social rented units not private units as proposed in this scheme. Officers and the Conservation area team were satisfied with the scheme. The team considered that the lighthouse was a modern structure, a view also supported by an expert local historian.

The applicant would be encouraged to work with the adjacent site owner to clear any Japanese Knotweed. However, the Council could not enforce this as part of this application as it fell outside its boundary. There was a conditions to address the issue on site.

Officers had carefully investigated the issue of the burial/ interment of ashes on site, but there was no record of this in the funeral books as detailed in the update report. Furthermore, there was an informative covering the discovery of any remains on site. This required the applicant to obtain a burial license from the Minster of Justice should any be discovered.

On a unanimous vote, the Committee RESOLVED:

1. That planning permission (PA/12/01646) at Site at the South West Junction of Glenworth Avenue and Saunders Ness Road, Glenworth Avenue, London be GRANTED for the erection of eight x three storey houses each containing three bedrooms inclusive of external amenity space and cycle parking subject to the following:
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 report.

7.3 313 Cambridge Heath Road, London E2 9LQ (PA/12/00623 and PA/12/00624)

Jerry Bell (Applications Manager) introduced the proposal regarding 313 Cambridge Heath Road, London E2 9LQ (PA/12/00623 and PA/12/00624)

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Tom Ridge speaking in opposition stated that had looked at the case file. According to this, 26 people not just the 21 recorded in the report had objected to the scheme along with the petition against with 12 signatures. He disputed that the criteria in policy for demolishing buildings in the conservation area had been properly applied. Particularly:

- The adequacy of the efforts to the maintain the building in use (point 4) - There was no mention of this in the report. The upper floor had already been adjusted as a hotel so this could be easily done. But this had not been fully explored;
- The suitability of any proposed replacement building (point 5) - This was a very standard design that conflicted with the historic buildings.

The proposal would dominate the historic gardens and spoil the setting of the Museum of Childhood. The latter would no longer be the tallest building in the area. It would ruin the cluster of protected buildings and gardens that formed a harmonious square. It would spoil the balance of the area. In response to Members questions, he stated that he was unaware of any consultation done by the applicant, other than the standard consultation carried out by the Council.

Mark Hogdson spoke in support of the application. The applicant had been working with Officers for over a year on the scheme. The plans sought to replace an out of date building with a new hotel that respected the area. The applicant had carried out a detailed heritage assessment and had tested the height and massing of the scheme given the sensitive nature of the area. The Conservation area experts were satisfied with the proposal and English Heritage had not raised any concerns. Officers considered that a five storey scheme in the area was acceptable. The plans would provide 27 new jobs, increase tourism with a commitment to use local firms. The design consisted of two elements— a dark brick section with a leaf detailed northern element to match the trees and Museum of Childhood. It would make a positive contribution to the heritage assets and the landscape.

In reply to Members, Mr Hogdson reported that the Applicant had spoken to the ward Councillors, but had not directly contacted residents themselves. However, the residents were consulted by the Council. He emphasised the purpose of the 'leaf design'- to fit in with that part of the site and also compensate for any loss of greenery. It was required that details of the design be submitted for approval. Such work would be undertaken by a design specialist.

Benson Olaseni (Planning Officer) presented the report with a power point presentation. He explained in detail the proposal, the site location and surrounding area and the proximity with the surrounding protected buildings including the Museum of Childhood. He explained the outcome of the consultation, the objections raised and the material considerations. In terms of land use, the proposal was considered acceptable given the site was not designated, was unsuitable for employment uses, the good transport links and the policy support for a hotel in this area. The Conservation team had raised no objections to the demolition given the lack of historic value of the existing building. The design and materials respected the area with the mix of traditional and contemporary brick work. It protected amenity with mitigation to restrict the hours of operation. The scheme was car free and there were no plans for onsite coach parking as the development would use the existing on street bays. Highways had raised no objections.

In response, Members expressed concern at the northern part of the proposed building. It was felt that the contemporary design, especially at the upper parts, was out of keeping with the conservation area and the more traditional museum of childhood. The design for this section was too overpowering. Whilst they were satisfied with the scheme as a whole and the scale and bulk, it was felt that this aspect of the scheme should be reviewed to find a design more in keeping with the area.

In response, Officers considered that the design fitted in well with the area. The aim of the design was to blend in with the buildings and respect the greenery. The relevant Council experts had considered this design and felt that it was appropriate.

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

That planning permission (PA/12/00623 and PA/12/00624) at 313 Cambridge Heath Road, London E2 9LQ be **DEFERRED**

It was agreed that the application be deferred to allow Officers to discuss further with the Applicant the appearance of the northern part of the site to address Members concerns over its contemporary design and to bring a revised application back to a future meeting.

(The Members that voted on this item were Councillors Helal Abbas, Shiria Khatun, Kosru Uddin, Md. Maium Miah and Peter Golds)

8. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

8.1 Raines Foundation Upper School, Approach Roach, London E2 9LY (PA/12/02022)

Update Report Tabled.

Jerry Bell (Applications Manager) introduced the proposal regarding Raines Foundation Upper School, Approach Roach, London E2 9LY (PA/12/02022). Mandip Dhillon (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report.

It was noted that the Council could not determine applications for listed building consent for its own buildings.

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

That the application (PA/12/02022) Raines Foundation Upper School, Approach Roach, London E2 9LY for internal alteration works, including forming of new doors, widening of existing doors, mechanical & electrical installation and associated work be referred to the Government Office for West Midlands with the recommendation that the Council would be minded to grant Listed Building Consent subject to conditions set out in the report.

8.2 Appeals Report

On a unanimous vote the Committee **RESOLVED**

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

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

(a) Park Poplar Business Park, 10 Prestons Road, London E14 9RL (PA/11/03375)

It was reported that the appeal against the decision by the Council to refuse would be dealt with by a public inquiry. The hearing would take place between Tuesday 4th and Friday the 7th December 2012, in the Town Hall Council Chamber.

(b) Land at Commercial Road, Basin Approach, London (PA/12/00925)

At its last meeting in August, the Committee resolved to defer the application to allow the applicant to consider the reduction in height of the six storey element of the development. This was primarily to retain views to St Dunstan's Church located in Stepney from the Hydraulic Tower and to understand whether this would improve Daylight conditions to the proposed residential units.

It is expected that Officer's will present the deferred report at the October Development Committee.

However, prior to that meeting, Members were encouraged to visit the tower to understand the different views that exist. The Tower is open to the general public on Saturday 22nd September 2012 at 1pm-5pm & on Sunday 23rd September 2012 at 1pm-5pm.

For member's who are unable to visit the Tower on these dates please contact Nasser Farooq on Nasser.farooq@towerhamlets.gov.uk by Tuesday 25th September 2012 and access arrangements will be made.

The meeting ended at 8.00 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Helal Abbas
Development Committee