

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON MONDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 2014

DECISIONS ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Councillor Shiria Khatun declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in agenda item 6.1 Toynbee Hall, 28 Commercial Street, London, E1 6LS (PA/14/1577 and PA/14/1578). This was on the basis that the Councillor was an employee of the Toynbee Hall. The Councillor reported that she would leave the meeting room for the consideration of this item.

Councillor Asma Begum declared an interest in agenda item 6.1, Toynbee Hall, 28 Commercial Street, London, E1 6LS (PA/14/1577 and PA/14/1578). This was on the basis that she formerly lived in the area and a close relation was a former employee of Toynbee Hall.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 20th August 2014 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

3. 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

4. PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS AND MEETING GUIDANCE

The Committee noted the procedure for hearing objections and the meeting guidance.

5. DEFERRED ITEMS

5.1 113-115 Roman Road, London, E2 0QN (PA/14/00662)

On a vote of 0 in favour of the Officer recommendation to grant the planning permission, 4 against and 0 abstentions, the Officer recommendation to grant the planning permission was not accepted.

Councillor Asma Begum then moved the reasons for refusal set out in paragraph 5.2 of the Committee report seconded by Councillor Chris Chapman. On a vote of 4 in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions, these reasons were agreed and it was **RESOLVED**:

That Planning Permission (PA/14/00662) at 113-115 Roman Road, London, E2 0QN be **REFUSED** for the demolition of existing three storey 13 bedroom hotel and construction of a new four storey (including roof extension and basement) building dropping down to three and one storey at the rear to create a 31 bedroom hotel with no primary cooking on the premises for the reasons set out in 5.2 of the report as set out below:

- 1) Some effect on residential amenity would be acceptable in an inner city area such as this, provided that an acceptable level of privacy, visual outlook, daylight and amenity standards are maintained. This proposal given its height, bulk, mass and plot coverage of the whole development would have an overbearing effect on the visual outlook, sense of enclosure of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in particular 111 Roman Road, resulting in and unacceptable reduction in the quality of their living condition, contrary to adopted policy SP10 of the Core Strategy (2010) and policies DM24 and DM25 of the Managing Development Document (2013).
- 2) The demolition of the existing building and its replacement with a larger building, would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of Globe Road Conservation Area, by reasons of inappropriate and poor quality design, the appearance of the front elevation and the effect on the rhythm of plot frontages along Roman Road. In this respect the development fails to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Globe Road Conservation Area and buildings within it. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 7.8 (C and D) of the London Plan (2011), SP10 of the Core Strategy (2010), DM27 of the Managing Development Plan (2013) and the guidance given in paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

6.1 Toynbee Hall, 28 Commercial Street, London, E1 6LS (PA/14/1577 and PA/14/1578)

Update Report tabled.

Councillor Shiria Khatun left the meeting for the consideration of this item only.

On a vote of 5 in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission (PA/14/1577) at Toynbee Hall, 28 Commercial Street, London, E1 6LS be **GRANTED** for various works to the Toynbee Hall Estate including the following: internal alterations to the listed Toynbee Hall and removal / replacement of extensions to the rear and side, provision of a new five storey (with set back top floor and basement) office block at 36 Commercial Street, reconfiguration and re-landscaping of Mallon Gardens, two storey (with set back top floor) roof extension to Profumo House along with ground level infill extensions and change of use of existing HMO units to office space, partial demolition and rebuilding of the southern end of Attlee House

Subject to:

2. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations, conditions and informatives set out in the Committee report and the amendment in the update report regarding the restriction of permanent occupation of the flats within Toynbee Hall.

On a vote of 5 in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

3. That listed building consent (PA/14/1578) at Toynbee Hall, 28 Commercial Street, London, E1 6LS be **GRANTED** for various works to the Toynbee Hall Estate as set out above subject to the conditions set out in the Committee report

6.2 The Odyssey, Crews Street, London, E14 3ED (PA/14/01582)

Councillor Shah Alam left the meeting at this point.

Update Report tabled.

On a vote of 5 in favour, 1 against and 0 abstentions, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission (PA/14/01582) at the Odyssey, Crews Street, London, E14 3ED be **REFUSED** for the installation of freestanding electronically controlled vehicular and pedestrian entrance gates for the reasons set out in paragraph 3 of the Committee report as follows.

- a) The proposal would restrict full public access and inclusive access resulting in an unacceptable form of development that would fail to retain a permeable environment, by reason of creating a physical barrier and the loss of a legally secured publically accessible route to the riverfront which forms a part of the Blue Ribbon Network. This would be contrary to the general

principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), policies 7.2 and 7.27 of the London Plan (2011), policies SP04 and SP10 of the Core Strategy (2010), and policies DM12 and DM23 of the Managing Development Document (2013). These policies require development to protect and improve existing access points to the Blue Ribbon Network and increase opportunities for public access and use of water spaces.

b) The proposed gates and fixed means of enclosure by virtue of their height and scale would appear visually intrusive and result in an inappropriate form of development that would create a 'gated' community and would therefore fail to achieve an inclusive environment and create an unacceptable level of segregation. This would be contrary to the general principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), policies 3.9, 7.1-7.5 and 7.27 of the London Plan (2011), policies SP04, SP09, SP10 and SP12 of the Core Strategy (2010), and policies DM12 and DM23 of the Managing Development Document (2013). These policies require development to promote the principles of inclusive communities, improve permeability and ensure development is accessible and well connected.

c) The proposed security gate due to its location adjacent to the adopted highway would have an unacceptable impact on the capacity and safety of the adjacent 3 public highway. This would be contrary to the general principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), the London Plan (2011), policy SP09 of the Core Strategy (2010), and policy DM20 of the Managing Development Document (2013). These policies require that development does not have any adverse impact on the capacity and safety of the transport network.

d) The proposed security gate would introduce security measures at the site which are overbearing and would compromise the visual quality of the local environment and would be an unsightly addition to the public realm. This would be contrary to the general principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), the London Plan (2011), policy SP10 of the Core Strategy (2010), and policy DM24 of the Managing Development Document (2013). These policies seek to ensure that design is sensitive to and enhances the local character and setting of the development.

6.3 11 Havannah Street, London E14 8NA (PA/14/01807)

The item had been withdrawn from the agenda for procedural reasons.

7. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

7.1 Planning Enforcement Review 2013/14

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

That the enforcement report be noted.

**HEAD OF PAID SERVICE AND CORPORATE DIRECTOR –
COMMUNITIES, LOCALITIES AND CULTURE.**

(Please note that the wording in this document may not reflect the final wording used in the minutes.)