

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON TUESDAY, 29 NOVEMBER 2016**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, 1ST FLOOR, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE  
CRESCENT, LONDON, E14 2BG**

**Members Present:**

Councillor Marc Francis (Chair)  
Councillor Danny Hassell (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Asma Begum  
Councillor Denise Jones  
Councillor Md. Maium Miah  
Councillor Gulam Robbani  
Councillor Helal Uddin  
Councillor Julia Dockerill

**Other Councillors Present:**

Councillor Andrew Wood

**Apologies:**

None

**Officers Present:**

Paul Buckenham	(Development Control Manager, Development and Renewal)
Fleur Francis	(Team Leader - Planning, Directorate, Law Probity and Governance)
Nasser Farooq	(Team Leader, Planning Services, Development and Renewal)
Zoe Folley	(Committee Officer, Directorate Law, Probity and Governance)

**1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

Councillor Denise Jones declared a personal interest in agenda item 5.2 Former Castle Wharf Esso Petrol Station, Leamouth Road, London, E14 0JG (PA/16/01763/A1). This was on the basis that she was a Trustee of the Trinity Buoy Wharf Trust and an LBTH appointed Member of the Lee Valley Park Regional Authority.

## **2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)**

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 20 October 2016 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## **3. RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS AND MEETING GUIDANCE**

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
- 3) To note the procedure for hearing objections at meetings of the Development Committee and the meeting guidance.

## **4. DEFERRED ITEMS**

None.

## **5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION**

### **5.1 30 Marsh Wall, E14 9TP (PA/16/00477)**

Application withdrawn from the agenda by the applicant.

### **5.2 Former Castle Wharf Esso Petrol Station, Leamouth Road, London, E14 0JG (PA/16/01763/A1)**

Update report tabled.

Paul Buckenham (Development Control Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the application for the redevelopment of the former Service Station site with a residential-led mixed use development, and associated works.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Councillor Andrew Wood expressed concern about the density of the application and the impact that the proposal and the other new developments in the area would have on the local infrastructure (schools, hospitals, play facilities) which there was a lack of. In response to questions from the Committee, he expressed concern about pedestrian safety given the proximity of the development to major roads. As a result, the children from the development would have to cross busy roads when leaving and entering the development. The redevelopment of the depot site would only worsen the problems. He also expressed concerns about air pollution in the area, the quality of the terrace play space and the developers consultation exercise given that meetings were held in remote locations. He considered that the plans showed symptoms of overdevelopment, did not satisfy the 'special circumstances' criteria in policy for high density developments. He also considered that if granted one of the units should be allocated as a health surgery.

Neeraj Dixit (Applicant's representative) spoke in support of the application summarising the nature of the consultation process. The application had been significantly amended following discussions with the GLA and LBTH Officers and would deliver a significant number of benefits. There would be a policy compliant level of affordable housing and child play space. The site had good and improving transport links. In response to questions, he reported that the site had a good PTAL rating of 4. Furthermore, the new pedestrian bridge (to be delivered as part of the London City Island (Leamouth North) development) would facilitate access to Canning Town station. This would be just one means of reaching the site. In response to questions about the quality of the play facilities and the social housing, he considered that the community space could be converted to a nursery, and that the plans had been carefully designed to shelter the site including the child play space from the surrounding environment. The social units were of a high quality and there would be a maximum of eight units per core. In relation to air quality, he considered that the proposed change of use should reduce the traffic at the site. In response to further questions, he commented on the quality of the design, the safety of the route over the bridge to Canning Town station, the accommodation, the amenity space, and the merits of the layout.

Nasser Farooq (Planning Services, Development and Renewal) gave a presentation on the application describing the site location and the surrounding area including the location of nearby residential developments. He also described the local transport connections, the routes to local amenities, and the measures to improve these links. In terms of the planning considerations, the land use complied with the policy. The height and materials related well to the surrounding buildings. Whilst the density of the scheme exceeded the London Plan density matrix, it did not display any of the amenity impacts typically associated with high density developments given the generous separation distances to nearby buildings. Concerns had been raised about the proximity of the site to the nearby Council depot. However, Officers did not consider that this would compromise the use of that site and

there would be mitigation to minimise any disturbance from the depot site. The child play space provision had been increased to meet the GLA standards, and the communal amenity space exceeded the policy requirements. The scheme would provide 35.4% affordable dwellings per habitable room. The Committee were also advised of the highway issues and the CIL contribution as amended in the update report.

Officers were recommending that the planning application was granted permission.

In response, Members asked questions about the suitability of the site for a high density development, with a large number of affordable family housing given the proximity of the site to busy roads. In view of this, it was considered that the plans may put at risk the safety of the occupants in crossing the highway and that the occupants may also experience noise disturbance from the highway. Members also asked questions about the pedestrian and transport links to the surrounding area given the distance between the site and surrounding amenities. Given these issues some Members felt that the development was too dense for such a confined area and that the site 'lacked a sense of place'. Members also commented on the differences between the proposed development and other developments in the surrounding area.

Questions were also asked about the quality of the child play space, the riverside walkway near the site and the new Canning Town bridge in view of public safety concerns in respect of the walkways.

The Committee also asked about the impact of the application on local infrastructure, the capacity of current services and whether there were any plans to expand the capacity of schools and health services in the area

In response, Officers explained that it was not uncommon for developments to come forward in similar environments such as near busy roundabouts and highways and there were many examples of such developments. Furthermore, the scheme had been carefully designed to mitigate any impact from the surrounding area and to create a barrier to the Leamouth Road and roundabout. There would also be appropriate noise mitigation. In addition, it was planned that the taller elements of the development would be located as far as possible away from the roundabout. A full noise assessment had been carried out to ensure compliance with the relevant standards.

It was also noted that the site was in walking distance to the DLR station, bus routes and pedestrian crossings along the highway. Steps were being taken to improve the connectivity of the area and to complete the bridge link from Leamouth North and the Canning Town Interchange. Details of which were noted. It was considered that the plans would have no adverse impact on surrounding buildings given the separation distances and there were no townscape issues as highlighted in the presentation.

In relation to the impact on the infrastructure, the mechanism for addressing this was through the Community Infrastructure Levy contribution which was

set out in the report. This would be carried out under a separate process. There was no planning requirement to provide a school on this site but other sites did include such a requirement. Furthermore, if approved, the child yield from the development would be factored into the growth models in respect of school places. Officers gave an overview of the capacity of the nearby schools and the location of a nearby medical centre.

Officers also responded to questions about the quality of the child play space, particularly the 17<sup>th</sup> level play space and the contributions for employment.

Councillor Denise Jones proposed and Councillor Marc Francis seconded that the consideration of the application be deferred for a site visit. On a vote of 4 in favour 2 against and 2 abstentions, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That the application for planning permission at Former Castle Wharf Esso Petrol Station, Leamouth Road, London, E14 0JG for the redevelopment of the former Service Station site with a residential-led mixed use development, and associated works be **DEFERRED** for a Committee Site visit.

The Committee also asked to receive further information about:

- Primary school and health care provision in the area
- Developments with child play space on the 17<sup>th</sup> floor.

The meeting ended at 8.35 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Marc Francis  
Strategic Development Committee