

STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 13 JULY 2017

DECISIONS ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR FOR THE COMMITTEE FOR 2017/18

It was proposed by Councillor Asma Begum and seconded by Councillor Danny Hassell and **RESOLVED**

That Councillor David Edgar be elected Vice-Chair of the Strategic Development Committee for the Municipal Year 2017/2018.

2. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

No declarations of interests were made.

Councillor Marc Francis declared a personal interest in agenda item 6.1 82 West India Dock Road, E14 8DJ and land to the east (including West India Dock Road) and bounded by the DLR line to the south, part of the Pennyfields to the east and part of Birchfield Street to the north (PA/16/01920). This was on the basis that he was a Member of the Committee that considered an application for this site and resolved to defer it on 2nd February 2010. He also pointed out he was not present at the 16th March 2010 meeting where the Committee reached a final decision on the application

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S) - TO FOLLOW

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 28 June 2017 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. 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, Place 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, Place 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

5. DEFERRED ITEMS

None

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

6.1 82 West India Dock Road, E14 8DJ and land to the east (including West India Dock Road) and bounded by the DLR line to the south, part of the Pennyfields to the east and part of Birchfield Street to the north (PA/16/01920)

Update report tabled.

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

That Subject to any direction by the Mayor of London planning permission be **REFUSED** at 82 West India Dock Road, E14 8DJ and land to the east (including West India Dock Road) and bounded by the DLR line to the south, part of the Pennyfields to the east and part of Birchfield Street to the north for the erection of a part 18, part 37 storey building comprising 20,079 m². (GIA) of residential floorspace (Class C3) (202 residential units comprising 69 x 1 bed, 100 x 2 bed and 27 x 3 bed and 6 x 4 bed), 11,597 m². (GIA) of hotel floorspace (Class C1) consisting of 320 hotel rooms with ancillary bar and restaurant area, 89 m². (GIA) of flexible retail and community floorspace (Class A1, A2, A3, D1 and D2), 1,729 sq. m. (GIA) of ancillary floorspace comprising associated plant, servicing areas, cycle parking and refuse stores, demolition and replacement of the existing Westferry DLR staircase, creation of a new 'left turn only' vehicular access from West India Dock Road, hard and soft landscape improvements to the adjacent areas of highway and public realm and other associated works. (PA/16/01920) for the following reasons as set out in the Committee report: (excluding the recommended refusal reason on 'Amenity Space' following changes to the application)

Site design principles

1. The proposal amounts to overdevelopment that seeks to maximise not optimise the development potential of the site. There would be conflict with London Plan 2016 Policy 3.4 '*Optimising housing potential*' (including Table 3.2 - '*Sustainable residential quality density matrix*'), Policy 3.5 '*Quality and design of housing developments*,' Policy 3.6 '*Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities*,' Policy 7.6 '*Architecture*', Tower Hamlets Core Strategy 2010 Policy SP02 '*Urban living for everyone*,' Tower Hamlets Managing Development Document 2013 Policy DM4 '*Housing standards and amenity space*' and the Mayor's '*Housing*' Supplementary Planning Guidance 2016. This is explained further in the reasons below.

Urban design and heritage assets

2. Planning permissions for the redevelopment of 82 West India Dock Road in 2007 and 2010 determined that a tall building would be appropriate to mark Westferry DLR station. The building now proposed is very different in terms of height, mass and resultant impact. The proposed height, mass and scale would be excessive relative to local character. There would be a failure to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of three surrounding conservation areas and adverse impact on the setting of buildings of architectural or historic interest causing either substantial or less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets. There is particular concern about impact on the Grade 1 Warehouse at West India Dock, the group of Grade II buildings at Limekiln Dock and the Grade 1 St. Anne's Church together with their associated conservation areas.

The proposed development consequently conflicts with planning policy at national, regional and local levels. The scheme would not be consistent with NPPF Chapter 7 *'Requiring good design'* paragraphs 58 and 59, Chapter 12 *'Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment,'* London Plan Policy 7.4 *'Local character'*, Policy 7.7 *'Location and design of tall and large buildings'*, Policy 7.8 *'Heritage assets and archaeology'*, Tower Hamlets Core Strategy Policy SP10 *'Creating distinct and durable places'* and the Managing Development Document Policy DM24 *'Place sensitive design,'* Policy DM26 *'Building heights'* and Policy DM27 *'Heritage and the historic environment.'* Whilst the proposal would result in public benefits by bringing a long vacant site back to beneficial use, by the provision of new housing including affordable homes and employment within the hotel; it is not considered these would outweigh the harm that would be caused and such public benefits could be achieved by an alternative scheme paying regard to its context and not causing such demonstrable harm.

Impact on the surroundings

3. The development would unacceptably impact on the amount of daylight and sunlight that would be received by surrounding properties, with a commensurate increased sense of enclosure, significantly breaching 7 guidance in the Building Research Establishment's publication *'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight a guide to good practice'* 2011. There is particular concern about impacts on Cayman Court and Compass Point, Salter Street. The extent and severity of the impacts are such that the development would cause significant harm to the amenity of nearby occupiers and be inconsistent with the London Plan 2016 Policy 7.6 *'Architecture'*, Tower Hamlets Core Strategy 2010 Policy SP10 *'Creating Distinct and durable places'* and the Managing Development Document 2013 Policy DM25 *'Amenity.'* The impacts indicate that the proposed density, height, massing and layout of the scheme are inappropriate and significantly outweigh the potential public benefits of the scheme.

Microclimate

4. It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposed development would result in satisfactory microclimate conditions within the development,

within the surrounding public realm and for users of the Docklands Light Railway. This conflicts with London Plan 2016 Policy 7.7 '*Tall and large scale buildings*, the Mayor's Sustainable Design and Construction SPG 2014, Tower Hamlets Core Strategy 2010 Policy SP10 '*Creating distinct and durable places*' and Tower Hamlets Managing Development Document 2013 Policy DM24 '*Place sensitive design*' and Policy DM26 '*Building heights.*'

WILL TUCKLEY, CHIEF EXECUTIVE

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