

STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 5.30 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 9 MAY 2019

DECISIONS ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interests

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

That the minutes of the meeting of the Strategic Development Committee held on 28 March 2019 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, 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.

4. DEFERRED ITEMS

There were no items.

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

5.1 Poplar Gas Works, Leven Road, London

Update report tabled.

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

1. That subject to any direction by the London Mayor, conditional Planning permission is **GRANTED** at the Poplar Gas Works, Leven Road, London for a hybrid planning application (part outline/part full) for a comprehensive mixed used development, subject to:
2. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the report.
3. That the Corporate Director of Place is delegated the power to negotiate the legal agreement. If within three months of the resolution the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director for Place is delegated power to refuse planning permission.
4. That the Corporate Director of Place is delegated the power to impose conditions and informatives to address the matters set out in the Committee report including the following:
 - the indicative wording set out in paragraph 2.2 of the update report in respect of the planning condition no 32 listed in paragraph 8.6 of the Committee report
 - In relation to the local connectivity study, a more detailed condition regarding the need to submit a detailed transport study prior to the submission of the reserved matters for phase 2 stage of the application.

5.2 255-279 Cambridge Heath Road, London, E2 0EL

Update report tabled.

Officers advised that the following wording should be removed from the first reason for refusal (regarding the affordable housing offer split and viability) on planning grounds, as the application did not qualify for the Mayor of London's fast track approach to development viability:

'that could be generated by the development and does not meet the 50% threshold required by the GLA Affordable Housing and Viability SPG which is applied as the site is 'public land'

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

That subject to any direction by the Mayor of London, planning permission is **REFUSED** at 255-279 Cambridge Heath Road, London, E2 0EL for the Demolition of existing buildings on site and redevelopment to provide 189 residential units and 1,676 sqm of flexible commercial floorspace (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, B1 and/or D1) in two buildings ranging from 5 to 15 storeys, along with disabled parking, servicing, cycle parking, public realm and amenity space for the following reasons as set out in the Committee report:

1. Affordable housing offer, split and viability

The proposed affordable housing split at 46:54 in favour of intermediate tenure does not accord with Council's policy which requires a 70:30 split in favour of rented tenure.

The application fails to deliver the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing on site.

As such the proposal is not in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019), Chapter 5, and development plan policies including London Plan policy 3.12 (MALP 2016), the GLA Affordable Housing and Viability SPG (2017), Core Strategy policy SP02 (2010), Managing Development Document policy DM3 (2013) and Emerging Local Plan policies S.H1 and D.H2 (2019).

2. Residential mix

Specific housing mix targets are set within Managing Development Document policy DM3 to account for housing issues local to Tower Hamlets; such as the need for family sized dwellings and social rented tenures. The proposed unit mix across all housing types does not accord with the current targets of Managing Development Document policy DM3 (2013) and does not accord with the principles set out within development plan policies including Core Strategy policy SP02 (2010) or within Emerging Local Plan policies S.H1 and D.H2 (2019). The proposal is also contrary to Chapter 5 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019).

3. Wind/microclimate

Insufficient wind/microclimate information has been provided and as such Council cannot ensure that amenity to residents and the public realm will not be negatively affected or that the proposed mitigation methods are sufficient or appropriate to mitigate any adverse effects. The application is therefore contrary to development plan policies including London Plan policies 7.6 and 7.7 (MALP 2016), Core Strategy policy SP10(4) (2010), Managing Development Document (2013) policies DM24, DM25 and DM26, Emerging Local Plan policy S.DH1 (2019) and the Mayor of London Sustainable Design and Construction SPG (2014) which all seek to protect existing and future amenity.

4. Highway Safety

The scheme proposes an overreliance on Birkbeck Street which would create conflicts between users i.e. cycling, pedestrian, accessible parking spaces and servicing vehicles which will be required to reverse onto or off the site, endangering public safety. The scheme would therefore have adverse and unacceptable effects on the safety of the public highway and is contrary to Chapter 6 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and development plan policies including London Plan policy 6.1 (MALP 2016), policies SP08 and SP09 of the Core Strategy (2012), policy DM20 of the MDD (2012) and policies S.TR1, D.TR2, D.TR4 of the Emerging Local Plan (2019).

It is also considered that the Highways issues presented on site are a symptom of over-development and as such the proposal is also contrary to London Plan policy 3.4 (MALP 2016), the Mayor of London Housing SPG (2016), Core Strategy policy SP02 (2010), MDD policy DM24 (2012) and Emerging Local Plan policy D.DH7 (2019).

5. Design and heritage

The proposed layout, height and massing arrangement poorly relate to the site and are considered out of keeping with the site context, townscape and heritage assets.

The proposal does not successfully integrate the proposed uses on site with the surrounding area, does not improve the permeability of the area and creates an overbearing relationship to adjacent sites. The scheme does not have regard to the form, function and structure of the area and does not make an overall positive contribution to wider area and as such, the proposal is not considered to be of the highest quality.

Less than substantial harm would be caused to adjacent heritage assets which have not been justified and are not outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme.

The proposal is not considered to be of the highest quality and is contrary to NPPF Chapters 12 and 16 (2019) and development plan policies including London Plan policies 3.5, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 (MALP 2016), Core Strategy policy SP10 (2010), Managing Development Document policies

DM23, DM24, DM26 and DM27 and Emerging Plan policies S.DH1, D.DH2, S.DH3 and D.DH4 (2019).

It is also considered that the design and heritage issues presented on site are a symptom of over-development and as such the proposal is also not in accordance with London plan policy 3.4, Housing SPG, LBTH Core Strategy policy SP02, LBTH MDD policy DM24 and emerging plan policy D.DH7.

6. Planning Obligations

In the absence of agreed heads of terms and a legal agreement to secure agreed and policy compliant financial and non-financial contributions including for employment, skills, training and enterprise and transport matters the development fails to mitigate its impact on local services, amenities and infrastructure.

The above would be contrary to the requirements of development plan policies including policies SP02 and SP13 of the LBTH Core Strategy (2010), policy 8.2 of the London Plan (MALP 2016), LBTH's Planning Obligations SPD (2016) and policy D.SG5 of the Emerging Local Plan (2019).

WILL TUCKLEY, CHIEF EXECUTIVE

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