

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 23 MARCH 2017

**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 Helal Uddin
Councillor Md. Maium Miah
Councillor Gulam Robbani
Councillor Julia Dockerill
Councillor Shafi Ahmed

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Dave Chesterton

Apologies:

None

Officers Present:

Paul Buckenham	(Development Control Manager, Planning Services, Place)
Paul Greeno	(Senior Corporate and Governance Lawyer, Legal Services)
Piotr Lanoszka	(Principal, Planning Officer, Place)
Christopher Stacey – Kinchin	(Planning Officer, Place)
Abiodun Kolawole	(Legal Services, Governance)
Zoe Folley	(Committee Officer, Governance)

1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Councillors Md Maium Miah and Julia Dockerill declared a personal interest in agenda item 5.2, 10 Bank Street, London, E14 (Eastern part of the site known as Heron Quays West) (PA/16/02956) as they had received hospitality from the Canary Wharf Group , which the applicant was a subsidiary of.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 16 February 2017 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

None.

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

5.1 Leven Wharf (known as Glaucus Works), Leven Road, London, E14 0LP (PA/16/02140) corrected reference

Paul Buckenham (Development Control Manager) introduced the application for the demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site to provide a part 7, part 11 storey mixed use building with basement parking to provide 291sqm of commercial space together with 160 residential units with associated works.

Christopher Stacey – Kinchin (Planning Services) presented the report. He explained the nature of the site bounded by the gas holder site and the River Lea. It was reported the application constituted an amendment to the consented application to provide additional housing. Consultation had been carried out and the results were noted. The provision of a housing led

strategic development in this location was supported and it was considered that the increase in height was acceptable in townscape terms. Whilst the density of the scheme exceeded that of the consented application, there would be additional affordable housing and financial contributions for further affordable units off site. In terms of the amenity impact, there would be some loss of light to properties, caused partly by the design of existing buildings. Overall the impacts would be negligible. There would be a moderate increase in vehicle trips but overall Transport for London and LBTH Highways felt that the proposals were acceptable subject to the conditions. There would be contributions for the Community Infrastructure Levy and a s106 agreement. It was recommended that the application be granted planning permission.

In response Members asked about the need for the offsite contributions for affordable housing and why the units could not be provided on site. The Committee also asked questions about the capacity for a health centre on site. It was noted that due to the layout of the consented scheme (which was currently under construction) and the terms of the agreement in respect of the housing, there were limited opportunities to provide additional affordable housing on site at this stage. Therefore, it was considered appropriate that contributions be secured as an alternative. In addition, the opportunities to provide a health facility on site were also restricted due to the site limitations. However, the D1 community use space could potentially accommodate a health centre and the neighbouring gas holder site could also provide such a facility given its size.

Members also asked questions about the viability testing and the Independent Consultants report. It was noted the initial report assessed the costs of the development prior to any work being carried out and found that the surplus would be £2,912,641. The report was then reviewed to take into account the current scenario and the additional costs already expended. This found that the scheme would deliver a surplus of £1,217,699. A contribution for this sum had been secured as a result of this.

The Committee also asked about the quality of and the location of the child play space. It was noted that the play space exceeded the standards in policy. The play area, comprising a podium level courtyard, would be located on the upper ground floor and would be of good quality design. All of the occupants would have access to this play space. It would effectively run parallel to the ground floor at certain points and benefit from a good degree of natural surveillance.

In response to further questions, it was reported that the plans should preserve the development potential of the neighbouring site due to the layout of the area amongst other things.

In response to questions about the amenity impact, it was confirmed that the impact would be minimal and would be broadly similar to that for the consented scheme. The scheme displayed no signs of overdevelopment, and would maximise the housing potential of the land. So overall it was considered that the density of the application was appropriate for the location.

Officers also answered questions about the CIL contributions.

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

1. That planning permission be **GRANTED** at Leven Wharf (known as Glaucus Works), Leven Road, London, E14 0LP (PA/16/01240) for the

Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site to provide a part 7, part 11 storey mixed use building with basement parking to provide 291sqm of commercial space (A1/A2/A3/A4, B1(a), D1 Use Classes) together with 160 residential units with associated landscaping, children's play facilities and public riverside walkway.

(Alterations to the development approved under planning permission PA/13/03053 including a two-storey extension to Block A and a single-storey extension to Block B to provide 34 additional residential units and all associated works).

Subject to:

2. Any direction by the Mayor of London.
3. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the Committee report.
4. That the Corporate Director of Place is delegated authority to recommend the conditions and informatives in relation of the matters set out in the Committee report

5.2 10 Bank Street, London, E14 (Eastern part of the site known as Heron Quays West) (PA/16/02956)

Update report tabled.

Paul Buckenham(Development Control Manager) introduced the application for the construction of a building of 166m AOD comprising of office and retail space along with a decked promenade to the West India Dock South, access and highways works, landscaping and other associated works.

The Chair invited the registered speakers to address the Committee.

Councillor Dave Chesterton addressed the Committee. He reported he had initially intended to object to the proposal due to the loss of the water space. However, having now met with the applicant and received assurances about their intention to develop a water space strategy and design the scheme in line with this, he was satisfied that this would mitigate any impact on the water space.

In response to questions, Councillor Chesterton outlined the scope of the applicant's strategy and the timetable for its production. In light of the positive approach, he confirmed that he no longer objected to the application. Officers advised that the Council were working on a water space strategy. They had received a copy of the applicant's draft strategy and this could inform their own strategy. The landscaping strategy could be worded in such a way to allow for further improvements to the public realm if supported by the water space strategy, as detailed in the update report

Howard Dawber (Canary Wharf Group (the Applicant) spoke in support of the application. He highlighted the aims of their new strategy to enhance the dock space. It was planned that the applicant would work with partners to implement the plans. He described the nature of the commercial space, highlighting the need for the large floor plate office accommodation for commercial reasons. The marketing intelligence showed that this feature would increase the units attractiveness to future tenants. It would therefore provide additional employment.

In response to questions, he noted that there have been a number of developments that had encroached on water space. The applicant had listened to the Councillors views and had decided to prepare the draft strategy. No representations in objection had been received and there was support for the provision of the new pedestrian route and the retail space. The plans would facilitate public access to the dock and heritage assets. There were measures to mitigate the impact on the micro climate, protect the biodiversity value of the site and a commitment to provide local jobs. He also outlined the nature of the discussions with the Canal and Rivers Trust and the agreement between the two parties.

Piotr Lanoszka, (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report describing the nature of the site including the location of the nearby listed buildings. He also explained the planning history, drawing comparisons between the extant scheme and this scheme. Consultation had been carried out and the outcome of this was noted. The delivery of office and retail space in this location was supported and would create additional employment. The scheme broadly corresponded with the neighbouring 1 Bank Street development in terms of the land use, and would provide a continuous public access route to that development. It would preserve the setting of the area and have a minimal impact on the setting of heritage assets. It was considered that the impact on the water space including that from the promenade would be minimal. There would be measures to mitigate the impact on the biodiversity value of the site and the micro climate. The application was recommended for approval.

Members asked questions about the commercial reasons for justifying the proposal. They questioned the need for the larger floor plate office space given the impact of this on the water space. It was asked whether the marketing evidence supporting the proposals had been tested. In response it was reported that alternative options had been explored. However it would be found that they would have a significant impact on the public realm. The marketing evidence had been carefully considered and had influenced the

scheme. This showed that occupants generally favoured this type of office space given the opportunities that the larger floor plates provided. It was also noted that the consented units had been marketed but had attracted little interest. In addition, there were limited opportunities to provide such commercial space in the area. So on balance, the changes were supported.

Members asked about the measures to attract local business and small enterprises to the development. It was noted that the applicant had taken steps to identify local retailers to occupy the development. In addition the design of the units should appeal to such businesses. It was likely that the development would comprise a diverse range of units similar to 1 Bank Street. In relation to public access, it was noted that there were also measures to facilitate public access to the site including public seating.

In response to further questions about the decked promenade, it was explained that the decking would enable the provision of the public access route. Overall it was considered that the public benefits of this would outweigh any impact on the water space, that would be mainly visual in nature rather than resulting in a total loss of water space. It was also noted that Officers would work with the applicant in implementing the conditions. Whilst Officers had seen the applicant's draft strategy, it had no planning status at this stage. However the landscaping conditions could be worded in such a way to enable the strategy to be brought forward to secure further public realm improvements.

In response Members expressed a wish to receive further reassurances regarding the status of the applicant's water strategy before making a decision. They also wished to receive further information about the impact of the scheme on the water space.

Councillor Marc Francis proposed and Councillor Julia Dockerill seconded a motion that the consideration of the application be deferred pending details of the applicant's water space strategy and its status and the impact of the application on the water space.

On a vote of 5 in favour, 1 against and 2 abstentions the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That the application for planning permission be **DEFERRED** at 10 Bank Street, London, E14 (Eastern part of the site known as Heron Quays West) (PA/16/02956) for the construction of a building of 166m AOD comprising 124,734sqm (GIA) of office (Use Class B1) and 293sqm (GIA) of retail (Use Class A1-A5) along with a decked promenade to the West India Dock South, access and highways works, landscaping and other associated works

The Committee were minded to defer the consideration of the application to the next Committee meeting to receive information regarding:

- the Applicant's water space strategy and the status of the strategy.
- The impact of the application on the water space.

6. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

7. PROPOSED REVISED PLANNING CODE OF CONDUCT

Paul Greeno (Senior Corporate and Governance Lawyer) presented the revised Planning Code of Conduct explaining the need to update the code. He drew attention to the key changes, including the new section on Members Interests.

In response, Members welcomed the new code and made a number of comments. In relation to lobbying, it was requested that the rules be reviewed to recognise that Members could engage in lobbying so long as they comply with the provisions in the code of conduct. In respect of Committee site visits, it was also requested that this be reviewed to recognise that Members could express views when attending site visits so long as they did not indicate that the Member had made up their mind.

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

1. That the revised Planning Code of Conduct in Appendix 1 of the report be noted;
2. That it be noted that pursuant to Part 1 Paragraph 4.02 of the Constitution the adoption and amendment of the revised Planning Code of Conduct is a matter for Council; and
3. That the following comments be reflected prior to the revised Code being put forward for adoption.

Section 7 Lobbying

It was requested that this section should be reviewed to recognise that Members may engage in lobbying so long as they comply with the provisions in the code of conduct.

Section 9 - Committee site visits

Rule Paragraph 9.1 requiring that Councillors must avoid expressing opinions or views on the application to any person present (including other councillors) during site visits.

It was requested that this paragraph be expanded to recognise that Members may express views so long as they do not indicate that the Member has made up their mind.

The meeting ended at 9.10 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Marc Francis
Strategic Development Committee