

## Appendix 2

<b>Agenda Item number:</b>	7.1
<b>Reference number:</b>	PA/11/03617
<b>Location:</b>	Skylines Village, Marsh Wall
<b>Proposal:</b>	<p>Proposed demolition of all existing buildings within Skylines Village and the erection of buildings with heights varying from 2 to 50 storeys in height, comprising of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 764 residential units (Use Class C3);</li><li>• 1,982 sq.m (GIA) of flexible retail floor space (Use Class A1-A5/B1);</li><li>• 4,480 sq.m (GIA) of office floor space (Use Class B1)</li><li>• 2,250sq.m (GIA) of community floor space (Use Class D1);</li><li>• A two-level basement containing associated car parking spaces, motorcycle spaces, cycle parking, associated plant, storage and refuse facilities</li></ul> <p>The application also proposes new public open space, associated hard and soft landscaping.</p>

### 1.0 CLARIFICATION AND CORRECTIONS

- 1.1 The Strategic Development Committee is requested to note the following clarifications and corrections to the report circulated with the agenda.
- 1.2 The following amendments to the submission documents reference numbers are required.

#### Submission Documents

PA/05/014 A C Proposed Typical Floor 1/300 A1  
PA/05/070 A B Building A Plans – Typical Plans - sheet 1 1/250 A1  
PA/05/071 A B Building A Plans – Typical Plans - sheet 2 1/250 A1  
PA/05/072-A B Building A Plans – Typical Plans - sheet 3 1/250 A1  
PA/05/073 A Building A Plans – Typical Plans – sheet 4 1/250 A1  
~~PA/05/073 superseded by July 2012 Addendum~~  
PA/05/080 A-B Building B Plans - Typical Plans - sheet 1 1/250 A1

- 1.3 The inclusion of a further paragraph under Section 2 of the report that summarises the material planning considerations is recommended – to read as follows:

*The proposal makes efficient use of a site which is included within the Isle of Dogs Opportunity Area, as identified in the London Plan (2011) and the Marsh Wall East site allocation, as identified in the Managing Development DPD (Submission Version May 2012) as modified and facilitates an increase in the supply of housing including affordable housing in accordance with Policies 2.13, 3.3 and 3.11 of the published London Plan (2011), Policy SP02 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM3 of the Development Management DPD (Submission Version May 2011) as modified.*

#### Recommendation

- 1.4 Paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 on page 94-95 of the agenda, which deal with the financial and non-financial planning obligations should be amended to reflect the applicant's agreement to contribute towards enhancement to South Quays DLR station (to the

## Appendix 2

tune of **£250,000** and a financial contribution towards multi-modal improvements directly to or in the vicinity of Preston's Road roundabout, to the tune of **£100,000**.

- 1.5 These changes/additions to the range of planning obligations are in response to late comments received from the GLA (email received 14<sup>th</sup> January 2013) which restated TfL's request for a contribution towards improving the accessibility to South Quay DLR station with specific reference to the provision of additional lift access. There have also been on-going discussions with the applicant regarding the desire to improve the safety and multi-modal movements through Preston's Road roundabout and the financial contribution offered by the applicant and suitably reflects the impact of this development on the operation of Preston's Road roundabout and proximity issues. With the required uplift in the 2% monitoring fee (now £124,891) the overall level of agreed planning obligations would be **£6,369,476**
- 1.6 This list of obligations should also reflect the actual percentage affordable housing proposed (35.7% by habitable room).
- 1.7 Following publication of the Committee report the applicant has reviewed their position regarding the 'Development viability review clause to secure any uplift' as referred to in paragraph 3.3, 9.93 and 9.238 in the Committee report. The applicant has requested that the clause be removed as it was felt that introducing uncertainty regarding the maximum level of affordable housing to be provided would be likely to erode potential investor's confidence in the scheme and therefore jeopardise the prospect of the development being delivered. In the light of this and in view of the overall percentage of affordable housing proposed at social target rent, alongside the other financial and non-financial planning obligations, your officers feel (with hindsight) that requiring a review mechanism in such circumstances, would be unreasonable. The requirement for a future review of development viability has therefore been deleted from the report.
- 1.8 Officers remain satisfied that the financial viability of the scheme has been appropriately and robustly tested. It is therefore considered that affordable housing and financial obligations have been maximised in accordance with London Plan (2011), Core Strategy (2010), Managing Development DPD (Submission Version) and Planning Obligations SPD (2012).
- 1.9 To clarify the position in respect of the proposed youth club accommodation, the S.106 clause should read – "the provision of two floors "shell and core including internal walls" in Block B for a youth and community services at a peppercorn rent for five years, but with the eventual operator obliged to meet service charges".
- 1.10 These changes should be mirrored in the later section of the report which refers again to Planning Obligations and CIL (paragraphs 9.229 – 9.238 inclusive)

### General Corrections

- 1.11 Paragraph 5.7, typographical error; heights for Block A1 and A2 should read 11 storeys (including plant) and 15 storeys (including plant) respectively.
- 1.12 Paragraph 7.12 The Environment Agency has confirmed that finished floor levels should be set no lower than 5.1 metres AOD.
- 1.13 Paragraph 7.14 delete last sentence of "Officer Comment" as the GLA made further comments by email dated 14<sup>th</sup> January 2013.

## Appendix 2

- 1.14 Paragraph 9.15 amend to read ‘*Currently, there is approximately 8,969sqm (GIA) of B1 office space within Skylines Village. The proposed scheme would provide 4,480 ~~5,094~~ sqm (GIA) of dedicated replacement B1 office space but also 1,982sqm of flexible commercial space (use classes B1/ A1-A5). Whilst the scheme would result in (best case) a net loss of office floorspace of 2,507 ~~4,893~~-sqm, which assumes that all units identified for flexible use are used for business purposes, the scheme also proposes a significant community floorspace (Class D1) which would generate additional employment. This site is not located within a Preferred Office Location and it is important to recognise that employment can be generated by all commercial uses and is not necessarily limited to B1 uses.*’
- 1.15 To provide further clarification in respect of child play space provision, a more detailed table is produced below. The child play space requirement set out in Table 3 and paragraph 9.106 should read 2,651sqm which results in an under provision of dedicated child play-space of 361sqm.

	<b>Playspace provided on site (sqm)</b>	<b>Playspace policy requirement (sqm)</b>	<b>+/- policy requirement</b>
Under 3 years provision	970	936	34
4-10 years provision	1320	1157	163
11-15 years provision	0	558	-558
<b>Total</b>	<b>2290</b>	<b>2651</b>	<b>-361</b>

- 1.16 Paragraph 9.117 should read ....*(based on 0646ha for ~~4,604~~ 1,599 additional residents).*
- 1.17 Paragraph 9.127, penultimate sentence should read “.....applicant has offered the space (shell and core) plus internal walls and a commitment for a peppercorn rent for a period of five years, with a future occupier required to meet service charge costs”
- 1.18 Para 9.176 – delete the word “indicative”

## 2.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

### Employment and Enterprise

- 2.1 Even though the Employment and Enterprise Team forms part of Development and Renewal and views are reflected in the Planning Considerations section of this report, it is considered appropriate to summarise their comments. There is a standard Planning Obligations SPD request for job opportunities for local people (20% of construction jobs going to local people through the Skillsmatch Service and procurement of local goods and services during the construction phase

There is a financial requirement as part of this development to support and/or provide the training and skills needs of local residents in accessing job opportunities created through the construction and end user phases of the development.

The applicant has committed to providing a Displacement/Relocation Strategy for existing businesses and Employment and Enterprise are content in principle, with the measures outlined in the Displacement Strategy which is similar to other

## Appendix 2

Displacement Strategies agreed elsewhere. This would be in accordance with the policy approach promoted through Policy DM15 of the Managing Development DPD. It is recommended that this is secured through the S.106 Agreement; with the Council's Employment and Enterprise team requesting input in agreeing the detail of the relocation strategy should planning permission be granted.

### 3.0 FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 Since publication of the agenda a further representations have been received on 17 and 24 January 2013 from two local residents objecting on the grounds of

- Overdevelopment – with 749 flats proposed on the back of the 850 flats that were recently approved on the ASDA site and 249 additional units on Angel House and further flats awaited on the London Arena Site. Lack of infrastructure to support this growing population.
- Heights of buildings – the development is too high at 45 storeys, which will damage the character of the area. The height of the buildings should be considerably reduced to say 5-6 storeys and no more than 10 storeys.
- Oversupply of housing, no point building flats that will remain empty.
- Overcrowding – South Quay DLR is already overcrowded in the mornings
- Reduction in property prices as many more properties come onto the market.

3.2 One of these letters had been previously submitted to the Council and the associated email dated 24<sup>th</sup> January advises that the view is shared by many residents of the Isle of Dogs.

3.3 In addition, the Council has received a petition in support of the application on 17 January 2013 comprising 42 (forty two) signatures.

3.4 The petition (paraphrased) reads as follows:

The following residents of Blackwall and Cubitt Town Ward support the planning application which will deliver a number of major benefits for the Isle of Dogs community such as:

- 228 new affordable homes (out of 764) with 174 being family sized (3 or more beds)
- The creation of a new 1 hectare public park on the sit which will be open to residents during daylight hours
- Provision of a large level of community floorspace which could be occupied by a youth club, with the remainder being used as a NHS Primary Care Trust or nursery
- In addition to the number of jobs associated with the construction period, the development will create up to 470 jobs which is approximately 3.5 times the number of people currently employed on the site

3.5 For completeness the total representations received on the application at submission stage and in relation to the amended plans are 29 objecting, one stating neither support nor objection and a petition of 42 signatures in support of the application.

### 4.0 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS AND CIL

4.1 There are proposed changes to the Planning Obligations and CIL Section of the Report to reflect the text outlined in Section 1 of this Update Report

## Appendix 2

### 5.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

- 5.1 Officer's recommendation remains as per the original subject to the amendments set out in Section 1 of this Update Report (Paragraphs 1.4 - 1.7).