LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

6th March 2013

UPDATE REPORT OF HEAD OF PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL

INDEX

Agenda item no	Reference	Location	Proposal		
6.1	PA/11/03617	Skylines Village, Marsh Wall	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:		
			 764 residential units (Use Class C3); 1,982 sq.m (GIA) of flexible retail floor space (Use Class A1-A5/B1); 4,480 sq.m (GIA) of office floor space (Use Class B1) 2,250sq.m (GIA) of community floor space (Use Class D1); A two-level basement containing associated car parking spaces, motorcycle spaces, cycle parking, associated plant, storage and refuse facilities The application also proposes new public open space, associated hard and soft landscaping. 		
7.1	PA/12/3318	The Robin Hood Gardens Estate together with land south of Poplar High Street and Naval Row, Woolmore School and land north of Woolmore Street bounded by Cotton Street, East India Dock Road and Bullivant Street	Submission of reserved matters relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of replacement school following outline planning permission dated 30th March 2012, reference PA/12/00001.		

7.2	PA/12/00637	Land adjacent to Langdon Park Station, corner of Cording Street and Chrisp Street, 134-156 Chrisp Street, London	Redevelopment of the site to provide a residential led mixed use development, comprising the erection of part 6 to 22 storey buildings to provide 223 dwellings and 129 sqm of new commercial floorspace falling within use classes A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, D1 and/or D2, plus car parking spaces, cycle parking, refuse/recycling facilities and access together with landscaping including public, communal and private amenity space.
-----	-------------	---	--

Agenda Item number:	6.1			
Reference number:	PA/11/03617			
Location:	Skylines Village, Marsh Wall			
Proposal:	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:			
	 764 residential units (Use Class C3); 1,982 sq.m (GIA) of flexible retail floor space (Use Class A1-A5/B1); 4,480 sq.m (GIA) of office floor space (Use Class B1) 2,250sq.m (GIA) of community floor space (Use Class D1); A two-level basement containing associated car parking spaces, motorcycle spaces, cycle parking, associated plant, storage and refuse facilities 			
	The application also proposes new public open space, associated hard and soft landscaping.			

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

- SKY2 PA 05_15A Proposed Landscape Plan
- SKY2_PA_05_15B Proposed Landscape Plan
- 130207 Summary of Open Space Functions Skylines Landscape Strategy Diagram (NTS) February 2013

2.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Drug & Alcohol Action Team (DAAT)

The DAAT have confirmed in writing (see Appendix 1 below) that an offer from the developer has been received that specifies the applicant's proposal to assist and rehouse existing drug and alcohol service currently residing at Skylines Village. The DAAT have agreed to the proposal and consider it to be equitable in ensuring continuity of service delivery, whilst also supporting future service delivery aspirations. The agreed terms of this offer will be secured as additional financial and non-financial planning obligations.

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

3.1 Officer's recommendation remains as per the original subject to the amendments set out in Section 1 of this Update Report.

Appendix 1



Tim Ross
Planning and Building Control
Mulberry Place
Clove Crescent
London
E14 2BG

Your ref: PA/11/03617 Date: 6th March 2013

Communities, Localities & Culture

Orug & Alcohol Action Team Tower Hamlets Town Hall 6th Floor, Mulberry Place 5 Clove Crescent London E14 28G Enquiries to:

Tek 020 7384 4755

Email: ali.akhtar@towerhamlets.gov.uk

www.towerhamlets.gov.uk

Dear Tim,

RE: DAAT Response to Applicant's offer for drug and alcohol services located at Skylines

I am writing to inform you the Drug and Alcohol Action Team (DAAT) has received an offer from the developer (26th February) that specifies the applicant's proposal to assist and rehouse existing drug and alcohol service currently residing at Skylines Village.

Within this offer, the applicant has agreed to:

- Confirm that community support services (or replacement services) can remain on the site until the start of the site redevelopment;
- Assist in relocating the services (or replacement services) by paying for move costs and any uplift in rent
 over and above existing levels during the build period;
- Reserve replacement floor space within the community element of the new Skylines development and pay
 relocation costs for the services (or replacement services) to return back into the development;
- Identify alternative and suitable accommodation for the Community Alcohol Team and pay for move costs
 and rental uplifts during the interim period (which may include existing properties from the applicant's
 portfolio for use for the interim period);
- Provide each service two years rent free in the new scheme.
- Ensure rent pay levels (within new development) remain equivalent to rent currently paid at Skylines.
 (+CPI), which is secured for 20 years (with appropriate break clauses included);
- Agree to transfer the arrangement to any new provider commissioned by the DAAT;
- Provide an additional discrete space within the community facility (at no cost) to enable external providers (including Alcoholics and Narcotics Anonymous and Al-Anon UK) to deliver services

Please note the DAAT welcome and agree the proposal and consider it to be equitable in ensuring continuity of service deliver, whilst also supporting future service delivery aspirations (identified at this time).

Yours sincerely,

Ali Akhtar

DAAT Business Manager

Agenda Item number:	7.1
Reference number:	PA/12/3318
Location:	The Robin Hood Gardens Estate together with land south of Poplar High Street and Naval Row, Woolmore School and land north of Woolmore Street bounded by Cotton Street, East India Dock Road and Bullivant Street
Proposal:	Submission of reserved matters relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of replacement school following outline planning permission dated 30th March 2012, reference PA/12/00001.

1.0 FURTHER CLARIFICATIONS

1.1 The committee report stated that 6 car parking spaces were to be provided; this should read as 5 spaces (3 no. standard spaces and 2 no. disabled spaces).

2.0 FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS

- 2.1 Since the time of publishing the committee report, a further letter of objection was received from Twentieth Century Society. The objections are discussed below:
- 2.2 The organisation maintain their objection to the demolition of this historic school building as it is felt that it is a positive contributor to the local townscape.
 - (OFFICER COMMENT: Woolmore School is not listed, nor is it is not located within a Conservation Area. The Council has however sought to carefully consider the value of the existing building in heritage terms as part of the development process.)
- 2.3 Despite the replacement fenestration, it is considered that the main neo-Georgian part of this building makes a positive contribution to the townscape. It is argued that it is the only example of neo-Georgian architecture in this part of Tower Hamlets – particularly relevant as the associated former Woolmore Street Infants School (1914) which has been derelict for some time, is also due to be demolished.
 - (OFFICER COMMENT: The applicant submitted a 'Justification for Demolition' document as part of the submission which includes an assessment of the efforts made to retain the existing structure. Officers consider that the justification is acceptable in demonstrating that it has not proved logistically viable to retain the building.)

In summary officers are of the view that given that the building is not a heritage asset, the loss of the building has been very carefully considered and justified.

2.4 The organisation are disappointed that the applicant has rejected options to retain the primary school building, and they are not convinced that more imaginative solutions to preserve it have been explored.

(OFFICER COMMENT: Officers are satisfied that the design team has explored all the possible options to maintain the building. This is further support by the fact that the site is not listed or in a conservation area. The new build option was chosen by the School, Governors and LBTH (Department for Children, Schools and Families). Furthermore the design has progressed with full engagement and support from the School community and local community.)

3 RECOMMENDATION

3.1 Officers recommendations remain unchanged.

Agenda Item number:	7.2				
Reference number:	PA/12/00637				
Location:	Land adjacent to Langdon Park Station, corner of Cording Street and Chrisp Street, 134-156 Chrisp Street, London E14				
Proposal:	Redevelopment of the site to provide a residential led mixed use development, comprising the erection of part 6 to 22 storey buildings to provide 223 dwellings and 129 sqm of new commercial floorspace falling within use classes A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, D1 and/or D2, plus car parking spaces, cycle parking, refuse/recycling facilities and access together with landscaping including public, communal and private amenity space.				

1.0 TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS

1.2 The committee report at paragraph 8.43 states:

As detailed in table 1 below, the overall indicative proposal includes 22.2% affordable housing provision by habitable room, or 223 units.

This should read:

As detailed in table 1 below, the overall indicative proposal includes 22.2% affordable housing provision by habitable room, or 34 units.

1.2 Table 4 at paragraph 8.56 contains an error in the proposed POD rent levels for the 2 bed units (£151.00 as opposed to £168.17). A revised table is shown below with the correction underlined in italics.

	1 bed (pw)	2 bed (pw)	3 bed (pw)	4 bed (pw)
Proposed development POD levels/E4 POD rent levels	£151.00 (inc service charge)	£168.17 (inc service charge)	£187.00 (inc service charge)	£229.00 (inc service charge)
Social Target Rents (for comparison Only)	£157.57 (including estimated £30 service charges)	£165.06 (including estimated £30 service charges)	£172.57 (including estimated £30 service charges)	£180.07 (including estimated £30 service charges)

1.3 The committee report at paragraph 8.6 states:

The application proposes the provision of 129 (NIA) square metres of ground floor commercial space fronting **Mile End Road**. This could be used for uses falling within Classes A1 — Retail Shops; A2 — Financial and Professional services; A3 — Restaurants/Cafes; A4 — Drinking Establishments; B1 — Offices; D1 — Non-Residential Institutions and/ or D2 — Assembly and Leisure.

This should read:

The application proposes the provision of 129 (NIA) square metres of ground floor commercial space fronting **Carmen Street**. This could be used for uses falling within Classes A1 – Retail Shops; A2 – Financial and Professional services; A3 – Restaurants/Cafes; A4 – Drinking Establishments; B1 – Offices; D1 – Non-Residential Institutions and/ or D2 – Assembly and Leisure.

1.4 The committee report at paragraph 8.85 states:

This site is located directly to the south of the application site and comprises a **16** storey residential led development with a commercial unit located at ground floor level. The development presently receives very good levels of natural daylight, well above the BRE recommendations.

This should read:

This site is located directly to the south of the application site and comprises a **15** storey residential led development with a commercial unit located at ground floor level. The development presently receives very good levels of natural daylight, well above the BRE recommendations.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 Officers recommendation remains unchanged.