

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

8 SEPTEMBER 2016

UPDATE REPORT OF HEAD OF PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
6.1	PA/15/02959	Site between Varden Street and Ashfield Street (Whitechapel Estate)	Demolition of all existing buildings and redevelopment to provide 12 buildings ranging from ground plus 2 - 23 storeys (a maximum 94m AOD height), comprising 343 residential dwellings (class C3), 168 specialist accommodation units (Class C2), office floorspace (class B1), flexible office and non-residential institution floorspace (Class B1/D1), retail floorspace (class A1 - A3), car parking, cycle parking, hard and soft landscaping and other associated works.

1. ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 1.1 Following publication of the agenda Queen Mary University (QMUL) have submitted further representations.
- 1.2 QMUL states that they have not been approached by the applicant to discuss how or if the space proposed in the development could accommodate Life Sciences or wider University needs.
- 1.3 QMUL advise that paragraph 9.32 which states "*neither Bart's Hospital Trust or QMUL seek the proposed accommodation for express research/life sciences purposes*" is not correct as discussions have not taken place.
- 1.4 QMUL have added to their previous objection based on construction, air quality and noise impacts on the Wingate Building. Request conditions to secure:
 - Noise and ventilation strategy
 - Construction Liaison Group

2.0 CORRECTIONS

- 2.1 Since publication of the agenda, a number of typographical errors have been identified. The table below lists the corrected text.

Paragraph	Correction
7.4	Add missing word " <i>However, the separation distance is too <u>far</u> for operatives...</i> "
9.6	9.6 add missing words " <i>..... <u>Whitechapel Road to the north</u> as delivering a Med City campus area.</i> "

Figure 7	Title should read <i>TVIA view of Block I E on Ashfield Street from corner with Cavell Street (in Ford Square)</i>
9.74	Refers to Buildings E and I G .
9.150	4 th sentence should state “..... <i>these daylight failings are considered acceptable unacceptable...</i> ”
9.217	Last sentence “... 33 <u>33%</u> and <u>56%</u> .”
9.199	“ 556% <u>56%</u> .”
Repeated paragraph numbers 2.290-2.299	Amend paragraph numbers 9.300-13 accordingly.
Appendix – list of application documents	<i>Design and Access Statement dated October 2015 <u>February 2016</u></i>

3. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

- 2.2 Clarification that the Tower Hamlets CIL liability would be approximately £2,237,235 (falling to £1,913,411 with social housing relief) and the Mayor of London CIL would be approximately £1,643,754 (falling to £1,441,238 with social housing relief).

4. PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

- 4.1 The applicant has written to the Council to clarify the proposed heads of terms of a draft Section 106 agreement, if permission were to be granted. Planning obligations are a material consideration and hence the full package proposed by the applicant is set out below.

Financial Contributions

- a) £223,600 towards carbon off-setting
- b) £329,154 towards Skills and Training

Non-Financial Contributions

- a) Affordable Housing provision as per Officer report
- b) A review mechanism which could increase the affordable housing to 25% of habitable rooms (excluding specialist housing re-provision)
- c) Provision of short term accommodation (Block A & I) for on-call NHS staff, patients/ visitor, new recruits (definition to be agreed) at affordable rent levels (to be agreed), and capped service charges (to be agreed)
- d) Long term accommodation (Block C) for Med-City Staff with income caps (definition to be agreed) at affordable rent levels (to be agreed), and capped service charges (to be agreed)
- e) Provision of 30 apprenticeships during the construction phase of the development
- f) Provision of 1 apprenticeship for end phase of the development for a 3 year period

4.2 The draft heads of terms have been noted and taken into account by officers. However the public benefits that could be secured would not outweigh the planning harm caused by the development or therefore affect the recommendation to refuse planning permission.

5. RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Officers' original recommendation to REFUSE planning permission remains unchanged.