

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 17 October 2018 at 6.30 p.m.

Council Chamber, 1st Floor, Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove
Crescent, London, E14 2BG

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA

This meeting is open to the public to attend.

Contact for further enquiries:

Antonella Burgio, Democratic Services
1st Floor, Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove Crescent, E14 2BG
Tel: 020 7364 4881
E-mail: antonella.burgio@towerhamlets.gov.uk
Web: <http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/committee>

Scan this code for
an electronic
agenda:



For further information including the Membership of this body and public information, see the main agenda.

5.4 Update Report

PAGE NUMBER(S)	WARD(S) AFFECTED
3 - 8	All Wards

This page is intentionally left blank

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - 17 OCTOBER 2018

UPDATE REPORT OF THE DIVISIONAL DIRECTOR OF PLANING AND BUILDING CONTROL

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.	PA/15/01846	Caspian Wharf, Violet Road, London, E3	Erection of a vehicular and pedestrian gate at Voysey Square, instalment of a gated link through Block A3, retention of a vehicular and pedestrian gate located at Seven Seas Gardens, relocation of pedestrian gates on Ligurian Walk and reconfiguration and location of cycle parking and refuse storage within Voysey Square.

1.0 ADDITIONAL REPRESENTTION RECEIVED

- 1.1 An additional letter of objection has been received from a local resident.
- 1.2 The main planning issues raised are related to anti-social behaviour and increased risk of crime.
- 1.3 These issues are addressed in the main report and there is no change to the recommendation.

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.2	PA/18/00459	Unit G1, Ground Floor, Block F, 15 Hanbury Street, London E1 6QR	Use of part of ground floor as a market on Saturdays, trading between the hours of 10.30am - 6pm (extension to existing Sunday market).

1.0 CORRECTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

- 1.1 Paragraph 9.4.12 should state 'The scheme is required to provide 24 cycle spaces for the proposal. The applicant has provided an indicative area to which cycle parking could be located however the number of spaces has not been detailed'.
- 1.2 Within the 'External Consultees' section of the report, it should be included that the St George Residents' Association had made an objection to the application as follows:

'I write on behalf of residents in 193 St George flats on the north side of Lamb Street, Folgate Street and Spital Square, whose flats are 2 or 3 minutes walk from the Old Truman Brewery on Hanbury Street.

Weekends in this part of Spitalfields are no longer a restful break from work for residents. Sunday was a market day for many years, with Saturday a welcome quieter day. Since Old Spitafields Market and Spitalfields Traders' Market (in Bishops Square) were permitted Saturday trading, our neighbourhood is invaded at weekends. It's fine if the customers stay within the markets, but they do have a way of buying take-out food and drinks and sitting on our walls, doorways, pavements, then leaving trash behind on the walls, in the garden beds and on the pavements.

Please do not grant this application "....because that is the character of the area...". This seems to be the latest reason given as justification for anything that destroys the amenity for nearby residents. If this is granted, the numbers of visitors in our residential streets will reach overload. Already Hanbury Street must be one of the untidiest streets in Tower Hamlets because of the amount of litter dumped on windowsills, tops of bins, doorways, street furniture.

Additional to all this are the ever-increasing numbers of food courier motorcycle drivers who wait in Lamb Street (30+ at times), continuously drive in and out of the street with no regard for the safety of other road users or pedestrians. Another Saturday Market will increase the number of food outlets these drivers can collect from.

Therefore, please REFUSE this application in order to protect our residential area from the cumulative effect on top of existing Saturday markets.'

2.0 ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

- 2.1 An additional letter of objection has been received expressing that there are more than enough markets in the area.
- 2.2 This point is noted, however the proposal seeks to extend the trading hours of an existing market, rather than introduce a new market into the locality.

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 Officer's recommendation is unchanged to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions and planning obligations set out in the officer's report.

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.3	PA/16/02713	5 Hollybush Place, London, E2 9QX	Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the land to provide 55 residential units over two blocks comprising one 6 storey building (Block B) and one part 5 and part 7 storey building (Block A) and the provision of 1625 sqm (GIA) of commercial floorspace (Class B1) at lower ground and ground level, with raised podium and associated landscaping, access and cycle parking.

1.0 CORRECTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

- 1.1 With regard to the provision of affordable housing, this is listed in the report as 36.3%; however this was incorrectly calculated in the applicant's schedule of accommodation at the time of preparing the report and is in fact **35.5%**. The unit mix remains the same. Two habitable rooms were in error included in the calculations previously.
- 1.2 The Council's appointed daylight/sunlight consultants have now had the opportunity to review the applicant's amended Daylight/Sunlight Report, following receipt of amended drawings to the scheme. The table below captures the main daylight findings to the revised scheme in respect of BRE guidance.

Table 1: Summary of daylight impacts

Daylight summary	VSC at window						NSL inside room					
	No. of windows tested	No. of windows that satisfy BRE VSC	No. that do not satisfy BRE				No. of rooms tested	No. of rooms that satisfy BRE NSL	No. that do not satisfy BRE			
			Minor loss 21-30%	Moderate 31-40% loss	Major >40% loss	Total			Minor loss 21-30%	Moderate 31-40% loss	Major >40% loss	Total
Hollybush House (with balconies)	32	8	5	4	15	24	17	11	4	1	1	6
Hollybush House (without balconies)	32	8	11	11	2	24	17	13	3	1	-	4
City View House	64	60	2	2	-	4	3	3	-	-	-	-
13-20 Kedleston Walk	36	20	12	1	3	16	16	7	3	3	3	9
Total	164	96	30	18	20	68	53	34	10	5	4	19

- 1.3 The updated review records improvements in particular in regards to daylight impacts on Hollybush House. Previously the overall impact on daylight to Hollybush House was reported to be moderate to major adverse. The overall impact on daylight to Hollybush House is now considered to be moderate adverse in the professional opinion of the Council's appointed daylight/sunlight consultant, when taking into account the self-obstructing overhanging gallery access of Hollybush House.

2.0. ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

2.1 An additional representation has been received from the current site tenant (attached) Travis Perkins Builders' Merchants in respect of:

- The Applicant has not offered a suitable replacement unit for Travis Perkins. They offered a unit with 678 square metres (7,300 square feet) on lower ground floor and 790 square metres (8,500 square feet) on the ground floor. This is not a suitable layout for a builders' merchant.
- The applicant not being able to occupy the B1 Use Class space within the application scheme as builders merchants' fall under sui generis Use Class.
- The scheme being contrary to Draft Policy E4D of London Plan that seeks to retain industrial uses accessible to public transport and provide capacity for essential industrial related services and contrary to DM15 (Local Job Creation and Investment) of the adopted Local Plan.
- The builders' merchant having to close with the loss of jobs and a key local service.

2.2 Travis Perkins had previously lodged two letters in objection to the scheme, which are included and addressed in the main report.

2.3 With respect to the issues raised in the latest representation from Travis Perkins the Committee should take into account the following:

- The scheme is not a joint application between the land owner and the tenant and so there is no method that the Council could secure that the existing builders' merchants on-site would be occupied within a mixed use re-development consent for the site.
- Officers have been in receipt of correspondence and plans that demonstrate the applicant did at pre-application stage engage and present plans to Travis Perkins for the existing use to occupy almost the entirety of the ground floor of the site (as a sui generis builders merchants). Also the applicant presented options for the tenant to relocate their builders' merchants business to other sites within the Borough, in which the applicant had a development partner able to facilitate such a relocation of the business.
- The applicant has attempted to engage with the tenant in order to either provide accommodation for the business within the development or support relocation, since 2012 but without success given the lack of sustained engagement from the tenant.
- Accordingly the scheme has progressed with a B1 office land use at ground and lower ground floor which would result in an uplift of employment floor space on-site (over existing) and a resultant opportunity for an improved mix of businesses to occupy the development with a commensurate increase in permanent jobs provided on-site.

- 2.4 As part of the application submission, an appendix showing nearby timber yards and builders' merchants has been provided. Officers are satisfied that although the scheme would result in the displacement of an active business, significant efforts have been made by the applicant to incorporate this business into the scheme or relocate the business; the scheme would optimise the use of the site as is, as set as an overarching objective of development plan policies; and the proposed uplift in employment space would more than offset any loss in number of jobs from the existing business operating on-site.
- 2.5 Officers have previously attempted to correspond with Travis Perkins regarding the tenant's discussions with the applicant to clarify their position during the application process but did not receive a response. The representations received from Travis Perkins to the application have been covered in the officer's report.

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 Officer's recommendation is unchanged to APPROVE planning permission subject to the conditions and planning obligations set out in the officer's report.