

STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 14 May 2019 at 5.30 p.m.

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

UPDATE REPORT

This meeting is open to the public to attend.

Contact for further enquiries:

Zoe Folley, Democratic Services

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

Tel: 020 7364 4877

E-mail: Zoe.Folley@towerhamlets.gov.uk

Web: <http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/committee>

Scan this code for
electronic agenda:



This page is intentionally left blank

UPDATE REPORT OF DIVISIONAL DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
4.1	PA/18/00917	Site Bound by Raven Row Stepney Way, Sidney Street, London, E1	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of three blocks ranging from 1 to 26 storeys in height comprising 648 residential units, commercial floorspace, 32 off-street car parking spaces, communal courtyards, associated landscaping and associated ancillary works. This application is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment.

1.0 CLARIFICATIONS

- 1.1 At paragraph 2.7 in the report, residential floorspace in the table should read 54,326sqm rather than 54,124sqm.
- 1.2 Contrary to that set out in 7.65, a recent Historic England update means that the site is now included in the Mile End Archaeological Priority Area.
- 1.3 Paragraph 8.3 details the non-financial obligations to be secured should permission be granted. Part b ‘*access to employment*’ incorrectly refers to: **13** x end-user phase apprenticeships. Part b ‘*access to employment*’ should read as follows:
 - b. Access to employment
 - 20% local procurement
 - 20% local labour in construction
 - 39 construction phase apprenticeships
 - **1 x end-user phase apprenticeship**
 - Advertise vacancies through skillsmatch
 - 10% of B1 floorspace to be ‘affordable’ (90% of market rents)

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 Officer’s recommendation to GRANT planning permission, subject to the recommended planning conditions and planning obligations and any direction by the Mayor of London, as set out in the Committee Report, is unchanged.

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
4.2	PA/18/03088	London Docklands Travelodge Hotel, Coriander Avenue, London, E14 2AA	Outline application (with all matters reserved) for the demolition of existing Travelodge Hotel (Use Class C1) and erection of a data centre (Use Class B8).

1.0 ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS IN SUPPORT

1.1 Three representations in support were received and can be summarised as follows:

- The scheme will bring job opportunities to the community
- The scheme will renovate the area
- The increased footfall will help the local economy
- The scheme is eye catching and will add value to the area

1.2 They raise no new planning issues.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 Officer's recommendation is unchanged, and is to **grant** planning permission.

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
4.3	PA/18/03089	Site north west of Leamouth Road Roundabout, Leamouth Road, London	Erection of 19 storey building (up to maximum height of 64.250 metres AOD) to provide a new 350 room hotel (Use Class C1) together with ancillary restaurant and bar, car parking, cycle parking and landscaping.

2.0 ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS IN SUPPORT

2.1 Three representations in support were received and can be summarised as follows:

- The scheme will bring job opportunities to the community
- The scheme will renovate the area
- The increased footfall will help the local economy
- The scheme is eye catching and will add value to the area

2.2 They raise no new planning issues.

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

3.1 Officer's recommendation is unchanged, and is to **grant** planning permission.

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.1	PA/18/01877	Westferry Printworks, 235 Westferry Road, E14 8NX	Comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment comprising 1,524 residential units (Class C3), shops, offices, flexible workspaces, financial and professional services, restaurants and cafés, drinking establishments (Classes B1/A1/A2/A3/A4) and community uses (Class D1), car and cycle basement parking, associated landscaping, new public realm and all other necessary enabling works.

1. ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

1.1 The following additional representations have been received:

Chair of Leaseholders Management Committee for a block of flats opposite the entrance to the Printworks on Westferry Road

1.2 Residents are concerned about the additional development proposal for the following reasons:

- a. The scale is unacceptable not following local planning authority tall buildings guidance.
- b. The proposals suggest that there is justification for an array of tall buildings because they will merge into the tall building skyline seen from Greenwich. This does not consider the vista from everywhere.
- c. In this south west corner of the Island, the local height of tall buildings is set by the Barkantine Towers at 22 floors. The proposals are more than double this.
- d. The development fails to follow local planning advice about clusters or grouping of tall towers – if it is approved there will be a large mass of towers over a large area of the Isle of Dogs, rather than a small cluster.
- e. Failure to follow the step down from Canary Wharf required by Tower Hamlets Tall Building Study or the Isle of Dogs and Poplar OAPF. It will be a big “step up” from the Barkantine district that sits between Canary Wharf and the Printworks site, dwarf the surrounding low level residential streets, overshadowing and overwhelming the people living nearby.
- f. The limited proportion of green space proposed compared to the increase in population density will make the ratio of green space worse on this corner of the Isle of Dogs with adverse health impacts.
- g. The tall towers will create fierce winds with a serious impact of the safety of young sailors at the Sailing Centre that may be forced to close.
- h. Insufficient attention given to how some of the buildings will be serviced e.g. B01 where service vehicles will have to use Westferry Road that will be busy with children and adults using the bus stop or crossing the road to the existing and the new school.
- i. Transport infrastructure on the Isle of Dogs is not sufficient to cope with such a high residential density.
- j. Limited public engagement by the developer.
- k. The proposals will not provide a sustainable development that will provide a viable and thriving community.

These raise no new issues not already considered in the Committee item.

Canary Wharf Ward Councillor

- 1.3 The Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site Management Plan (Third Review 2014) has plans (from page 122) showing building height contour lines that trigger consideration by the World Heritage Executive. A 20-storey boundary is shown at Westferry Printworks.
- 1.4 Officers confirm that the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Co-ordinator, UNESCO and the Royal borough of Greenwich have been consulted. The Royal borough has objected to the proposals (paragraph 9.36 of the Committee Report).

2 . AMENDMENTS TO REFUSAL REASONS 1 & 4

- 2.1 Some policy references are omitted from recommended Refusal Reasons 1 and 4 in the Committee item. The Reasons should read:

Reason 1 - Townscape and visual impact

“The height and mass of the development within its local context would not be proportionate to the site’s position outside of the Canary Wharf major centre, outside the Crossharbour District Centre and would fail to provide an appropriate transition in height between Canary Wharf and the lower rise buildings of the existing townscape. The proposed scale, height and massing would result in a development that would be overbearing, unduly prominent in local views and more distant views and detract from the local context on the Isle of Dogs, the Canary Wharf Skyline of Strategic Importance, the Greenwich Maritime and Tower of London World Heritage Sites including the Grade 1 listed Tower Bridge. The proposed development therefore fails to respect the features that contribute to the area’s character and local distinctiveness and demonstrates clear symptoms of over development and excessive height. This is contrary to London Plan 2016 Policies 7.4 ‘*Local Character*’, 7.6 ‘*Architecture*’, 7.7 ‘*Tall and large scale buildings*’, 7.8 ‘*Heritage assets*’, 7.10 ‘*World Heritage Sites*’, 7.11 ‘*London View Management Framework*’ and 7.12 ‘*Implementing the London View Management Framework*’, Tower Hamlets Core Strategy 2010 Strategic Objectives SO22 & SO23 and Policies SP10 ‘*Creating distinct & durable places*’ and SP12 ‘*Delivering placemaking*’, Managing Development Document 2013 Policies DM24 ‘*Place sensitive design*’, DM26 ‘*Building heights*’ DM28 ‘*World Heritage Sites*’ and Site Allocation 18, together with the London View Management Framework SPG 2012 and the Maritime Greenwich and Tower of London WHS Management Plans.”

Reason 4 - Housing mix and choice

“An affordable housing offer that fails to provide a satisfactory ratio between social rent and intermediate housing would conflict with London Plan Policies 3.8 ‘*Housing choice*’, 3.11 ‘*Affordable housing targets*’ and 3.12 ‘*Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes*’ together with Tower Hamlets Core Strategy Policy SP02 ‘*Urban living for everyone*’ and Managing Development Document Policy DM3 ‘*Delivering homes*.’

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 Officer’s recommend that the Secretary of State is informed that were the Committee empowered to determine the application it would have refused planning permission for the amended Refusal Reasons 1 & 4 above together with Reasons 2, 3.& 5 within the Committee item..

This page is intentionally left blank