

# DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Thursday, 12 March 2020 at 7.00 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:**

David Knight, Democratic Services  
1st Floor, Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove Crescent, E14 2BG  
Tel: 020 7364 4651  
E-mail:  
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.

	<b>PAGE NUMBER(S)</b>	<b>WARD(S) AFFECTED</b>
<b>5 .1 North and South Passage, Iron Mongers Place, E14</b>	<b>3 - 4</b>	<b>Island Gardens</b>
<b>5 .2 Brune House, Bell Lane &amp; Carter House, Brune Street &amp; Bernard House, Toynbee Street, London E1</b>	<b>5 - 8</b>	<b>Spitalfields &amp; Banglatown</b>
<b>5 .3 De Paul House, 628-634 Commercial Road, London, E14 7HS</b>	<b>9 - 10</b>	<b>Limehouse</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 5.1

## UPDATE REPORT, DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE. 12<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.1	PA/19/02040	North and South Passage, Ironmongers Place, London, E14	Variation of condition 4 of planning permission PA/13/01547 dated 10/10/2013, for the installation of new gates and barriers to a private footpath in a private housing development.  Variation to allow the gates to remain permanently locked.

### 1.0 NEW CONSULTATION RESPONSE

1.1 One additional external consultee response has been received from the Metropolitan Police. The response was received on 05/03/2020 and objects to the application. The points raised can be summarised as:

- Access to the passage would still be possible via Ironmongers Place, however the locking of the gates would result in natural surveillance being significantly or completely removed.
- Reduced natural surveillance may allow the passage to become a more attractive location for drug dealing, robbery, fly tipping and Anti-Social Behaviour.
- The passage being out of sight of local residents or being more difficult to access by police patrols would make it easier to store or discard stolen mopeds/cycles and aid burglary of surrounding properties.
- If the gates were locked, the design and location of the existing gating would allow the gates to be easily climbed and would not deter illegitimate users of the site.
- The following options have been recommended in lieu of the proposal to permanently lock the gates:
  - Enhancement and upgrade to the passage to improve local usage and natural surveillance; OR
  - Complete block off of the passage with access only provided for maintenance with minimum 2.4 metre robust barriers. Subject to an acceptable fire escape strategy in consultation with the London Fire Brigade and Building Control).

### 2.0 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 Officer recommendation remains that planning permission should be REFUSED for the reasons set out in the main report.

This page is intentionally left blank

## UPDATE REPORT, DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE. 12<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.2	PA/19/02849	Brune House, Bell Lane & Carter House, Brune Street & Bernard House, Toynbee Street, London, E1	Brune Street: Installation of 'conservation style' iron vehicle gate (height 1,800 mm); Replacement of existing railing with 'conservation style' iron railing resulting in additional 600 mm height (height 1,800 mm); Replacement of existing double gate with conservation style iron gate (height as existing). Toynbee Street: Replacement of existing single swing arm gate with 'conservation style' iron vehicular and pedestrian gate (height 1,800 mm); Replacement of x3 porous and staggered boundary fences with single 'conservation style' iron pedestrian gate (1,800 mm). (Application is a re-submission with additional information provided)

### 1.0 NEW CONSULTATION RESPONSE

1.1 One additional representation from the Holland Estate Residents TRA (representing the residents of Brune, Bernard, Carter and Barnet Houses) was received. The response was received on 11 March 2020 and supports to the application. The points raised can be summarised as follows:

- Further background on the housing stock transfer promises in 2006. The programme of works included lifts and perimeter security enhancements.
- PA/08/02347 granted permission for these works previously.
- There is reference in the committee report to resolving anti –social behaviour though other measures instead of the proposed security enhancements. Whilst this may be feasible for new build properties but not in the case of existing buildings and the way the buildings/spaces between the buildings work in reality.
- A scheme for gates at nearby Herbert and Jacobson House were recently approved by committee members and this has reduced anti-social behaviour.
- The night time economy has increased in the area which leads to drunken anti-social behaviour including street drug use/trade, noise nuisance and rough sleeping
- The recorded anti-social behaviour figures are high already but these figures are higher due to underreported of residents to the relevant authorities
- There has been a higher boundary wall between the street and the estate historically. This hasn't been considered.
- The new fencing is appropriate to the streetscape and provides a strong boundary that has always been there but with a more open and permeable feel.
- The proposed design is sympathetic to the conservation area and would enhance the current modern rails. The proposal is not considered to be overbearing.
- The proposal will not have an adverse impact on the accessibility and permeability to the local area and there will be no negative impact on equality or social cohesion as a result of the proposal.

## 1.2 Officer response:

- Paragraph 7.21 and 7.22 of the committee report provide officers comments on housing stock transfer promise in 2006. Whilst it is unfortunate that promises were not delivered, officers remain of the opinion that these works were not submitted as a formal planning submission and do not require consideration as part of this planning application presented to committee this evening
- From research in to the planning history, officers understand that conditions attached to PA/08/02347 have not all been discharged. This includes condition 3 (materials) and condition 7 (boundary treatment details). Given this and officers understanding of what has been build out on site, officers opinion is that the previous permission has not been fully implemented and cannot be fully implemented.
- Under PA/16/00254, planning permission was refused and later dismissed by the planning inspectorate for the erection of a 2.3 metre high metal security gate to Herbert and Jacobson House. PA/16/01628 subsequently allowed the single gate which was included as part of the variation to the parent consent PA/08/02347. Officers are of the opinion that this scheme is different to the proposal under consideration given that this is for a single gate down a narrower access point rather than gating the entire estate.
- Officer's comments regarding the anti-social behaviour matters are included in section 7.15 to 7.20 of the committee report. Officers remain of the opinion that alternative methods to alleviate anti-social behaviour could be considered. There is insufficient evidence provided to demonstrate the reduction in anti-social behaviour with the closing of the gates at Herbert and Jacobson House.
- Whilst there has been a wall historically, officers are of the opinion that the existing railings are less harmful to the conservation and streetscene especially in height and design terms. A simpler solution than currently proposed would therefore be beneficial. The previous wall also did not enclose the estate, thus not restricting movement within the estate and the wider area.
- Officers detailed comments regarding the impact on the conservation area and its setting, the impact of the proposal on the locality and the impact on accessible and inclusive communities is provided in the main body of the committee report.

## 1.3 Paragraph 4.2 of the committee report should also be updated to reference:

- 32 letters of representation were received in support plus a petition of 81 signatures. 31 individual representations were received in support (including a letter of support from Holland Estate Residents TRA) with 29 of these using a template response.

## 2.0 GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

### 2.1 Paragraph 8.1 under the Recommendation sub-heading, the following grounds of refusal to be included:

1. The proposed gates and railings would result in an incongruous form of development that would harm the local streetscape and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Wentworth Street Conservation Area and adjacent Artillery Passage Conservation Area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to

policies LP7.4, LP7.5, LP7.6 and LP7.8 of the London Plan (2016) and policies S.DH1, D.DH2 and S.DH3 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan (2020).

2. The proposed gates and railings would result in a gated community by segregating the estate from the public realm. This would negatively affect the social integration of the area and be contrary to the promotion of mixed and balanced communities. As such, the proposal would be contrary to policies LP3.9, LP7.2 and LP7.3 of the London Plan (2016) and policies D.DH2 and D.DH8 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan (2020).

### **3.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 Officer recommendation remains that planning permission should be REFUSED for the reasons set out above.

This page is intentionally left blank

## UPDATE REPORT, DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE. 12<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.3	PA/19/00804	De Paul House, 628-634 Commercial Road, London, E14 7HS	Demolition of existing building and erection of a building of seven storeys, inclusive of two set back floors, plus a lower ground floor to provide 109 rooms for short-term hostel and HMO accommodation. (amended description)

### 1.0 CLARIFICATION POINTS

- 1.1 The CGI included in the Committee report in Figure Three and Appendix 2 does not incorporate the latest changes which omitted the balcony from the first floor. As such, the relevant CGI can be found in the applicant's Design Response as shown below.



CGI of the proposed development

- 1.2 Paragraph 2.4 states the facilities provided on the ground floor. It should be noted that the kitchen/lounge is provided within the reception area. Whilst the applicant refers to this as café, it appears that it would cater for the future occupiers, rather than the wider public.
- 1.3 Paragraph 1.4 should mention that the Lowell Street conservation area is situated to the north-west of the application on the opposite side of Commercial Road.

- 1.4 Policy D.H7 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (2020) states that it is appropriate to use the Environmental Health standards for the purposes of a planning assessment. Paragraphs 7.35 and 7.38 should be read as follows:

*7.35 Local Plan policy D.H7 states that HMO accommodation should comply with relevant standards and satisfy the housing space standards outlined in policy D.H3.*

*Furthermore, the supporting text of policy D.H7 states that ‘Applicants should also ensure that HMOs satisfy the appropriate environmental health and fire standards’.*

*7.38 Whilst the HMO standards offer guidance on internal spaces including individual room sizes and communal indoor spaces, it seems appropriate to use the communal outdoor amenity space standard contained in policy D.H3 to ensure that the proposed housing accommodation is of the highest quality as required by planning policy.*

- 1.5 The assessment of the provided communal outdoor amenity space in the report did not include the communal balconies provided on the second, third and fourth floor. The updated table and paragraph 7.44 are provided below.

Number of rooms	Required communal outdoor amenity space	Provided communal outdoor amenity space
84	125sqm	65.3sqm (fifth floor) 3 x 14.9sqm (2 <sup>nd</sup> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> floors) 110sqm (total)

*7.44 The proposal would provide 110sqm of communal outdoor space in the form of communal balconies on floor 2-4 and a rooftop on the fifth floor. This would result in the provision of 1.3sqm for each room of the shared living accommodation and would fall short to provide the minimum requirement as stated above by 15sqm. As a comparison, the shared living accommodation at 767-785 Commercial Road included 310sqm of communal outdoor amenity spaces for 134 rooms. This resulted in an average of 2.3sqm per room and satisfied the minimum policy requirements.*

## **2.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 Officer recommendation remains that planning permission should be REFUSED for the reasons set out in the Committee report.