

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Thursday, 6 January 2022 at 6.30 p.m.

Council Chamber - Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove Crescent,
London, E14 2BG

This meeting is open to the public to attend.

Contact for further enquiries:

Zoe Folley, Democratic Services To view the meeting on
line: <https://towerhamlets.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>
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
an electronic
agenda:



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

	PAGE NUMBER(S)	WARD(S) AFFECTED
8. UPDATE REPORT	3 - 6	

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 8

UPDATE REPORT, DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE, 6th January 2022

Agenda item no	Reference no.	Location	Proposal / Title
6.1	PA/19/02608	Brunton Wharf Estate, Salmon Lane, E14	Construction of a part-four and part-nine storey building comprising 32 x Class C3 residential dwellings, hard and soft landscaping works, security enhancements, and the re-opening of an existing undercroft parking structure.

1 Clarifications and Corrections

1.1 Pursuant to Appendix 1 of the original Committee Report, the list of Drawing and Documents for approval to be amended to read:

- BRW_RSS_00_00_DR_A_0501 D03
- BRW_RSS_00_XX_DR_A_1001 D01
- BRW_RSS_00_XX_DR_A_1002 D01
- BRW_RSS_00_XX_DR_A_1003 D01
- BRW_RSS_00_XX_DR_A_1004 D01
- BRW_RSS_00_00_DR_A_1051 D01
- BRW_RSS_00_00_DR_A_1200 D04
- BRW_RSS_00_00_DR_A_1201 D13
- BRW_RSS_00_00_DR_A_1202 D11
- BRW_RSS_00_00_DR_A_1203 D08
- BRW_RSS_00_00_DR_A_1210 D08
- BRW_RSS_00_00_DR_A_1211 D04
- BRW_RSS_00_00_DR_A_1212 D01
- BRW_RSS_00_00_DR_A_1213 D01
- BRW_RSS_00_00_DR_A_1214 D03
- BRW_RSS_00_00_DR_A_1219 D01
- BRW_RSS_XX_XX_DR_A_1301 D02
- BRW_RSS_XX_XX_DR_A_1302 D02
- BRW_RSS_XX_XX_DR_A_1401 D04
- BRW_RSS_XX_XX_DR_A_1402 D05
- BRW_RSS_XX_XX_DR_A_1403 D06
- BRW_RSS_XX_XX_DR_A_1404 D05
- BRW_RSS_XX_XX_VS_A_8001 D01
- BRW_RSS_XX_XX_DR_A_8002 D01
- BRW_RSS_XX_00_DR_A_8003 D01
- BRW_RSS_00_00_DR_A_1230 D01
- BRW_RSS_00_00_DR_A_1231 D01
- BRW_RSS_00_00_DR_A_1250 D02
- BRW_RSS_ZZ_ZZ_DR_A_1410 D03
- BRW_RSS_ZZ_ZZ_DR_A_1430 D01
- BRW_RSS_ZZ_ZZ_DR_A_1431 D01
- BRW_RSS_XX_XX_DR_A_7002 D02
- BRW_RSS_XX_XX_DR_A_7004 D01
- BRW_RSS_XX_XX_DR_A_7005 D02
- BRW_RSS_00_00_DR_A_1240 D01
- 1967/03 RevA

- Design & Access Statement – Rivington Street Studio (November 2019)
- Planning Statement – Rivington Street Studio (December 2019)
- Air Quality Assessment – agb Environmental (December 2019)
- Foul Sewerage and Utilities Assessment – Scott White and Hopkins (November 2019)
- Environmental Noise Survey and Acoustic Design Statement Report – Hann Tucker Associates (October 2019)
- Construction Management Plan – Southdownssafety (November 2019)
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment – agb Environmental (September 2019)
- Sustainability and Energy Statement – Scott White and Hookins (May 2020)
-
- Transport Statement – Cottee Transport Planning (December 2019)
- Train Induced Noise and Vibration Assessment Report (Hann Tucker Associates (October 2019)
- Statement of Community Involvement – Rivington Street Studio – November 2019
- Ecological Impact Assessment – agb Environmental (April 2019)
- Phase 1 Geoenvironmental Desk Study – agb Environmental (April 2019)
- SUDS Report – Scott White and Hookins (December 2019)
- Daylight and Sunlight Assessment (Internal and External) – BRE (December 2019)
- Stage 1 Road Safety Audit dated 19/09/2021

2 Additional Representations

2.1 Since publication of the report, a petition containing 94 signatories has been received. The matters raised in the petition have been previously raised and reported, but for the benefit of doubt, they are listed below:

- The additional dwellings will lead to additional antisocial behaviour, parking pressure, congestion on local roads and inconvenience and disruption for residents and businesses
- Concern regarding whether the London Fire Bridge supports the revised scheme
- Overlooking of the Stephen Hawing School playground

2.2 In addition, since publication of the report, a number of additional letters of objection have been received from two individuals. These letters raised no new planning matters.

3 Recommendation

3.1 The Officer recommendation remains that planning permission should be GRANTED for the reasons set out in the main report and all conditions.

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
6.2	PA/21/01190/NC.	King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore, Glamis Road, Wapping, E1W 3EQ	The Thames Water Utilities Limited (Thames Tideway Tunnel) Order 2014 application to discharge Schedule 3 Requirements: KEMPF2 - Location of permanent works; KEMPF3 - Detailed design approval for permanent above-ground structures; KEMPF4 - Detailed design approval for signature ventilation columns; KEMPF5 - Detailed design approval for river wall and foreshore structure; KEMPF6 - Landscaping works; KEMPF14 - Surface water drainage; and PW11 - Interpretation strategy (project-wide requirement)

1 Additional Representations

- 1.1 One further letter was sent for the attention of Committee Members prior to the cancelled December 9th 2021 Development Committee meeting. Some of the points repeat those which are already set out in the Committee report. Although it added that the applicant's willingness to engage with resident concerns about safety, security and amenity is welcomed despite it not yet producing results. It also added that if Members accept Officers' recommendation then they could add an informative requesting that the applicant continues to work with Officers to modify the proposals to address these concerns.

2 Clarifications and Corrections

- 2.1 Figure 4 should be re-labelled as 'Flood defence strategy'.
- 2.2 Since the publication of the report, the applicant has stated the intention is for the three eastern ventilation columns to have a dark grey finish. Officers have re-consulted LBTH Place Shaping who raise no objection to this. Therefore, para. 8.26 should be amended to read *"The dark grey finish is considered to combine with the size, location and form of the three non-signature columns in a way that is acceptable to the appearance of proposed development and the wider park context."*
- 2.3 Para. 8.11 of the report incorrectly states the depth of the proposed kiosk. For clarity, the depth would be 4.223m and not 2.223m.
- 2.4 The drawing labelled 'proposed east elevation' in Appendix B actually shows the proposed west elevation.
- 2.5 For clarity, the cycle stands will be within the wider masterplan area of the park and not within the DCO area.

3 Recommendation

- 3.1 The Officer recommendation remains that all Requirements should be DISCHARGED.

This page is intentionally left blank