

# Strategic Development Committee

## Supplemental Agenda – Update reports

**Thursday, 1 December 2022 6.30 p.m.  
Council Chamber - Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove  
Crescent, London, E14 2BG**

### **5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION**

#### **5.1 South Dock Bridge, London (PA/21/00885) (Pages 7 - 8)**

Update report

#### **5.2 Royal Mint Court, London, EC3N 4QN (PA/21/01327 & PA/21/01349) (Pages 9 - 12)**

Update report



This page is intentionally left blank

**STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE 1 DECEMBER 2022  
UPDATE REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL**

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.1	PA/21/00885	South Dock Bridge  (Land on the north and south side of South Dock, including dock area and Upper Bank Street)	Construction of a new pedestrian footbridge to connect South Quay and Canary Wharf in Isle of Dogs, to align with Upper Bank Street on the north bank of the London South Dock, and the Berkeley Homes 'South Quay Plaza' scheme on the south bank, including landscaping on Upper Bank Street and other associated works.

## 1. PLANNING CONDITIONS

- 1.1 Minor changes are proposed to the trigger points for the submission of details to be approved by condition.
- 1.2 The 'Prior to Occupation' sub-heading replaced by 'Prior to the first public use'. Conditions 24 (Wayfinding Signage) and 24 (Cycle Signage) remain under this category.
- 1.3 Condition 15 'Bridge Operation and Maintenance Plan' moved from 'Pre-commencement' sub-heading to 'Prior to first public use'.
- 1.4 Condition 21 'Secure by Design' moved from 'Pre-superstructure works' sub-heading to 'Prior to first public use'.
- 1.5 Condition 6 renamed 'Design and material details' and moved from 'Pre-superstructure works' sub-heading to 'Pre-commencement'.

## 2. ADDITIONAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 2.1 An additional follow-up representation was received from a neighbour which re-emphasises their original comments relating to potential begging and users dumping rubbish.
- 2.2 Whilst in favour of the bridge, it notes "*the need to implement the right strategies to avoid it becoming a waste dumping site and to take measures to avoid begging on the bridge. The beggars on the existing [Wilkinson Eyre] bridge are the cause of significant amounts of waste being thrown into the canal.*"

## 3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 As per the original recommendation to GRANT planning permission, subject to the amended trigger points for the planning conditions set out in section 1 of this report.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 5.2

## STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE 1 DECEMBER 2022 UPDATE REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.2	PA/21/01327 (Full Planning Permission)  PA/21/01349 (Listed Building Consent)	Royal Mint Court, London, EC3N 4QN	<p><u>Planning application</u> Redevelopment of the site to provide an embassy (Sui Generis use class), involving the refurbishment and restoration of the Johnson Smirke Building (Grade II listed), partial demolition, remodelling and refurbishment of Seaman's Registry (Grade II listed), with alterations to the west elevation of the building, the retention, part demolition, alterations and extensions to Murray House and Dexter House, the erection of a standalone entrance pavilion building, alterations to the existing boundary wall and demolition of substation, associated public realm and landscaping, highway works, car and cycle parking and all ancillary and associated works.</p> <p><u>Listed building consent</u> Refurbishment and restoration of the Johnson Smirke Building (Grade II listed), partial demolition, remodelling and refurbishment of the Seaman's Registry (Grade II listed), with alterations to the west elevation of the building, the retention, along with part demolition and alterations to the existing boundary wall and front railings and demolition of substation, associated landscaping, and all ancillary and associated works.</p>

### 1. MAYOR OF LONDON STAGE 1 UPDATE

- 1.1 In their stage 1 response the Greater London Authority planning officers (GLA) on behalf of the Mayor of London, stated that, *“Car parking levels do not accord with the London Plan and the applicant should address the other transport concerns set out in this report, especially in relation to the detailed highway arrangements.”*
- 1.2 Subsequently, the GLA have confirmed that their position on highways issues is the same as the strategic highways authority, Transport for London (TfL) who confirmed that they have no objection subject to the highways related conditions and obligations secured, to go with planning approval.

### 2. ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 2.1 Since publication of the report a further 5 representations in objection have been received including from Tower Hamlets Neighbourhood Watch Association, Councillor Faroque Mahfuz Ahmed and an updated response from Royal Mint Estate Tenant and Resident Association.
- 2.2 The total representations now received from residents and stakeholders is 58, including 2 general comments.
- 2.3 A number of topics have been repeated from previous submissions and a summary of the main issues raised in objection are listed below.

- No contact made with residents directly and failure to consult properly
- Residents were ignored by the applicant's PR company
- No social tenants have been invited to the resident's engagement meetings
- Question whether the committee has the expertise to make a decision on the application and they are inadequately trained
- Insufficient jobs and no retail
- Removes open space within the site
- Inhibits the potential of the previous mixed use consent coming forward
- Creates hostile spaces
- Police resources are already stretched
- Terrorist attacks
- Will increase ASB
- Muslims may feel targeted
- Unsure how long construction will take
- Residents should be given temporary accommodation when construction is ongoing due to personal illnesses
- Failure to notify various emergency planning bodies
- This will have an enormous impact on Royal Mint Estate
- Protests would impact on major roads nearby
- Royal Mint Green may be used by protestors to prepare or camp, causing disruption
- Apartments and car parking will impact on local infrastructure
- Blast assessment has not been made public and officers and members do not have security clearance to view it
- No consideration of agent of change principle in regard to noise
- Cultural Exchange building will be damaging to the conservation area and World Heritage Site
- Applicant country is a material consideration
- Concerned about the building becoming a secret police station
- Concerned about the violent assault of protesters at the Manchester Chinese Consulate
- Concerned about the actions of the Chinese government in relation to other countries and human rights record
- UK government have warned against China
- Non-compliant procurement process and conflict of interest in appointment of the blast assessor

Councillor issues raised on behalf of constituents:

- Concerns over human rights record of China
- Impact on Muslim community and local mosques
- Could become a secret police station
- Residents may be dragged from their homes in the middle of the night
- Terrorist attacks on Royal Mint Estate who were not consulted properly

- Impact of protests on safety of residents

### **3. CORRECTIONS**

- 3.1 On page 1 of the committee report, “*Public consultation (including Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA),)*” is dated as 30/06/2020 but this should be 30/06/2021.
- 3.2 Para 7.11 of the committee report should include, “*It is understood that the proposed ancillary staff accommodation units would be split as 50% dual aspect and 50% single aspect.*”
- 3.3 Para 7.153 of the committee report should include, “*A final version of the Travel Plan would be secured and monitored by S106 legal agreement, subject to approval.*”
- 3.4 Para 7.155 of the committee report should include, “*Access for cyclists is proposed via the servicing access on East Smithfield and is also available on Royal Mint Street adjacent to Cycle Superhighway 3.*”
- 3.5 Para 7.158 of the committee report should include, “*The existing site egress on to Royal Mint Street would be retained for cars only, not larger delivery or servicing vehicles.*”
- 3.6 The ‘Energy & Environmental Sustainability’ section contains duplicate paragraphs 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4. Para 7.4 of the ‘Energy & Environmental Sustainability’ section should be disregarded.

### **4. UPDATED PLANS**

- 4.1 The following amended plans have been provided since publication of the committee report:
- Landscape Masterplan (P20145-00-001-GIL-0100 Rev 10)
  - Proposed Works Cartwright Street Entrance Masterplan (B4-\_11\_19 Rev 01)

### **5. PLANNING CONDITIONS AND OBLIGATIONS**

- 5.1 In para 8.7 of the committee report, under ‘Prior to Occupation’ conditions, an additional condition should be included as follows:

*“Details of low reflectance glass for windows facing out to Mansell Street in the Seaman’s Registry building, with a reflectance no more than the existing glass (or that of clear glass, either single or double depending on what is there now, if the exact type of glass cannot be determined).”*

### **6. RECOMMENDATION**

- 6.1 The officer recommendation to grant planning permission and listed building consent remains, subject to:
- Additional planning condition regarding solar glare of windows on Mansell Street from the Seaman’s Registry building

This page is intentionally left blank