

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 6.30 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 10 OCTOBER 2019**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, 1ST FLOOR, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE  
CRESCENT, LONDON, E14 2BG**

**Members Present:**

Councillor Abdul Mukit MBE (Chair) (up to and including Item 5.1 only)

Councillor John Pierce

Councillor Mufeedah Bustin

Councillor Leema Qureshi (up to and including Item 5.1 only)

Councillor Rajib Ahmed (Substitute for Councillor Dipa Das) (Item 5.2 only)

**Other Councillors Present:**

Councillor Dan Tomlinson (As registered speaker for Item 5.2 only)

**Officers Present:**

Fleur Francis – (Team Leader - Planning, Legal Services  
Governance)

Adam Garcia – (Senior Planning Officer, Place Directorate)

Gareth Gwynne – (Area Planning Manager (West), Planning  
Services, Place)

Piotr Lanoszka – (Canary Wharf & Strategic Projects Lead)

Joel West – (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

**Apologies:**

Councillor Dipa Das

**1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

Councillor Abdul Mukit declared an interest in respect of item 5.2 stating that he had a close relationship with the applicant and would be withdrawing from the meeting for the duration of the item.

Councillor Rajib Ahmed declared an interest in respect of item 5.2 stating that he knew the applicant.

Councillor Mufeedah Bustin declared an interest in respect of item 5.2 stating that she knew the applicant.

Councillor John Pierce declared an interest in respect of item 5.2 stating that he knew the applicant.

Councillor Leema Qureshi declared an interest in respect of item 5.2 stating that she had a close relationship with the applicant and would be withdrawing from the meeting for the duration of the item.

Councillor Dan Tomlinson (present from Item 5.2 and participating as a registered speaker only in the item) declared an interest in respect of item 5.2 stating that he knew the applicant and objectors and would be withdrawing from the meeting prior to deliberation and voting by the Committee.

## **2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)**

The Committee **RESOLVED**

1. That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 19 September 2019 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## **3. RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS AND MEETING GUIDANCE**

The Committee **RESOLVED** that:

1. The procedure for hearing objections and meeting guidance be noted.
2. In the event of changes being made to recommendations by the Committee, the task of formalising the wording of those changes be delegated to the Corporate Director, Place along the broad lines indicated at the meeting; and
3. In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/informatives/planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Corporate Director, Place be delegated authority to do so, provided always that the Corporate Director does not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision

## **4. DEFERRED ITEMS**

There were no deferred items.

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

### **5.1 City Hotel, 12-20 Osborn Street, London, E1 6TE (PA/19/01301)**

An update report was tabled.

Gareth Gwynne introduced the application for part 4, 5 and 6 storey rear extension plus partial basement and associated internal changes to the existing hotel to create an additional 153 rooms, external alterations to the

Osborn Street elevation, cycle parking facilities, disabled car parking, plant, demolition of rear buildings within car park and other associated works.

Adam Garcia (Planning Services) presented the report describing the nature of the site and the surrounding area, and the outcome of the consultation, resulting in the receipt by the Council of 37 Letters of representation, 37 letters of objection and 1 petition in objection of 60 signatures. Mr Garcia summarised the comments raised in objection to the proposal.

Mr Garcia briefly summarised the results of the assessments relating to:

- Land use
- Design and heritage
- Impact on amenity of the surrounding residential properties, including the impacts on sunlight and daylight;
- Overshadowing and impact on outlook, privacy and sense of enclosure at Green Dragon Yard; and
- Impact on outlook, privacy and sense of enclosure at 22-30 Osborn Street.

Finally Mr Garcia provided a summary of proposed transport and servicing procedures and outlined the proposed planning obligations.

Officers considered that the application, complied with policy so should be granted.

The Chair invited the registered speakers to address the Committee.

Matt Cassini and Ahmed Boudeffeur expressed concerns about the scheme regarding the following issues:

- The application included little effort to mitigate the impact on local residents.
- Applicant's public engagement had been inadequate and misleading.
- The proposal would have a detrimental impact on community safety.
- Assumptions in the application have gone unchallenged.
- There is insufficient evidence for an increased demand for hotel rooms.
- Concerns about fire risks and escape routes.
- Construction noise and dust and impact on air pollution.
- Vehicles would cause an obstruction when turning in the street.
- Overshadowing and loss of daylight to neighbouring residents.
- Loss of residents' privacy by being overlooked.
- Access to Green Dragon Yard would be hindered.
- Detrimental impact on waste management.
- Detrimental impacts on biodiversity and health.

Gareth Jackson and Kevin Francis addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant and made the following points:

- Consultation with residents had been thorough.
- Demand for increased hotel places is evident.

- The applicant has made changes to the proposals to address residents' concerns.
- Significant efforts have been taken to ensure fire safety.
- Whilst the applicant had made genuine efforts to obtain floor plans of Green Dragon Yard, none were available.
- Daylight tests indicate only moderate loss of daylight with levels consistent with those in the locality as indicated in the officer's report.

#### Questions to Officers

In response to questions, officers explained that the Highways Service had reported no significant concerns with potential impact on the street including parking, turning, impact on local businesses etc. Officers provided further detail on the tests used to determine the loss of daylight and sunlight to affected properties. Further to questions regarding fire risk concerns of objectors, officers advised that fire strategies were outside the scope of planning and are addressed at building control stage. Officers also responded to questions around land use, specifically as to why this site is considered suitable for a hotel and would prove challenging to provide housing.

#### Questions to Applicants team

In response to question about the refuse arrangements the applicant's representative provided details of how the hotel's proposed refuse management would mitigate the impact on neighbouring roads through a 'just in time' system'.

On a vote of 2 in favour 2 against, with the Chair exercising a **casting** vote in favour, the Committee **RESOLVED**:

1. That planning permission be **GRANTED** at City Hotel, 12-20 Osborn Street, London, E1 6TE (PA/19/01301) SUBJECT to the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the following planning obligations set out in paragraphs 8.2 and 8.3 of the report
2. That the Corporate Director of Place is delegated the power to negotiate the legal agreement. If within three months of the resolution the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director for Place is delegated power to refuse planning permission.
3. That the Corporate Director of Place is delegated the power to impose conditions and informatives to address the matters set out in paragraphs 8.6 and 8.7 of the report.

#### **ELECTION OF CHAIR**

Councillors Abdul Mukit and Leema Qureshi left the meeting prior to the start of this item.

As the Chair had left the meeting and the deputy chair was not present, the Clerk asked the Committee to elect a person to preside.

Councillor Rajib Ahmed proposed and Councillor Mufeedah Bustin seconded a proposal that Councillor John Pierce be elected Chair for the remainder of the meeting. On a vote of 3 in favour, none against, the Committee

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Councillor John Pierce be elected Chair for the remainder of the meeting

**5.2 96-98 Bromley High Street, London, E3 3EG PA/19/00256**

Gareth Gwynne introduced the application for demolition of the existing building to construct a four storey residential building containing 4 x two bedroom units, 2 x one bedroom units and 1 x three bedroom unit with associated cycle parking spaces, private amenity space and other associated works.

Piotr Lanoszka (Planning Services) presented the report describing the nature of the site and the surrounding area, and the outcome of the consultation, resulting in the receipt by the Council of 10 letters of objection and 1 petition in objection of 39 signatures. Mr Lanoszka summarised the comments raised in objection to the proposal.

Mr Lanoszka briefly summarised the results of the assessments relating to land use; housing; design; heritage; impact on neighbour amenity; highways and transport; and the environment.

Officers considered that the application, complied with policy so should be granted.

The Chair invited the registered speakers to address the Committee.

Susan Christopher and Keith Cunningham expressed concerns about the scheme regarding the following issues:

- Massing and scale of the proposal is inappropriate and would make it out of character with other buildings in the locality.
- Impact on parking stress in the locality.
- Risk to nearby tree and car park.
- Loss of residents privacy through being overlooked.
- Major loss of daylight.
- Disruption and noise of development.
- Stress and impact on health of residents, including vulnerable residents
- Claims of a factual inaccuracy in the case officer's report: the distance between the proposed development and 1A Priory Street being 6.5m (not 12.5m).
- Objectors have engaged an independent daylight consultant to review proposals. The consultant's report was not mentioned in the case officer's report.
- Flaws in the assessment of sunlight and daylight loss.

Councillor Dan Tomlinson addressed the Committee. Councillor Tomlinson stressed that he was not opposed in principle to development on this site, but wished to express concerns about this scheme regarding the following issues:

- The cumulative impact of development in Bromley North is concerning to residents.
- Concern over reports of inaccuracies in the report regarding distance of 1A and 1B Priory Street from the proposal and of the address of nearby properties being incorrect.
- Further impact on parking stress in the locality.
- The major adverse impact on daylight/sunlight of affected properties, as indicated in the report, must be tested against Council policies not to approve schemes that would have significant material detriment to daylight and sunlight of local residents.

The applicant's representatives indicated they did not wish to address the Committee, but were on hand to respond to any questions it had on the application or points raised.

#### Questions to Officers

In response to questions, officers explained that:

- The reported distance of 1A and 1B Priory Street from the proposal was correctly stated in the report as 12.5m as the distance between principal elevations; however the distance is closer when the ground floor extension to 1A Priory Street is taken into account.
- The locality included a variety of buildings of different scale and height and the proposal would therefore not be out of character.
- Conditions already proposed would mitigate the loss of privacy and impact of noise on local residents (for example the obscure glazing on some windows).
- No impact was anticipated to neighbouring car park or tree.
- Work had been undertaken with Historic England to ensure acceptable safeguards to archaeological loss. Previous planning applications on the site had not provided such safeguards.
- Provision of housing at the site was in line with Council priorities and formed the main public benefit of the scheme to weigh against negative impacts.
- Whilst daylight loss to some neighbouring properties was significant, this proposal is acceptable as retained levels are considered good for an urban location.

#### Questions to Applicants team

In response to questions, the applicant's representatives explained that loss of parking provision would be limited to the removal of the current residential driveway and that the proposal is for a car-free development.

Councillor Dan Tomlinson left the meeting at this point.

Councillor John Pierce proposed and Councillor Mufeedah Bustin seconded a proposal that the application be deferred for the reasons set out

below. On a vote of 3 in favour, none against, the Committee **RESOLVED**:

1. That the application for 96-98 Bromley High Street, London, E3 3EG (PA/19/00256) be **DEFERRED** pending a site visit.

The Committee was minded to defer the application for a site visit for the following reason:

- To establish the distance of the properties at 1A and 1B Priory Street from the rear elevation of the proposed building.

In accordance with Development Procedural Rules, the application was **DEFERRED** in order to undertake a site visit.

## 6. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

There were no other planning matters.

The meeting ended at 8.35 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Abdul Mukit MBE  
Development Committee