

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 7.30 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 12 FEBRUARY 2020**

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

**Members Present:**

Councillor John Pierce (Chair)  
Councillor Abdul Mukit MBE (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Val Whitehead  
Councillor Zenith Rahman  
Councillor Rabina Khan  
Councillor Sabina Akhtar  
Councillor Leema Qureshi (Substitute for Councillor Kevin Brady)

**Other Councillors Present:**

Councillor Peter Golds  
Councillor Andrew Wood

**Apologies:**

Councillor Kevin Brady  
Councillor Tarik Khan

**Officers Present:**

Paul Buckenham	– (Development Manager, Planning Services, Place)
Katie Cooke	– (Planning Officer, Place)
Kevin Crilly	– (Planning Officer, Place)
Gareth Gwynne	– (Area Planning Manager (West), Planning Services, Place)
Rachel Mckoy	– (Head of Commercial & Contracts, Legal Services Governance)
Simon Westmorland	– (West Area Team Leader, Planning Services, Place)
Zoe Folley	– (Committee Officer, Governance)

**1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

No interests were declared.

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

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Strategic Development Committee held on 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2020 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair, subject to the following: in relation to Item 6.1 Quay House, Admirals Way, London.

Pg 5 of the Minutes: Replace: 'the owners (of the Wardian Building) had been notified of the proposals and had not submitted any comments'

with:

'had not submitted an objections'.

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

The Committee RESOLVED that:

- 1) In the event of changes being made to recommendations by the Committee, the task of formalising the wording of those changes is delegated to the Corporate Director, Place along the broad lines indicated at the meeting; and
- 2) 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 is delegated authority to do so, provided always that the Corporate Director does not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision
- 3) To note the procedure for hearing objections at meetings of the Development Committee and the meeting guidance.

## 4. DEFERRED ITEMS

There are none.

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

### **5.1 Former News International Site, 1 Virginia Street, London, E98 1XY (PA/19/00766)**

Paul Buckenham, (Development Manager) introduced the application for the approval of reserved matters for Plot E of London Dock to provide a secondary school with associated works - pursuant to Condition 3 of planning permission PA/19/00764, related to the provision of details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and mix of the school. Due to the number of representations, the application had been brought to the Committee for determination. Since the Committee report had been published a further two representations in objection had been received bringing the total to 45 letters of representation. The representations did not raise any new material issues and the outcome of the consultation would be reported during the presentation.

Katie Cooke (Planning Services) presented the report, describing the site location and surrounds. The principle of development had been set by the site allocation and part outline part detailed (hybrid) application approved in 2014. The matters reserved for determination only concerned: appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and mix of the school and concerned Plot E.

Three rounds of consultation were carried out and 44 representations were received, including one general comment. Issues raised included: concerns around height of the proposal, the amenity impacts and lack of consultation.

Officers considered that the proposals reflected the outline permission in terms of: the appearance, scale, the layout. This included the creation of landscaping and public realm to facilitate pupil access. The proposals would maintain a high quality environment and would comply with the planning policy.

The sunlight and daylight impacts on neighbouring properties were assessed as part of the s.73 application which was approved in November 2019 This had not changed. Therefore Officers remained of the view that the impacts in this regard as well as the impacts generally on amenity, would be minimal due to the conditions

Given the merits of the application, the Committee were recommended to approve the reserved matters application.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Amanda Atkins addressed the Committee in objection on behalf of the residents of Telford Yard. Whilst not opposed to the provision of the school, she expressed concern about the impact on the Telford Yard that was a local heritage building. This was on the basis of the amenity issues, including noise from the proposed ventilation plant for the scheme. She also objected to the scale of the proposed school and the choice of location in one of the worst

polluted areas in London and the highway impacts. The issues had worsened since 2014.

Councillor Peter Golds, expressed concerns about the layout, appearance and landscaping issues. He stated that the local highway was one of the most polluted highways in London. The issues had worsened over recent years. This application failed to take into account the air quality issues. The pupils would suffer as a result. He also considered that there had been a fall in pupil numbers in the west of the borough, so this may result in an oversupply of school places.

Jennifer Woods (Planning consultant) spoke in support of the application. She provided further assurances that the plans complied with the hybrid application. She also provided assurances about the measures set out in the various control documents, that included an updated environmental assessment that had been robustly tested, and the quality of the design.

Vanessa Ogden (Executive Head Teacher, Mulberry School Academy) also addressed the Committee in support. She reported on the proposed school management arrangements. In particular the measures to ensure pupil safety. It was also confirmed that a number of the facilities would be open to the public. Every effort would be made to consult and listen to views about the management of the school.

#### Committee's Questions to Officers

In response to questions about the pollution issues, it was reported that:

- An update environmental statement had been submitted, as part of the minor material amendment's (Section 73) application
- Various locations were assessed, and the findings showed that these issues would accord with guidance
- A condition had been attached to ensure windows of the school would be sealed facing the Highway. The Council's Environmental Health Team considered that the measures were appropriate.

In response to questions about the width of the pavement and the access issues, it was noted that

- Access to and from the site would be controlled by conditions, through such measures as the use of marshals to manage student movements
- It was considered that the layout of the scheme should provide sufficient space for pupils to come and go (due to measures such as the setting back of the building and the provision of space to prevent students congregating on the highway).

In response to questions about the coach parking arrangements, the following issues were noted.

- Condition 57, of the outline permission, (as amended), concerned this issue. Details of the changes were set out in the Committee report. In summary the Council in consultation with TfL and LBTH Highways had advised the applicant to explore a more suitable place for coach parking given the issues with the narrowness of Virginia Street and Pennington Street.
- It was confirmed that condition 57 requires that a Road Safety Audit must be submitted, exploring the options for a suitable location for coach parking, for prior approval by the Council.

In response to further questions, it was noted that should this reserved matters application be approved, as part of the previous permission, conditions shall be secured in respect of public access to the facilities in accordance with the Sports England advice.

#### Questions to the applicant's representative

In response to questions about air pollution, Ms Ogden commented that, with the mitigation proposed, the pupils should benefit from clean air.

Regarding the access arrangements, she confirmed that the scheme had been carefully planned to ensure: the provision of safe and secure access for pupils and areas for the public to use. Other measures secured to facilitate pupil safety included: the closure of access points to the highway during the PM departure and the provision of a new pedestrian crossing across the highway.

On a vote 7 in favour, and 0 against, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That the reserved matters application is **GRANTED** at Former News International Site, 1 Virginia Street, London, E98 1XY for the following development subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Committee report.
  - Application for the approval of reserved matters for Plot E of London Dock to provide a secondary school with six forms of entry and a sixth form, a basement, public realm and school play space facilities, parking and associated highways works pursuant to Condition 3 of planning permission PA/19/00764, related to the provision of details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and mix of the school. (PA/19/00766)

**6. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS**

**6.1 Pre - Application Presentation: Stroudley Walk Market, Stroudley Walk, London (PF/18/00163)**

The Committee noted the contents of the report and pre-application presentation

The meeting ended at 9.20 p.m.

Chair, Councillor John Pierce  
Strategic Development Committee