

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 6.30 P.M. ON TUESDAY, 17 MARCH 2020**

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

**Members Present:**

Councillor Kevin Brady  
Councillor Val Whitehead  
Councillor Zenith Rahman  
Councillor Rabina Khan  
Councillor Tarik Khan  
Councillor Dipa Das (Substitute)

**Other Councillors Present:**

None

**Apologies:**

Councillor John Pierce  
Councillor Abdul Mukit MBE  
Councillor Sabina Akhtar

**Officers Present:**

Jerry Bell	– (Area Planning Manager (East), Planning Services, Place)
Piotr Lanoszka	– (Regeneration Manager, Place )
Rachel Mckoy	– (Head of Commercial & Contracts, Legal Services Governance)
Zoe Folley	– (Committee Officer, Governance)

**Election of Chair for the meeting**

In the absence of the Chair and the Vice Chair of the Committee, the Committee agreed the appointment of Councillor Kevin Brady to act as the Chair for the meeting

**1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest.

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

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Strategic Development Committee held on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2020 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) 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 were no items.

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

### **5.1 267-269 East India Dock Road (PA/19/01838)**

Update report tabled.

Jerry Bell, (Applications Team Leader), introduced the application for internal and external alterations to the existing residential units at no. 267 East India Dock Road and proposed erection of a 163-bedroom hotel with associated works.

Piotr Lanoszka (Planning Services), presented the application, describing the site location and the character of the area in the Crisp Street District Centre. The site had good transport links and had been assessed as unsuitable for a residential development due to the air quality issues. Members also noted the scheme layout. There had been consultation on the application resulting in 2 representations in objection and 1 in support and the issues raised were noted.

It was noted that:

- That the proposed hotel use complied with the policy. A hotel led use would therefore be a suitable use for this site
- The regeneration benefits of the application were strong, including the creation of jobs and increased footfall to the area, that would benefit the local economy.
- The design of the building, (comprising a tower and a podium) would fit in and enhance the area. Details of the materials were noted
- The height of the building when viewed from outside All Saints Churchyard would be broadly the same as the apparent height of the Blackwell Reach Development. The proposals had been assessed in relation to the new Tall Building Zones in the new Local Plan. It was considered that the proposal met the criteria for tall buildings outside the tall building zone, with the exception of part 3 b, regarding strategic infrastructure. However, given the mitigating factors set out in the report and the merits of the application, it was considered that this deficiency is not sufficient enough to warrant refusal. The update report summarised the urban design case for the proposal as a landmark of district importance to mark the eastern end of the Chrisp Street District Centre and provided a detailed assessment of the proposal in relation to the tall buildings policy.
- Whilst a number of neighbouring residential properties would experience moderate to major adverse impacts in terms of daylight levels it was considered that the residual levels would remain reasonable for a dense urban location, as detailed in the daylight and sunlight assessment.
- Given the measures to protect privacy and the angle of inter-visibility, it was considered that the impacts in terms of privacy and overlooking would be limited.
- The site had good transport links and would be car free with the exception of the provision of 2 accessible disabled spaces. A Travel plan would be secured to control coach parking and other issues.
- A range of planning obligations would be secured.
- Officers were recommending that the permission was granted subject to satisfactory completion of an archaeological borehole assessment, conditions and planning obligations as set out in the report and stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

With the permission of the Chair, a representative of Mrs Nilufar Chowdhury, the registered speaker, addressed the meeting. They expressed objections about:

- Noise from construction works to their nearby property, especially in view of the recent problems with disturbance from construction impacts
- Impact on privacy given the proximity of their windows to the development.
- Overshadowing and light loss.
- That a hotel would be out of keeping with the surrounding residential area.
- Increased parking and highway congestion from use of the hotel.

Narinder Assi addressed the meeting on behalf of the applicant. He reported the following issues.

- That the current site was an eyesore and the proposal represented a good opportunity to regenerate a site given its lack of ability to provide residential housing.
- That the design of the proposal had evolved over time.
- There had been two rounds of consultation. The scheme had been amended to address the concerns regarding the height of the scheme and also to provide such measures as obscure glazing to address amenity issues
- The Greater London Authority broadly supported the scheme.
- That the proposal would have no sign impact on the highway and supported sustainable forms of transport

#### Committee's Questions to Officers.

The Committee asked questions about: the GLA's and the LBTH Design Officers comment on the development and the height of the development.

In response it was noted that:

- Given the characteristics of the site, Officers considered that the height of the building was acceptable. The report set out a number of the site specific reasons for approving this scheme on this site. Future applications would need to be considered on their merits.
- That Officers were mindful of the difficulties in providing a residential scheme on the site and the extent of the mitigation that would be required to minimise the impacts.

In response to further questions about the impacts from the scheme, Officers provided assurances regarding the following matters:

- That if granted, the construction impact would be managed by condition.

- The Council had a 24hour noise complaint hot line and that Environmental Health had powers to act in this regard.
- Given the site's location in a busy area, especially the existing frontage, the impact on the area should be limited, especially along the quieter streets.
- That the parking restrictions on the highway would prevent increased parking.
- That the comments regarding energy efficiency measures could be managed through conditioning a revised Energy Statement
- That given the mitigation to safeguard against a loss of privacy and manage overlooking, the impacts in this regard should be limited. For example there would be opaque glazing at certain floors and the angles of the windows would also mean that the impacts would not be significant.
- In relation to the objector's property, Officer's explained in further detail the impact of the assessment of the properties most affected and their location. Generally they would be acceptable. In respect of any sun/lights and daylight impacts the Planning Inspector in the recent Whitechapel Estate scheme planning inquiry had recently confirmed that similar residual levels were acceptable, in assessing that scheme.
- That the development should benefit the local economy by providing additional visitor numbers.
- Officers also clarified the waste management arrangements.

In response to further questions, it was noted that Council Officers monitored the non - financial obligations regarding access to employment and apprenticeship places.

#### Questions to the applicant.

In response to questions about the GLA design comments, Narinder Assi provided an update regarding the discussions with the GLA to clarify certain elements of the revised scheme, particularly relating to the entrances. The GLA were now satisfied that the proposals were acceptable. He also outlined the measures to address the comments of the LBTH Design Officer.

On a vote of 4 in favour, and 2 against, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That subject to any direction by the Mayor of London following the Stage 2 referral process, planning permission is **GRANTED** at 267-269 East India Dock Road (PA/19/01838) for the following:
  - (Amended description): Internal and external alterations to the existing residential units at no. 267 East India Dock Road and proposed erection of a 163-bedroom hotel (C1 use class) comprising of a part four, and part-eighteen storey building over basement, with associated roof top plant room, ground floor servicing, car and bike parking and landscaping.

2. Subject to a borehole assessment being carried out and the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the Committee report.
3. 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 if borehole assessment is not carried out/outcome is such that planning permission should be refused.
4. That the Corporate Director of Place is delegated the power to impose conditions and informatives to address the matters set out in the Committee report

The meeting ended at 8.10 p.m.

Chair,  
Strategic Development Committee