

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 5.30 P.M. ON TUESDAY, 14 MAY 2019**

**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 Dipa Das  
Councillor Kevin Brady  
Councillor Val Whitehead  
Councillor Zenith Rahman  
Councillor Rabina Khan

**Other Councillors Present:**

Councillor Mufeedah Bustin  
Councillor Andrew Wood  
Councillor Peter Golds

**Apologies:**

Councillor Dan Tomlinson

**Officers Present:**

Paul Buckenham	– (Development Manager, Planning Services, Place)
Solomon Agutu	– (Interim Team Leader Planning, Legal Services, Governance)
Julian Buckle	– (Planning Officer, Place)
Max Smith	– Team Leader, Planning and Building Control
Joshim Uddin	– Principal Infrastructure & Development Viability Officer
Richard Humphreys	– (Planning Officer, Place)
David Knight	– (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

**1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **2. 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.

## **3. DEFERRED ITEMS**

There were no items.

## **4. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION**

### **4.1 Site Bound by Raven Row Stepney Way, Sidney Street, London, E1 (PA/18/00917)**

Update report tabled

The Committee received and noted a report together that outlined a proposal to demolition of existing buildings and erection of three blocks ranging from 1 to 26 storeys in height comprising 648 residential units, commercial floorspace, 32 off-street car parking spaces, communal courtyards, associated landscaping and associated ancillary works. With the permission of the Chair (i) Amanda Day to spoke in opposition to the application; and (ii) David Roach spoke in support of the application. The Chair also exercised his discretion to allow a representative of the Applicant to speak during the consideration of this report on aspects of the proposal.

It was noted that the officer recommendation was to grant planning permission subject to conditions and obligations and GLA Stage II approval

The Committee asked a number of questions about the proposals and the points raised are summarised as follows:

The Committee noted:

- That with regard to the impact on the Accident and Emergency Department at the Royal London that the Hospital was satisfied with this proposal. Whilst the Applicant feels that there is very little difference in what they already have the permission to build and what they now wish to build;
- With regard to parking spaces referenced in the proposals whilst the aim is to have zero parking there is an issue regarding the viability of the scheme should the number of spaces are reduced;
- That although when a housing developer gets planning permission they are normally required by the Council to make a number of the homes that they build officially “affordable”. This number in Tower Hamlets being 35 per cent and developers are aware of the requirement before they begin drawing up plans;
- Also developers can as the scheme progresses through a viability assessment evidence that the amount of affordable housing they originally agreed is no longer viable;
- That with regard to money the GLA has secured from Government to tackle London’s housing crisis. The developer has already accessed the maximum it can from such a funding stream;
- That with regards to the play and informal recreation provision within the scheme that can be accessed safely from the street by children independently. There would be a share amenity space on ground floor and on certain levels within the blocks and that space which forms an integral part of the surrounding neighbourhood.
- Noted that a percentage of the play and informal recreation provision space has been moved from ground to first floor which will be protected against pollution by the buildings in the proposed development.
- Developer contributions secured as part of planning permission for such new developments have in the past provided significant funding for any new healthcare infrastructure needed to support growth. However, with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) there is a change from an up-front negotiation of developer contributions (section 106 payments) on a site by site basis around a planning application. Now health professionals (including CCGs) now need to provide costed evidence of infrastructure needs to the local planning authority for investment and release of appropriate funds.
- Noted that only emergency service and maintenance vehicles can access the car free areas of the site and the later only at agreed times;
- With regard to the impact of the site on the neighbourhood through developer contributions (section 106 payments) secured as part of planning permission there has been the inclusion of increased permeability and extensive public realm work that will form an integral part of the surrounding neighbourhood.
- Were concerned that the scheme in its current form would not deliver the desired percentage of affordable housing and that consideration should be given to there being a Late Stage Review of the scheme. Which would ensure that the review and any additional contribution
- towards off-site affordable housing provision;

- This review of the viability of the scheme would also look at if it can capture any additional affordable housing due to any up lift as a result of an overall increase in value;

As a result of a full and wide ranging discussion on the report Councillor Rabina Khan **moved** and Councillor Kevin Brady **seconded** that the following be added to the legal agreement:

- Obligation requiring a late stage review of the affordable housing.

On a unanimous vote, this additional obligation was agreed.

On a unanimous vote, the Committee **RESOLVED**:

1. That subject to any direction by the Mayor of London, conditional Planning permission is **GRANTED** at Site Bound by Raven Row Stepney Way, Sidney Street, London, E1 for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of three blocks ranging from 1 to 26 storeys in height comprising 648 residential units, commercial floorspace, 32 off-street car parking spaces, communal courtyards, associated landscaping and associated ancillary works (PA/18/00917) SUBJECT to:
  2. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the report subject to:
    - Amendment in the update report specifying that there will be 1 x end-user phase apprenticeship
    - An obligation requiring a late stage review of the affordable housing.
    - Confirmation by officers of the carbon off-setting contribution
  3. That the Corporate Director of Place is delegated the power to negotiate the legal agreement and to agree the section 106 legal agreement and any subsequent Rent and Nominations Agreement and Highway 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.
  4. That the Corporate Director of Place is delegated the power to impose conditions and informatives to address the matters set out in the report.

#### 4.2 London Docklands Travelodge Hotel, Coriander Avenue, London, E14 2AA (PA/18/03088)

Update report tabled.

The Committee received and noted a report that set out a proposal for an outline application (with all matters reserved) for the demolition of existing Travelodge Hotel (Use Class C1) and erection of a data centre (Use Class B8).

It was also noted that the officer recommendation was to grant outline planning permission with conditions and planning obligations

The Committee asked a number of questions about the proposals and the points raised are summarised as follows:

The Committee noted;

- The application assessed within this report (planning reference PA/18/03088) was linked to an application for the erection of a new 19 storey hotel northwest of Leamouth Road roundabout (under planning reference PA/18/03089). The two sites being approximately 235m apart and within the same estate.
- The linking of the applications stems from the desire of the applicants to facilitate the re-development of the Coriander Avenue site for the data centre and to ensure a nearby site could accommodate a new hotel. The Section 106 agreement for both applications will ensure that there will never be two hotels in operation at the same time to ensure acceptability of the land use.
- The proposal will create jobs and provide training and support the role and function of Canary Wharf and the City of London.

As a result of discussions on the report on a unanimous vote, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That subject to any direction by the Mayor of London, conditional Planning permission is **GRANTED** at London Docklands Travelodge Hotel, Coriander Avenue, London, E14 2AA for Outline application (with all matters reserved) for the demolition of existing Travelodge Hotel (Use Class C1) and erection of a data centre (Use Class B8), SUBJECT TO:
2. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the 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.

4. That the Corporate Director of Place is delegated the power to impose conditions and informatives to address the matters set out in the report SUBJECT TO the addition of the an informative agreed at the Committee meeting addressing the following matter
  - Design quality of the development. In the context of the setting of the Grade II\* listed building East India Dock House.

#### **4.3 Site north west of Leamouth Road Roundabout, Leamouth Road, London (PA/18/03089)**

Update report tabled

The Committee received and noted a report regarding the erection of 19 storey building (up to maximum height of 64.250 metres AOD) to provide a new 350 room hotel (Use Class C1) together with ancillary restaurant and bar, car parking, cycle parking and landscaping. The development of this site would facilitate a new data centre nearby (approx. 200m) and the demolition of the existing Travelodge Docklands Hotel.

It was noted that the officer recommendation was to grant planning permission with conditions and planning obligations.

The Committee asked a number of questions about the proposals and the points raised are summarised as follows:

- The application proposes a 350 room hotel that measures 19 storeys in height. The building would be positioned on the north-west corner of the site and comprise of (i) Ground floor - Reception and Back of House; (ii) First floor - Restaurant/Bar; and (iii) Second to Eighteenth floor - Hotel rooms.
- The total Gross Internal Area (GIA) would measure 11,759sqm and the maximum height of the building would measure 64.25m. Access and egress to the site would take place from Sorrel Lane and Saffron Avenue.
- A total of 35 car parking spaces are proposed, 5 of which would be blue badge spaces. Of the 35 spaces 40% would provide active electric charging points. The site would provide a pocket park and access across the southern landscaped area. The perimeter of the site would be lined with planting and there would be a refuse store located on the north-east corner.
- The application assessed within this report is linked to an application for the demolition of an existing hotel and erection of a new data centre at Coriander Avenue (under planning reference PA/18/03088). This is because there is an existing Travelodge hotel at Coriander Avenue and this site will cease to operate once the new hotel - proposed north-west of Leamouth roundabout - is in operation.
- Any whilst a S106 can identify and highlight the requirements for planning contributions **e.g.** provide increased employment; education,

and training the Council cannot be legally compel them hire local residents although they can influence.

- The Section 106 agreement for both applications will ensure that there will not be two hotels in operation at the same time. This is to ensure acceptability of the land use. The two sites are approximately 235m apart and are within the same estate.
- The 'land swap' is largely driven by the fact the application site has the East India Dock Tunnel running directly beneath it, which severely restricts the developable area and intern the building typology that can be constructed. A hotel use can be delivered on a much smaller footprint than that required to house a data centre (such are their functional requirements) and henceforth the two sites are being proposed in this way.
- The height, massing, and design of the scheme would result in a striking building that frames the wider estate. The impact to neighbouring occupiers would be limited and acceptable for an urban location. The development would have a neutral impact on the setting of the Grade II listed East India Dock Wall.

As a result of discussions on the report on a unanimous vote, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That subject to any direction by the Mayor of London, conditional Planning permission is **GRANTED** at Site north west of Leamouth Road Roundabout, Leamouth Road, London Erection of 19 storey building (up to maximum height of 64.250 metres AOD) to provide a new 350 room hotel (Use Class C1) together with ancillary restaurant and bar, car parking, cycle parking and landscaping. (PA/18/03089)

**SUBJECT TO:**

2. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the 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.
4. That the Corporate Director of Place is delegated the power to impose conditions and informatives to address the matters set out in the report.

**5. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS**

**5.1 Former Westferry Print Works 235 Westferry Road E14 8NX**

Update report tabled

The Committee received a report that is seeking the authority of the officers to defend an appeal which has been submitted to the Secretary of State by the

developer. In addition, the Committee received and considered representations from Councillor Mufeedah Bustin; Councillor Peter Golds; Councillor Andrew Wood and Mr Dave Chesterton.

The Committee asked a number of questions about the proposals and the points raised are summarised as follows:

The Committee

- Was advised that the Secretary of State had imposed a timetable which required that this report is considered by the Committee on 14th May 2019 in time for the Council to submit a Statement of Case by 22nd May 2019 in order to avoid breaching the imposed timetable and making the authority liable for costs for unreasonable behaviour. However, as the report had not been written when the timetable had been imposed, the Council asked Secretary of State to review the timetable and he has declined. These it was noted are the special circumstances justifying the need to consider this as a matter of urgency;
- Noted that on 4th August 2016, the Mayor of London had granted full planning permission for the demolition of Westferry Printworks followed by comprehensive mixed use redevelopment of 118,738 m<sup>2</sup> including buildings ranging from 2-30 storeys (tallest 110 m AOD) comprising: a secondary school, 722 residential units, retail use, restaurant and cafe and drinking establishment uses, office and financial and professional services uses, community uses, car and cycle basement parking, associated landscaping and new public realm (the 'Permitted Scheme'). The planning permission has been implemented by the demolition of the print works and works to construct the new basement.
- Noted that a new application has now been made for full planning permission to redevelop the Westferry Printworks site by alternative proposals. This proposal excludes the school from the development site. Following amendments to the application on 4th March 2019, reducing the height of the tallest building by two storeys, the residential accommodation has been increased to 1,524 units, building heights have increased to a maximum of 44-storeys (Tower 4 height 155.3 m AOD), and a 5th tower introduced (Tower 5 – 32 floors tall - height 112.35 m AOD) with a consequential reduction in publicly accessible open space.
- Noted that an appeal had now been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate against the Council's failure to determine the application within the statutory timescale. Therefore, a public inquiry will examine material planning considerations associated with the planning application. Following the Inspector's report, the Secretary of State has directed that he shall determine the appeal himself. The reason for this direction is because: "The appeal involves proposals for residential development of over 150 units or on sites of over 5 hectares, which would significantly impact on the Government's objective to secure a better balance between housing demand and supply and create high quality, sustainable, mixed and inclusive communities." Accordingly,



the Council is consequently unable to determine the application and the Committee's instructions are therefore required on the case that the Council should make to the inquiry.

- Noted that officers have assessed the revised proposals against the development plan for the area that jointly comprises the London Plan 2016 and the Tower Hamlets Local Plan (Core Strategy 2010 and the Managing Development Document 2013). Regard has also been paid to the emerging development plan (Draft London Plan August 2017 and the Draft Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031) and other material considerations particularly the Draft Isle of Dogs Opportunity Area Planning Framework 2018 (OAPF), the Mayor's supplementary planning guidance – London World Heritage Sites - Guidance on Settings 2012, the London View Management Framework 2012, 'Housing' 2016 and Affordable Housing & Viability 2017, together with the Maritime Greenwich and Tower of London World Heritage Site Management Guidelines, Building Research Establishment's 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight, the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF) and Historic England guidance on development affecting heritage assets.
- Was advised that the underlying principles of the 2016 permitted scheme in terms of site layout and land use remain under the current scheme save for the introduction of Tower T5 and the increase in building height across the development. Officers consider that the proposed mix of uses, involving a strategic housing development, shops, offices, community and leisure uses together with public open space accords with MDD Site Allocation 18. Under the terms of the extant section 106 Agreement, it was intended that the Council would separately organise the procurement, construction and funding of the school. The Applicant it was noted had stated "The school will be delivered pursuant to the Consented Scheme planning permission." However, officers have identified a conflict with development plan policy for the location of tall buildings, and adverse effect that this will have on sailing conditions on Millwall Outer Dock beyond those to be mitigated under the 2016 legal agreement.
- Was informed on 7th May 2019, the Appellant had withdrawn their offer of 35% affordable housing advising that a revised viability assessment will be submitted and confirming "that the affordable housing offer will be less than 35%". Whilst the original 35% offer would have been policy compliant in terms of amount, the Committee was advised that the offer failed to provide the split between affordable rented and intermediate housing as required by the development plan.
- Noted that at the time of writing, the Appellant's Updated Viability Assessment has not been received; neither has a revised affordable housing offer nor details of consequential amendments to the housing tenure mix.
- Noted the GLA's comments that the scheme does not comply with the London Plan, draft London Plan and the draft Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) due to the absence of a strategy to compensate the proposed loss of coherent open park space caused by the inclusion of block T5, the impact on the backdrop setting of the

grade I listed Tower Bridge, carbon reduction targets, and sustainable drainage strategy. Although the Mayor had advised that the resolution of these issues could, nevertheless, lead to the application becoming compliant with the London Plan and should be addressed prior to the Mayor's decision-making stage.

- Noted that the report recommends that the Committee resolves that were it empowered to determine the application it would have refused planning permission for the reasons set out below (notwithstanding the absence of an affordable housing offer) and to authorise officers to submit supporting evidence to the Secretary of State at the public inquiry.
- Felt that the height and mass of the development within its local context would not be proportionate to the site's position outside of the Canary Wharf major centre, outside the Crossharbour District Centre and would fail to provide an appropriate transition in height between Canary Wharf and the lower rise buildings of the existing townscape. The proposed scale, height and massing would result in a development that would be overbearing, unduly prominent in local views and more distant views and detract from the local context on the Isle of Dogs, the Canary Wharf Skyline of Strategic Importance, the Greenwich Maritime and Tower of London World Heritage Sites including the Grade 1 listed Tower Bridge. The proposed development therefore fails to respect the features that contribute to the area's character and local distinctiveness and demonstrates clear symptoms of over development and excessive height.
- Acknowledged that due to increased adverse effect of the proposed development would have an effect on both the wind climate and sailing conditions in Millwall Outer Dock beyond those to be mitigated by the Wind Mitigation Contribution has agreed in 2016, the proposed development would further jeopardise the recreation use of the waterspace by the Docklands Sailing and Watersports Centre particularly for young and novice sailors.
- Recognised that the Westferry Printworks is a crucial element within the Tower Hamlets supply of land for both market and affordable housing.
- Noted that an affordable housing offer of less than 35% within the proposed development would fail to meet the minimum requirement of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan, would not be financially justified and would therefore fail to provide an adequate amount of affordable housing to meet targets.
- Noted that with regard to the transport infrastructure the impact on the highway would be no different from the 2016 scheme as TfL can provide extra buses as the existing consent includes a contribution of £300,000 towards improving capacity. TfL considers that this contribution of £300,000 remains sufficient to deliver the additional capacity required. Whilst regarding the Dockland Light Railway (DLR) 43 fixed-formation trains that are to be replaced under the Rolling Stock Replacement Programme that will in the view of TfL increase the Lines capacity by 10% by 2020.

- Expressed concern at the impact of the proliferation in the number of vans as a direct result of the increase in online shopping. Van traffic it was noted has risen faster than that of any other vehicle type and most household deliveries do not take place in the evening when the roads are quieter. In addition, the Committee reminded that according to the GLA the number of new minicabs has risen by 56% in the last two years, largely being due to Uber the location-based app for hiring an on-demand private driver.
- Noted that TfL has successfully bid for the Housing Infrastructure Fund to deliver additional capacity on the DLR South Route and unlock further development on the Isle of Dogs including the additional development now proposed at Westferry Printworks although development must be phased to ensure it coincides with the necessary increase in DLR capacity
- Were concerned to note the impact of the scheme on sailing as it results in significant localised differences compared with the existing permission. The dock averaged sailing quality improves insignificantly (by less than 1%). However, the western dock area shows an average reduction in total time below the acceptable sailing quality. The Trust it was noted are keen to ensure that the West India and Millwall docks remain active spaces alive with on-water uses. Therefore, as the existing planning permission is reliant on section 106 arrangements that require mitigation of the impact of the development on sailing conditions. The Council should assess whether it is possible to mitigate the impact of the revised scheme.
- Was concerned with regard the impact on the water quality of the Millwall Outer Dock: The submitted Environmental Impact Assessment had identified that the soil and groundwater on-site is contaminated. Therefore, the Trust requests safeguarding criteria should to be adhered secured by a Construction Environmental Management Plan. Given the nature of the site once built the need for the incorporation of SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) and oil interceptors into the surface water drainage system as there are concerns about the discharge of surface water into the dock. In addition, to developing a sustainable solution for heating and cooling the system that utilises the dock waters without harming the eco system.

As a result of discussions on the report on a unanimous vote, the Committee requested that Officers should further explore the concerns raised by Members at the Committee around the transport, visual and heritage aspects of the proposals with a view to identifying if they could form further reasons for refusal that could be defended. This was **agreed**.

On a unanimous vote, the Committee **RESOLVED**:

The Committee resolves to inform the Secretary of State that were it empowered to determine the application at Former Westferry Print Works 235 Westferry Road E14 8NX for a comprehensive mixed used development, it would have **REFUSED** planning permission for the amended Refusal

Reasons 1 & 4 in the Committee update report together with Reasons 2, 3. & 5 within the Committee report as set out below:

### ***Townscape and visual impact***

#### **Reason 1 - Townscape and visual impact**

The height and mass of the development within its local context would not be proportionate to the site's position outside of the Canary Wharf major centre, outside the Crossharbour District Centre and would fail to provide an appropriate transition in height between Canary Wharf and the lower rise buildings of the existing townscape. The proposed scale, height and massing would result in a development that would be overbearing, unduly prominent in local views and more distant views and detract from the local context on the Isle of Dogs, the Canary Wharf Skyline of Strategic Importance, the Greenwich Maritime and Tower of London World Heritage Sites including the Grade 1 listed Tower Bridge. The proposed development therefore fails to respect the features that contribute to the area's character and local distinctiveness and demonstrates clear symptoms of over development and excessive height. This is contrary to London Plan 2016 Policies 7.4 '*Local Character*', 7.6 '*Architecture*', 7.7 '*Tall and large scale buildings*', 7.8 '*Heritage assets*', 7.10 '*World Heritage Sites*', 7.11 '*London View Management Framework*' and 7.12 '*Implementing the London View Management Framework*', Tower Hamlets Core Strategy 2010 Strategic Objectives SO22 & SO23 and Policies SP10 '*Creating distinct & durable places*' and SP12 '*Delivering placemaking*', Managing Development Document 2013 Policies DM24 '*Place sensitive design*', DM26 '*Building heights*' DM28 '*World Heritage Sites*' and Site Allocation 18, together with the London View Management Framework SPG 2012 and the Maritime Greenwich and Tower of London WHS Management Plans."

#### ***Wind Impact on the Docklands Sailing Centre***

Due to increased adverse effect on wind climate and sailing conditions in Millwall Outer Dock beyond those to be mitigated by the Wind Mitigation Contribution agreed in 2016, the proposed development would further jeopardise recreation use of the waterspace by the Docklands Sailing and Watersports Centre particularly for young and novice sailors. This would conflict with London Plan 2016 Policies 7.6 '*Architecture*', 7.7 '*Tall and large scale buildings*', 7.27 '*Blue Ribbon Network: Supporting infrastructure and recreational use*' and 7.30 '*London's canals and other rivers and waterspaces*', Tower Hamlets Core Strategy Policy SP04 '*Creating a green and blue grid*', Tower Hamlets Managing Development Document 2013 Policy DM12 '*Water spaces*' and Policy DM26 '*Building heights*'. There would also be conflict with draft London Plan Policies SI16 '*Waterways – use and enjoyment*', SI17 '*Protecting London's waterways*' and Draft Tower Hamlets Local Plan Policies S.OWS2 '*Enhancing the network of open spaces*' and D.OWS4 '*Water spaces*'.

### ***Affordable housing - amount***

Westferry Printworks is a crucial element within Tower Hamlets supply of land for both market and affordable housing. An affordable housing offer of less than 35% within the proposed development would fail to meet the minimum requirement of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan, would not be financially justified and would fail to provide an adequate amount of affordable housing to meet targets. The development is consequently not consistent with London Plan Policies 3.8 '*Housing choice*', 3.11 '*Affordable housing targets*', 3.12 '*Negotiating Affordable Housing on Individual Private Residential and Mixed Use Sites*', Tower Hamlets Core Strategy Policy SP02 '*Urban living for everyone*' nor the NPPF.

### ***Housing mix and choice***

An affordable housing offer that fails to provide a satisfactory ratio between social rent and intermediate housing would conflict with London Plan Policies 3.8 '*Housing choice*', 3.11 '*Affordable housing targets*' and 3.12 '*Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes*' together with Tower Hamlets Core Strategy Policy SP02 '*Urban living for everyone*' and Managing Development Document Policy DM3 '*Delivering homes.*'

The March 2019 dwelling mix within the market housing would fail to provide a satisfactory range of housing choice in terms of the mix of housing sizes. There would be a failure to provide a mixed and balanced community caused by an unacceptable overemphasis towards 2-bedroom units and insufficient family homes. The development is consequently inconsistent with London Plan Policy 3.8 '*Housing Choice*, Policy 3.9 '*Mixed and balanced communities*,' Tower Hamlets Core Strategy Policy SP02 '*Urban living for everyone*' and Managing Development Document Policy DM3 '*Delivering Homes*'.

### **B Possible changes**

Should further information be provided that materially affects the ability of the council to defend one or more of the above reasons, officers are delegated powers to amend the reasons accordingly.

That Officers further explore the concerns raised by Members at the Committee meeting around the transport, visual and heritage aspects of the proposals with a view to identifying if they could form further reasons for refusal that could be defended

**The meeting ended at 8.15 p.m.**

**Chair, Councillor John Pierce  
Strategic Development Committee**