

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 6.30 P.M. ON MONDAY, 8 JULY 2019**

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

**Members Present:**

Councillor Abdul Mukit MBE (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Kevin Brady  
Councillor Val Whitehead  
Councillor Rabina Khan  
Councillor Sabina Akhtar  
Councillor Tarik Khan  
Councillor Dipa Das (Substitute for Councillor John Pierce)

**Other Councillors Present:**

None

**Apologies:**

Councillor John Pierce  
Councillor Zenith Rahman

**Officers Present:**

Paul Buckenham	– (Development Manager, Planning Services, Place)
Kevin Crilly	– (Planning Officer, Place)
Amanda Helliwell	– (Legal Services, Governance)
Piotr Lanoszka	– (Team Leader, Planning Services, Place)
Zoe Folley	– (Committee Officer, Governance)

**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 19<sup>th</sup> June 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) 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**

#### **6.1 Mile End East Estate, Mile End, London E3 PA/17/02373**

Update report tabled.

Paul Buckenham (Development Control Manager) introduced the application for the creation of new residential units at Buttermere House, Coniston House, Derwent House, Windermere House and Loweswater House; and Wentworth Mews to provide a total of 142 new dwellings with associated works.

It was noted that the determination of this application has been referred to the Strategic Development Committee by the Corporate Director of Place due to the unique strategic implications of the case, including the potential for this proposal to be a precedent for future estate regeneration schemes across the borough, the number of existing residential buildings included within the development site and the proposal's wider implications for place-making and access to play-space and amenity space for residents across the estate.

Kevin Crilly (Planning Services) presented the application explaining the site location and the key features of the application. Consultation was carried out. 18 letters of objections were received with a petition in objection with 17 signatures. The key issues raised were noted.

In design terms, it was considered that the proposal would complement and be sympathetic to the existing buildings. The proposal would also be in keeping with the surrounding townscape.

Regarding the affordable housing, it was confirmed that Option 1 'baseline' would deliver:

- 49.5% affordable housing by habitable room, with a tenure split of 73% affordable rent to 27% intermediate, providing: 41 affordable rent units at 50/50 split between Tower Hamlets Living Rent and London Affordable Rent, and 15 intermediate units either Shared Ownership or London Living Rent.

Option 2 'with grant' would deliver:

- 78.4% affordable housing by habitable room, with a tenure split of 46% affordable rent to 54% intermediate, providing: 41 affordable rent units at 50/50 split between Tower Hamlets Living Rent and London Affordable Rent, and 58 intermediate London Living Rent units.

On 4<sup>th</sup> July 2019 the Mayor of London awarded grant funding for the additional intermediate affordable housing (London Living Rent) referred to as Option 2 within the committee report.

As such Option 1, is no longer relevant and the applicant has agreed to commit through a S106 planning obligation to implement Option 2 to provide 78.4% affordable housing.

Given that the 78.4% affordable housing offer has now been confirmed and will be secured as a planning obligation, Option 2 now carries full weight, representing a very substantial public benefit in favour of the development proposal.

The standard of the accommodation would be high. A number of the units would experience sunlight and daylighting impacts. Overall the standard of residential amenity would remain good. Given this and the merits of the scheme in terms of the public benefits, Officers considered that the proposal was acceptable in terms of amenity issues. The revised play space strategy would provide good quality play space. A number of conditions were proposed to minimise construction impact. The development would be a car free development and acceptable in highways terms.

The Chair invited the registered speakers to address the Committee

Sally Goodwin(resident of one of the developments effected) and Lene Milaa (local resident), expressed concerns about the proposal. It was considered that the additional storeys would be out of character with the design of the lower rise existing buildings. They also expressed concern about overdevelopment of the estate as a result of the proposal in terms of loss of

open space and loss of amenity. Concern was also expressed about the lack of progress with implementing Phase 1 of the development, particularly as the child play space remained incompleting. Concerns were also expressed about use of the existing play space for storage. The space was an eyesore.

It was also considered that there had also been a lack of consultation with residents and the information provided by the developer was misleading, particularly in relation to the social housing. The six metre separation distance was in breach of the planning policy.

Steve Inkpen, (Applicant's representative) spoke in support of the application. He reported that the applicant had a good track record in delivering housing developments. He highlighted the benefits of the proposals in terms of delivering a high amount of affordable housing, improved communal space and play space, improved security by for example increasing natural surveillance, and a new waste storage area. The proposals had been put together at the request of residents to help address ASB along with other objectives. A comprehensive consultation exercise was held including a residents survey. The vast majority of those surveyed supported the application. Most of the works would be completed off site to minimise the construction impacts.

Tania Nalywajko spoke in support of the proposals as a resident of one the developments subject to the works. She advised that the residents had initiated these proposals. The development would make the estate safer and would help address ASB. It would deliver much needed new affordable accommodation whilst preserving the open space.

#### The Committee's Questions to Officers:

The Committee asked questions about the construction impact. Officers clarified the standard hours of operation for the construction works. It was noted that consideration could be given to varying the standard hours to minimise construction impact.

Regarding the transport issues, the site had an excellent PTAL rating of 6 and it was noted that the opening of the new Crossrail line would increase capacity on the transport network and relieve pressure on the network. A transport assessment had been submitted by the applicant. This forecasts indicated that the development should only generate a small number of public transport trips.

Regarding the impact on health and education services, Officers provided assurances about the availability of a sufficient number of school places to accommodate pupils from the development. The application would also be CIL liable and contributions could be secured for health service improvements, where necessary.

The Committee also sought clarity on the impact on the sunlight and daylight levels to surrounding properties especially the minor to major impacts identified in the report. It was noted that a number of properties, would experience impacts. However in most instances either: access to sunlight and daylight to the properties was already restricted or the levels of sunlighting and daylighting was good and would remain so. On balance, Officers considered that the impacts were acceptable given: the mitigating factors and the public benefits of the application. The applicant's sunlight and daylight assessment had been independently verified. Paul Buckenham drew Members attention to pages 44 and 45 of the Committee report. Regarding the table, he advised that there were slight errors in the negligible impacts column, which were VSC compliant. There were errors in the first lines down to Rushton Walk Tower. All of the rest of the information was correct. The columns dealing with the minor, moderate and major adverse impact were all correct. The Committee could still continue to determine the application unless the Committee felt that a revised table should be brought forward, which could be done through deferring the application. Having noted this advice, the Committee indicated that they wished to continue to consider the application.

In response to further questions, Officers advised of the impact of the grant funding on the housing mix. It was also clarified that drainage and sound proofing issues were a building control issue. Regarding the separation distances, Officers noted the concerns about the 6 metre separation distance. It was explained that due to the design measures and that the separation distances broadly complied with policy, Officers considered that this was acceptable.

#### The Committee's Questions to Applicant

Members sought clarity on the impact of the development on the existing buildings. It was noted that the plans had been reviewed to ensure there would be no structural issues.

The Committee also asked questions about the accessibility of the current play areas given the concerns about its use as a compound. Mr Inkpen reported that there were a number of play areas on the estate. He also advised of their plans to have a clear time table for the installation of the play space and the plans sought to provide additional play space of a better quality which was accessible to everyone. In response to questions about the timeframe for the building the development, the applicant was happy to review the plans to minimise the construction impacts.

Mr Inkpen also provided assurances about: the improved security features to help prevent ASB and the affordable housing offer, highlighting the tenure split. Regarding the 2009 permission, it was reported that the works had mostly been completed. It was also noted that the applicant had taken steps to improve the drainage system and that any issues would be dealt with as necessary as part of the development. Regarding the number of four bedroom units, it was noted that the plans had been designed in such a way

to maximise the number of larger units whilst ensuring it remained viable. The 2009 permission included a large amount of four bedroom units.

The Committee questions to objectors.

In response to questions, the objectors explained how the proposals would harm their quality of life given the impacts in terms of: additional parking stress, pressure on the drainage system and disturbance during the construction phase. They also expressed concerns about noise disturbance from having properties above their properties and that the proposals would put pressures on an already overcrowded transport network.

In view the of issues raised around the availability of the current play space and merits of a phasing plan to minimise construction impacts, the Committee agree to two new conditions requiring:

- the submission of a phasing plan
- the delivery of the play space prior to the first occupation of the dwellings.

On a vote of 6 in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That conditional Planning permission be **GRANTED** at Mile End East Estate, Mile End, London E3 for
  - Construction of 2-storey roof extensions to Buttermere House, Coniston House, Derwent House, Windermere House and Loweswater House; residential conversion of ground level garages to Windermere House and Wentworth Mews; infill units to Levels 1-4 of Windermere House to provide a total of 142 new dwellings; access and servicing including car parking spaces for disabled motorists; cycle parking spaces and incidental works.

**SUBJECT TO:**

2. The prior completion of a legal agreement.
3. That the Corporate Director of Place is delegated the power to negotiate the legal agreement to cover the obligations listed in paragraphs 8.4 and 8.5 with Option 2 in respect of the affordable housing and to add any other planning obligations as necessary. 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 listed in paragraphs 8.6 and 8.7 in the Committee report and to add any other conditions and informatives as necessary including the additional conditions agreed by the Committee requiring:

- the submission of a phasing plan
- the delivery of the play space prior to the first occupation of the dwellings.

The meeting ended at 8.00 p.m.

Chair,  
Strategic Development Committee