

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 6.30 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 6 JANUARY 2022**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER - TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE CRESCENT,  
LONDON, E14 2BG**

**Members Present:**

Councillor Leema Qureshi  
Councillor Dan Tomlinson  
Councillor Kabir Ahmed  
Councillor David Edgar (Substitute for Councillor Abdul Mukit MBE)  
Councillor Tarik Khan (Substitute for Councillor Kevin Brady)

**Other Councillors Present:**

Councillor Peter Golds

**Officers Present:**

Sally Fraser	– Team Leader (East)
Gareth Gwynne	– (Area Planning Manager (West), Planning Services, Place)
Diane Phillips	– (Lawyer, Legal Services)
Tanveer Rahman	– (Senior Planning Officer, Place)
Bob Bennett	– (LBTH Project Manager for Tideway).
Zoe Folley	– (Democratic Services Officer, Committees, Governance)

**Apologies:**

Councillor Kevin Brady  
Councillor Kyrsten Perry  
Councillor Sufia Alam

In the absence of the Chair and the Vice Chair, Councillor Tarik Khan moved and Councillor Leema Qureshi seconded a proposal that Councillor David Edgar is elected Chair of the Committee for this meeting

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Councillor David Edgar is elected Chair of the Committee for this meeting..

**1. TO ELECT A VICE - CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE**

Councillor Tarik Khan moved and Councillor Dan Tomlinson seconded a proposal that Councillor Kevin Brady is elected as Vice – Chair for the Committee for the remainder of the year 2021 – 22.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Councillor Kevin Brady is elected as Vice – Chair for the Committee for the remainder of the year 2021 – 22.

**2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)****RESOLVED:**

1. That the minutes of the meeting of the Strategic Development Committee held on 14th September 2021 be agreed as a correct record

**3. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER INTERESTS**

None declared

**4. 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

**5. DEFERRED ITEMS**

NONE

## 6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

### 6.1 Brunton Wharf Estate, Salmon Lane, E14 (PA/19/02608)

Update report published

Gareth Gwynne (Area Planning Manager (West), Planning Services, Place) introduced and highlighted the contents of the update report. The application sought the construction of a part-four and part-nine storey building comprising 32 x Class C3 residential dwellings, hard and soft landscaping works, security enhancements, and the re-opening of an existing undercroft parking structure. It was also recommended that an additional condition should be added to the planning application that:

- Prior to 1st occupation of the development the access arrangements will be implemented and maintained thereafter for the life of the development

Sally Fraser (Team Leader (East), Place) presented the application

The scheme was granted by the Development Committee on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020 (following deferral by the Development Committee on 17<sup>th</sup> August 2020 for a site visit). The application was granted permission in October 2020 with the fire access arrangements to be dealt with by condition. After the committee meeting, discussions with LFB concluded that a reliance on dry risers to serve Caledonia House was not sufficient. A new solution was found. LFB have formally responded in relation to the revised scheme. They are supportive of the revised proposals as they relate to fire access to Caledonia House and raise no objections with regards to the scheme overall.

The key changes were highlighted below in relation to:

- The proposed new vehicular crossover onto Salmon Lane, at the location of the existing pedestrian entrance into the site. This crossover would provide access into the site for emergency vehicles only, with retractable bollards restricting vehicular access at all other times
- A segregated walkway would provide pedestrian access into the site.
- The removal of one of the two existing crossovers that serve the estates' Salmon Lane car park. With the revised arrangements in place, vehicles would enter the car park via the western crossover and exit via the newly created crossover.
- Removal of a decorative 'pavilion' feature, spanning the pedestrian entrance to make way for the new vehicular route.

This application now sought permission to agree these minor changes. No other changes had been made to the scheme.

The Committee also noted an overview of the scheme including:

- Site layout.
- Outcome of the consultation including the responses to the September 2020 Committee scheme and those to this amended scheme. The additional representations were set out in report and summarised.
- The proposed new building would respond positively to the area.
- The scheme would deliver a number of benefits including the provision of 32 new affordable homes.
- Proposed site wide landscaping arrangements.
- Parking and servicing arrangements.

Officers remained of the view that the planning application should be granted permission.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee

Andrew Boff, GLA Conservatives, Londonwide Assembly Member raised concerns about the application in relation fire safety issues regarding:

- the risks of more petrol cars in the undercroft - Have LFB responded to that risk?
- the plans to provide sprinkler systems.

It was also requested whether the Council could publish the correspondence with LFB

Concerns were also raised about a lack of security gates. There was a wish to see them reinstated.

David Tucker spoke in the support of the scheme highlighting the following:

- The improved fire safety plans, which the relevant experts had supported. A road safety audit had been carried out to ensure it was safe.
- That the proposal would improve security, with secured access to parts of the development.
- Benefits of the application including the provision of affordable housing, new play space, landscaping and cycling storage.

The Committee asked questions of clarity of the registered speaker and Officers around the following issues:

- Reassurances about the Fire Authority's response and the Tenants and Residents Association's concerns about fire escape. It was confirmed that the London Fire Brigade had been involved from an early stage and had been fully consulted on the scheme, including the plans for the undercroft, and with finding a solution to the issues with the dry risers to Caledonia House.
- Their formal response stated that they supported the scheme.

- Their latest comments had been received in November 2021, and the full document will be put on the Council's website.
- The adequacy of the new fire access route and the measures to prevent parking along the route. In response, Officers drew attention to the proposals for retractable bollards for use only by emergency vehicles on the new access route for emergency vehicles. This will prevent cars from accessing/parking on this route. The proposals should also generally alleviate parking pressures.
- The safety of the undercroft. The applicant highlighted that the proposals should improve security by restricting access to that area. The Committee considered the merits of requesting that a sprinkler system was installed in the undercroft.
- Noise levels mitigation. Officers noted the relationship between the development and the railway. This was not an uncommon relationship. They expressed confidence that the conditions secured will mitigate against any impact and address those matters. These were noted, including a requirements for a noise mitigation scheme.
- Concerns regarding the changes to the scheme, particularly the loss of promised benefits associated with the application. In response, Officers highlighted the decision to remove gates on the northern perimeter of the site - prior to the submission to the Committee in October 2020. However, alongside this, it was noted that other gates would be retained and this should help prevent ASB. No other changes had been made the scheme approved in October 2020, except for the minor amendments to improve fire safety arrangements
- Waste collection and servicing arrangements. It was noted that Highways Services and the Council's Waste Team, had been consulted about the proposals, and they had no concerns regarding the impact of proposed collection arrangements,

The Committee agreed an additional condition regarding:

- Provision of a sprinkler system in the undercroft
- Prior to 1st occupation of the development the access arrangements will be implemented and maintained thereafter for the life of the development

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

1. That, planning permission is GRANTED at Brunton Wharf Estate, Salmon Lane, E14 for the following development
  - Construction of a part-four and part-nine storey building comprising 32 x Class C3 residential dwellings, hard and soft landscaping works, security enhancements, and the re-opening of an existing undercroft parking structure. (PA/19/02608)
2. Subject to: the conditions outlined in the original report dated October 2020; the additional conditions in the report dated 6th January 2022 and a condition requiring

- Provision of a sprinkler system in the undercroft
- Prior to 1st occupation of the development the access arrangements will be implemented and maintained thereafter for the life of the development

## **6.2 King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore, Glamis Road, Wapping, E1W 3EQ (PA/21/01190)**

Update report published

Gareth Gwynne introduced the application and highlighted the contents of the update report. The application seeks approval to discharge requirements, in relation to the Thames Tideway Tunnel 2014 Order - in accordance with approved parameter plans approved as part of the Development Consent Order.

They related to:

- KEMPF2 - Location of permanent works;
- KEMPF3 - Detailed design approval for permanent above-ground structures;
- KEMPF4 - Detailed design approval for signature ventilation columns; KEMPF5 - Detailed design approval for river wall and foreshore structure;
- KEMPF6 - Landscaping works;
- KEMPF14 - Surface water drainage; and
- PW11 - Interpretation strategy (project-wide requirement)

Tanveer Rahman (Senior Planning Officer, Place) presented the application

In summary the following issues were noted:

- Overview of the Development Consent Order and associated parameter plans.
- Site location and the key features of the proposals before the Committee.
- The outcome of the public consultation (38 letters in objections were received, one representation from a Councillor, 3 neutral letters and 1 in support). The main issues raised related to design, landscaping, the ventilation shafts, kiosk, the artwork, safety and security s, and amenity..
- That the proposal would serve as a positive addition to the King Edward Memorial Park, and deliver comprehensive soft and hard landscaping.
- Planning Officers were supportive of the scheme and raised no objections to the proposals which were generally supported by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces,,Place Shaping, Arboriculture and Biodiversity Teams. In addition consultation responses received from the Environment Agency,the Port of London Authority (who manage

the River Thames) and the Met Police Designing Out Crime Team raising no objection to the details submitted.

Overall, the development is considered to comply with relevant Requirements of the DCO and its relevant guideline documents. It was considered that the Requirements could be discharged.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee

Hazel Parker-Brown, Amanda Day and Councillor Peter Golds raised concerns regarding the following issues:

- The proposed kiosk – in terms of its utilitarian design, size and location,
- It was requested that the design should be reviewed in consultation with Officers to prevent the loss of trees, and impacts on the pedestrian access route.
- Increased security risks for neighbours - given the proximity of the kiosk to the boundary and properties at Free Trade Wharf. It was questioned why these issues had not been raised with the Safer Neighbourhoods Team?
- The design/colour of the ventilation towers. Concerns were expressed over the use of poor materials, they would be brown not bronze.
- Suitability of the proposed art work, and including the artwork ships. Concerns were expressed that it fails to reflect of the history of the park.
- The proposed benefits of the scheme.

Chloe Evans and Tony Bowden, (Resident of Trafalgar Court) highlighted the benefits of the scheme including:

- The wider benefits of the project - to provide a national significant infrastructure project - to reduce sewage disposal in the River Thames.
- The benefits included: landscaping improvements to extend the park, with enhanced view of the Thames, biodiversity improvements, new public art, bespoke ventilation columns, which were unique to the site.
- The proposals comply with the design principles document.
- The applicant is mindful of the concerns about the kiosk and the security risks. It was further noted that these plans had been carefully designed to set back the proposal from the boundary and ensure this was safe. The Metropolitan Police had not raised any issues. The applicant was also exploring further proposals in relation to the boundary wall and properties, outside the remit of this application.
- The applicant has carried out a substantial amount of engagement with the local residents and had sought to make changes where possible to the plans. This included the creation of bespoke ventilation columns and making changes to the proposed artwork and materials, amongst other things
- Tony Bowen also commented that the disruption from the works had been so far minimal. There had been regular contact between the

applicant's team and residents. The improvements to the park were welcomed.

The Committee asked questions of clarity of the registered speaker and Officers around the issues summarised below:

- The issues around the safety of the nearby residents of Free Trade Wharf. Concerns were expressed that the gap between the kiosk, the boundary wall and residents properties may pose a security risk. Whilst aware that the issues of the boundary wall was outside the remit of the planning application, the Committee were keen to see any potential security issues addressed in relation to the boundary wall, and for further consideration to given to options such as increasing the height of the boundary wall. The Committee were keen to ensure the applicant's team continue to engage with residents, particularly about their safety concerns.
- The security has been raised as an issue. The Metropolitan Police has considered the application and had raised no concerns. Officers were satisfied with the security measures and the mitigation proposed, (landscaping works, the anti – climbing measures, the separation distances). It was also recommended that an informative should be imposed that the applicant continue to liaise with the Metropolitan Police regarding gaining secure by design accreditation.
- The applicant's team also confirmed that the scheme had been carefully designed in such a way to maximise security with materials to prevent climbing, graffiti, and be of a good quality appearance.
- In view of the Committee comments, the applicant underlined their commitment to:
  - continue to look at ways with the Council to address any security issues in relation to the height of the boundary wall and residents safety and
  - to continue to engage with the residents regarding the proposals, particularly the residents of the Free Trade Wharf about any security issues.
- It was also stated by Bob Bennett (the Council's Project Manager for the scheme) that the Council met regularly with Thames Tideway and they would continue to raise these issues.
- Members also discussed the design and appearance of the kiosk, the ventilation columns, and the artwork. It was questioned how these would fit into the area and whether changes had been made to the proposals?
- It was noted that the kiosk' footprint would be larger than that contained in the DCO's illustrative landscaping plan. However the design of the kiosk had also been amended to change the materials from brick to cladding – so that it would appear less intrusive and to improve its appearance
- Consideration had been given to alternative sizes and designs- , (bearing in mind the need to comply with the DCO approved parameter plan and design documents and for the building to accommodate the essential equipment). Having assessed these options, including



creating a sloping roof, it was found this the alternatives would be more intrusive. This was considered to be the most suitable option in view of the functional requirements.

- It was noted that the design issues were to a degree subjective. It was for the Committee to decide on whether they found this satisfactory bearing in mind the limitations/need to comply with the DCO and associated documents.
- Officers were of the view of that the design of these features would be acceptable and will reflect the local heritage. Details of the specific features were noted, including the design of the proposed artwork ships.
- With the permission of the Chair, a member of the applicant's team provided an overview of the merits of the design and the aims of interpretation strategy in respect of reflecting/celebrating the local heritage and culture of the area. They also advised of the plans to provide information about the site and the proposals, through for example signage.
- Members also asked questions about the approach to the landscaping. The applicant advised that they had worked hard to incorporate as much soft landscaping into the scheme as possible, and provide public seating and areas that residents would enjoy to use. They also advised of the need for provision of the hard landscaping to meet the servicing and access, which would be very difficult to avoid.

The Committee voted on a proposal to defer the application and on a vote of one in favour and three against, this was not agreed.

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

1. That the Thames Water Utilities Limited (Thames Tideway Tunnel) Order 2014 application Schedule 3 Requirements be DISCHARGED for the following:
  - KEMPF2 - Location of permanent works;
  - KEMPF3 - Detailed design approval for permanent above-ground structures;
  - KEMPF4 - Detailed design approval for signature ventilation columns;
  - KEMPF5 - Detailed design approval for river wall and foreshore structure;
  - KEMPF6 - Landscaping works;
  - KEMPF14 - Surface water drainage; and
  - PW11 - Interpretation strategy (project-wide requirement)
2. Subject to the Informatives in the Committee report and the additional Informative requested by Members recommending that the applicant continue to work with residents to make security improvements outside of the scope of the DCO.

**7. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS**

There were none

The meeting ended at 9.40 p.m.

Chair,  
Councillor David Edgar  
Development Committee