

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 6.30 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 2 MARCH 2023

COUNCIL CHAMBER - TOWN HALL, WHITECHAPEL

Members Present:

Councillor Abdul Wahid (Chair)
Councillor Kamrul Hussain (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Iqbal Hossain
Councillor James King
Councillor Amin Rahman

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Peter Golds
Councillor Nathalie Bienfait

Officers Present:

Gareth Gwynne	– (Area Planning Manager, Planning and Building Control, Place)
Astrid Patil	– (Lawyer, Legal Services)
Rikki Weir	– (Principal Planning Officer, Planning and Building Control, Place)
Lauren Ford	– (Planning Officer, Planning and Building Control, Place)
Kirsty Glimer	– (Team Leader, Planning and Building Control, Place)
Sally Fraser	– (Team Leader, Planning and Building Control, Place)
Thomas French	– (Democratic Services Officer Committees)

Apologies:

Councillor Suluk Ahmed
Councillor Amy Lee

1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER INTERESTS

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests, however the Chair mentioned that he received correspondence on items on the agenda.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the Committee held on 7 December 2022 meeting 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. 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

4. DEFERRED ITEMS

Nil items.

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

6. TOWER BRIDGE WHARF, 84 ST KATHARINE'S WAY, LONDON, E1W 1UR

The published update report was noted.

Gareth Gwynne, Area Planning Manager, introduced the application for Construction of an additional storey to create five new residential apartments. Associated cycle and refuse store.

Rikki Weir, Principal Planning Officer, provided a presentation on the application. The Committee were reminded of the key features of the application, including photographs of the site and surrounds. The Officer's recommendation was to refuse planning permission.

At the invitation of the Chair, objections were raised to the committee, highlighting the impact on access to the Thames River path and anti-social behaviour.

At the invitation of the Chair, reasons to support the application were raised to the committee, highlighting the need to improve the overall look of the building and the need to increase security in the area.

Further to questions from the Committee, officers and residents provided more details on the following elements of the application:

- How long has anti-social behaviour been reported here? And what did officers investigate about the anti-social behaviour in the area? Residents have been reporting anti-social behaviour in the area since around 2016, including calling the police. Officers looked at police data, community reporting from Safer Neighbourhood Panels and the work of the council's own noise team.
- What were the number of objections and how many were residents? Officers reported that most of the objections came from local residents in the Wapping area and there were over 60 objections.
- Is the anti-social behaviour from local residents? What is the nature of it? There has been a range of activity in the area, usually in large groups. The data collected does not go into that kind of breakdown, but residents have noticed a few instances of seeing the same individuals returning to the area.
- How can we find a balance between allowing access to the area but also tackling anti-social behaviour? Officers have recommended refusal based on the restriction of access for a number of reasons, but there are real concerns from residents about anti-social behaviour.
- Members expressed concern about the access issues that were presented and no real plans to address anti-social behaviour.

The Committee debated the application and moved to the vote.

On a vote of 5 in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions the Committee

RESOLVED:

That planning permission is **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would be unacceptable as it would adversely impact on active lifestyle choices, it would unduly restrict access to Publicly Accessible Open Space, water spaces, the Thames Path and National Trail, contrary to policies D.SG3, S.OWS1, S.OWS2, D.OWS4 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan, GG3, SI 16, G4 of the London Plan.
2. The proposed development would be unacceptable as it would adversely impact on designate heritage assets (the Tower of London Conservation Area) through loss and restriction of the enjoyment of important riverside views. The proposal would also result in loss of permeability, legibility, connectivity and accessibility resulting in a less socially inclusive, less equal and less cohesive neighbourhood, increasing the perception of a private, gated community, contrary to policies S.DH1, D.DH2, S.DH3, D.DH4 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan, D3, D8, HC1, HC3, HC6 of the London Plan.

3. The proposed development would be unacceptable as it would adversely impact on the transport network, contrary to policies S.TR1 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan and T1, T2, T3 and T4 of the London Plan.

7. 22 SENRAB STREET, LONDON, E1 0QE

Gareth Gwynne, Area Planning Manager, introduced the application for Construction of an additional storey to create five new residential apartments. Associated cycle and refuse store.

Lauren Ford, Planning Officer, provided a presentation on the application. The Committee were reminded of the key features of the application, including photographs of the site and surrounds. The Officer's recommendation was to refuse planning permission.

At the invitation of the Chair, reasons to support the application were raised to the committee, highlighting that similar properties locally have had similar improvements, and the application has become more sensitive to the local area since it was last presented.

Further to questions from the Committee, officers and residents provided more details on the following elements of the application:

- How does this application differ from those houses on the same road with similar extensions? Officers confirmed while the application was of a similar size but since Senrab Street has become within a conservation area, this application is no longer favourable to local conservation.
- Have other applications come through the council's planning process that have had similar extensions within conservation area implications? Officers detailed applications they were aware of, but stated that the council is empowered to support conservation areas through the local plan.
- What was the impact of the consultation within the local area on this application? Offices detailed the consultation, stating that of the 30 properties that were consulted with, 24 were in support of the application with no objectors.

The Committee debated the application and moved to the vote.

On a vote of 0 in favour, 4 against and 1 abstention the Committee

RESOLVED:

That planning permission is **GRANTED** for the following reason:

- There were no objections to the application;
- Members considered that the proposed development would enhance the character of the property and provide much needed additional living space;

- The house next door and next-door-but-one already have similar extensions, built prior to Senrab's Street's designation as a Conservation Area. The fact that the heritage has already been impacted by the development to those two houses means that the impact of the proposed development is lessened;
- Members did not find the proposed development to be unsympathetic to the character of the Conservation Area.

8. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

There were no other planning matters to consider.

The meeting ended at 19:55

Chair, Councillor Abdul Wahid
Development Committee