

STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON TUESDAY, 15 DECEMBER 2009

DECISIONS ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Rania Khan and Shiria Khatun, on behalf of whom Councillors Sirajul Islam and Helal Abbas deputised respectively.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members declared interests in items on the agenda for the meeting as set out below:-

Councillor	Item(s)	Type of Interest	Reason
Shafiqul Haque	6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5	Personal	Correspondence received from concerned parties. He was a member of a Gym located in the Britannia Hotel, adjacent to the site that was the subject of the application. He was a Ward Member for the site.
	7.2	Personal	
	7.3	Personal	
Helal Abbas	7.1	Personal	Correspondence received from concerned parties.
Sirajul Islam	7.1	Personal	Correspondence received from concerned parties.
Alibor Choudhury	6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5	Personal	Correspondence received from concerned parties.
Marc Francis	6.1, 7.1, 7.5	Personal	Correspondence received from concerned parties
Rupert Eckhardt	7.1, 7.2	Personal	Correspondence received from concerned parties. He was a Ward Member for the area of the application.
	7.2	Personal	
Stephanie Eaton	7.1, 7.3, 7.4	Personal	Correspondence

			received from concerned parties
Dulal Uddin	6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3,7.4, 7.5	Personal	Correspondence received from concerned parties

3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

RESOLVED that the unrestricted minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2009 be confirmed as a correct record of the proceedings.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

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 Development and Renewal 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 Development and Renewal is delegated authority to do so, provided always that the Corporate Director does not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision.

5. PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS

The Committee noted the procedure for hearing objections and those who had registered to speak at the meeting.

6. DEFERRED ITEMS

6.1 Job Centre Plus, 60 Commercial Road, London E1 1LP

On a vote of three for and nil against, it was -

RESOLVED that planning permission for the demolition of the existing building at 60 Commercial Road, London, E1 1LP and erection of a 21 storey building plus basement to provide retail/commercial/community unit (Use Class A1/A2/A3/A4B1/D1) at ground floor and student accommodation and

ancillary uses together with associated servicing, landscaping and other incidental works be REFUSED, subject to any direction from the Mayor of London, for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its excessive height and bulk, would appear out of character with the surrounding area. The proposal fails to relate to the scale of nearby buildings on Commercial Road and to the rear of the site on Back Church Lane. As a result, it is considered that the proposal would be out of keeping with the existing urban form. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 4B.1, 4B.8, 4B.9, and 4B.10 of The London Plan 2008, policies DEV1, DEV2 and DEV3 of the Unitary Development Plan 1998 and policies CP48, DEV1, DEV2 and CON2 of the Council's Interim Planning Guidance 2007 which seek to ensure development is of appropriate design.
2. The proposed development would result in unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight to nearby residential properties and as such is contrary to saved policies DEV1 and DEV2 of the adopted Tower Hamlets Unitary Development Plan 1998 and policies DEV1 and DEV2 of Council's Interim Planning Guidance (2007): Core Strategy and Development Control, which seek to ensure development does not have an adverse impact on neighbouring amenity.
3. The planning obligations are considered inadequate to mitigate against the impact of the development on community infrastructure and transport. As such, the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of Policy DEV4 of the adopted Tower Hamlets Unitary Development Plan 1998 which seeks to secure appropriate planning obligations which are reasonably related to the scale and nature of the proposed development and are necessary for the development to proceed.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

7.1 Eric and Treby Estates, Mile End, Treby Street, London

On a vote of four for and three against, it was –

RESOLVED:

- (1) That planning permission be GRANTED for the regeneration of Eric and Treby Estate, comprising the refurbishment of existing buildings, the demolition of 14 bed-sit units at 1-14 Brokesley Street and the erection of buildings between 1 and 7 storeys to provide 179 residential units (comprising: 19 x studio, 61 x 1 bed, 52 x 2 bed, 38 x 3 bed and 9 x 5 bed), two new community buildings of 310 sq.m and 150 sq.m, a new housing management office of 365 sq.m and 251 sq.m of commercial space and the introduction of an estate wide landscape improvement scheme, subject to:-

(a) Any direction by the Mayor of London;

(b) The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations listed in paragraph 3.3B of the Officer's report, as amended by paragraph 3.2 of the Officer's update report so as to include the following non-financial planning obligation:

- The bus stop outside site 8 shall be relocated to an alternative location (to be agreed in consultation with Transport for London), or suitable alternative access arrangements agreed.

(2) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated power to negotiate the legal agreement above.

(3) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated authority to impose conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the matters listed at paragraph 3.5 of the Officer's report.

(4) That Conservation Area Consent be GRANTED for the demolition of 1-14 Brokesley Street, subject to the conditions listed at paragraph 3.6 of the Officer's report.

(5) That, if by 30 April 2010 the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated power to refuse planning permission.

NOTE: At this point the Chair indicated that the order of business on the agenda would be varied in order to consider item 7.4, in view of the fact that speakers were registered and a large number of the public present. However, the agenda items are recorded in their original order for ease of reference.

7.2 40 Marsh Wall, London E14 9TP

On a vote of one for and four against, it was –

RESOLVED

That the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission for demolition of the existing building at 40 Marsh Wall and erection of a 39 storey building (equivalent of 40 storeys on Manila Street) with three-level basement, comprising a 305 bedroom hotel (Use Class C1) with associated ancillary hotel facilities including restaurants (Use Class A3), leisure facilities (Use Class A3), leisure facilities (Use Class D2) and conference facilities (Use Class D1), serviced offices (Use Class B1); together with rooftop plant and associated landscaping and the formation of a taxi drop-off point on Marsh Wall be NOT ACCEPTED.

The Committee indicated that they were minded to refuse the planning application because of serious concerns over:

- The issue of impact on views from the south of the site.
- The allocation of S106 funding towards highway improvements and footway reconstruction with York stone and granite sets on the south side of Marsh Wall.
- Public transport issues.
- Inadequacy of coach and other vehicular parking facilities.

In accordance with Development Procedural Rules, the application was DEFERRED to enable Officers to prepare a supplementary report to a future meeting of the Committee setting out proposed detailed reasons for refusal and the implications of the decision.

7.3 Former Beagle House, Braham Street, London E1 8EP

On a vote of three for and four against, it was –

RESOLVED

That the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission for the demolition of the existing building at Former Beagle House, Barham Street, London, E1 8EP and the erection of a 17 storey building comprising two ground floor retail units (Class A1, A2, A3, or A4), 1st – 17th floor office use (Class B1) and two basement levels plus associated servicing, landscaping, plant accommodation, parking, access and any other works incidental to the application be NOT ACCEPTED.

The Committee indicated that they were minded to refuse the planning application because of serious concerns over:

- The physical impact of the scheme on the surrounding area in terms of the bulk and massing of the proposed building.
- Inadequate financial contributions towards the local transport infrastructure.
- Inadequate financial contributions towards local employment and training.

In accordance with Development Procedural Rules, the application was DEFERRED to enable Officers to prepare a supplementary report to a future meeting of the Committee setting out proposed detailed reasons for refusal and the implications of the decision.

7.4 Site at 438-490 Mile End Road, London E1 4PE

On a vote of nil for and six against, it was –

RESOLVED

That the officer recommendation to grant planning permission for the demolition of existing structures at 438-490 Mile End Road, London, E1, and erection of a new building ranging from 3 to 9 storeys to provide a new education facility comprising teaching accommodation and associated

facilities, student housing, cycle and car-parking, refuse and recycling facilities be NOT ACCEPTED.

The Committee indicated that they were minded to refuse the planning application because of serious concerns over:

- The physical impact of the scheme on the surrounding area in terms of the height, bulk and massing of the proposed building.
- Inadequate financial contributions towards local employment and training initiatives.
- The requirement for a more mixed nature of occupancy of the proposed development.

In accordance with the Development Procedural Rules, the application was DEFERRED to enable Officers to prepare a supplementary report to a future meeting of the Committee setting out proposed detailed reasons for refusal and the implications of the decision.

7.5 Former Goodmans Fields, 74 Alie Street & Land North of Hooper Street and East of 99 Leman Street, Hooper Street, London

On a vote of two for and four against, it was –

RESOLVED

That the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission for redevelopment of Former Goodmans Fields, 74 Alie Street (Land north of Hooper Street and east of 99 Leman Street, Hooper Street), London, to provide four courtyard buildings of 19-23 storeys, erection of a 4 storey terrace along Gower's Walk, change of use to residential (Class C3) and construction of an additional storey to 75 Leman Street: the overall scheme comprising 772 residential units (Class Class C3), 650 bedroom student accommodation (sui generis), 351 bedroom hotel (Class C1), primary care centre (Class D1), commercial uses (Class A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1 and D2), public open space, landscaping, servicing, plant accommodation, car parking and access and associated works be NOT ACCEPTED.

The Committee indicated that they were minded to refuse the planning application because of serious concerns over:

- The overdevelopment of the site as manifested particularly in the number of towers and the height of the proposed buildings.
- Excessive massing of the perimeter buildings and their impact on surrounding properties.

In accordance with the Development Procedural Rules, the application was DEFERRED to enable Officers to prepare a supplementary report to a future meeting of the Committee setting out proposed detailed reasons for refusal and the implications of the decision.

Kevan Collins
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

(Please note that the wording in this document may not reflect the final wording used in the minutes.)