

**STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON MONDAY, 7 MARCH 2011**

**DECISIONS ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Stephanie Eaton.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Item(s)</b>	<b>Type of Interest</b>	<b>Reason</b>
David Edgar	8.1	Personal	The report contained references to the Leaside Regeneration Company, of which he was a Council nominated Board Member.
Carli Harper-Penman	8.1	Personal	She was an owner occupier of a property in Bow Quarter, the freehold for which was owned by Ballymore Group. However she had no financial interest in that Group.

**3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES**

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 20 January 2011 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**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.

## 6. DEFERRED ITEMS

Nil items.

## 7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

### 7.1 Bow Enterprise Park, Cranwell Close, London

Councillor Shahed Ali proposed an amendment, seconded by Councillor Kabir Ahmed, "That a condition be added for details of proposed uses of parking spaces between affordable and full market housing to be referred to Officers for approval at a later date." On being put to the vote, the amendment was declared **carried** unanimously.

On a vote of five for and one against, the Committee **RESOLVED**

- (1) That planning permission be **GRANTED** at Bow Enterprise Park, Cranwell Close, London, for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of new buildings between 3 to 20 storeys plus basement and comprising Use Class B1 (up to 6220 sq.m.), flexible Use Class A1/A2/A3/A5 (up to 490 sq.m.), 557 residential units (Use Class C3) (up to 46,844 sq.m.) comprising 217 x 1bed, 234 x 2bed, 93 x 3bed, 6 x 4bed, 7 x 6bed with associated landscaping, highways and infrastructure works, subject to any direction by the Mayor of London, the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure planning obligations, and to the planning conditions and informatives as set out in the circulated report and amended by the update report **Tabled** at the meeting.
- (2) That a further condition be added as follows:

“That details of proposed uses of parking spaces between affordable and full market housing be referred to Officers for approval at a later date.”

- (3) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated in resolution (1) above.
- (4) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated authority to issue planning conditions and informatives to secure the matters listed in the circulated report.
- (5) That, if within three months of the date of this committee the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated the power to refuse planning permission.

## **8. OTHER PLANNING ITEMS**

### **8.1 Leamouth Peninsula North, Orchard Place, London, E14**

On a **unanimous** vote it was **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the Committee formally object to the application made by the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation (LTGDC) at Leamouth Peninsula North, Orchard Place, London, E14 for hybrid planning application for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Leamouth peninsula for mixed-use development to provide up to 185,077 sq.m (GEA) of new floor space and up to 1,706 residential units (use class C3) comprising:

**1) Full planning application** for development of **Phase 1**, at the southern end of the site, comprising the erection of 5 buildings, namely G, H, I, J & K, and alterations to existing building N, to provide:

- 537 residential units (use class C3)
- 5,424sqm of office and flexible business workspace (use class B1)
- 382sqm retail, financial and professional services, food and drink (use class A1, A2, A3, A4 A5)
- 1,801sqm of leisure (use class D2)
- 1,296sqm of community uses (use class D1)
- 249sqm art gallery (use class D1)
- 2,390sqm energy centre 275 car parking spaces

**2) Outline planning application for Phase 2**, at the northern end of the site, comprising Buildings A, B, C, D E, F & M (with all matters reserved except for access and layout) and to provide:

- Maximum of 1,169 residential units (use class C3)
- 2,424sqm of office and flexible business workspace (use class B1)
- 1,470sqm of retail, financial and professional services, food and drink (use class A1, A2, A3, A4 A5)
- 1,800sqm of arts and cultural uses floorspace (use class D1)
- 4,800sqm of educational floorspace (use class D1)
- Storage and car and cycle parking
- Formation of a new pedestrian access (river bridge) across the River Lea
- Formation of a new vehicular access and means of access and circulation within the site, new private and public open space and landscaping and works to the river walls.

(2) That such formal objection be made, as set out in the circulated report and the update report **Tabled** at the meeting, on the grounds that:

(i) The provision of 19.6% affordable housing (or 11% without grant funding) together with the proposed cascade mechanism would fail to contribute towards meeting the borough's affordable housing need and affordable housing targets, contrary to the aims of PPS3, Policy 3A.9 of the London Plan (2008), Policy HSG3 of the IPG (2007) and Policy SP02 in the Core Strategy (2010) which seek to ensure the borough meets the overall strategic target for affordable housing.

(ii) The overall under provision of family housing would result in an unacceptable housing mix contrary to policy 3A.9 and 3A.10 in London plan, policy HSG2 and HSG3 in the IPG (2007) and policy SP02 in the Core Strategy (2010) which seek to ensure developments provide an appropriate housing mix to meet the needs of the borough.

(iii) Given the significance of this strategic site in terms of the Council's overall growth agenda and the vision for Leamouth (especially housing growth, the provision of affordable housing, improved connectivity and the delivery of required social/community infrastructure to support development), the proposal, viewed alongside financial viability constraints and the inability of the scheme to satisfactorily mitigate the various impacts and accommodate associated infrastructure requirements, will fail to deliver a sustainable, liveable, vibrant, accessible and inclusive community, contrary to policies S01, SP02 and SP13 of the adopted Core Strategy (2010).

(iv) The proposal, by virtue of the proposed solid encroachment of the northern bridge landing on to the foreshore, fails to provide sufficient information to ensure necessary mitigation against nature conservation contrary to Policy 3D.14 and Policy 4B.1 of the London Plan (2008); the London Biodiversity Action Plan (2008); Policy DEV57 of Tower Hamlets UDP (1998) (saved policies); Policy DEV7 of Tower Hamlets IPG (2007) and Policy SP04 of Tower Hamlets Core Strategy (2010) which seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity value.

(v) The proposed encroachment of the northern bridge landing into the river is likely to impede flood flow and/or reduce storage capacity, thereby increasing the risk of flooding contrary to PPS25, Policy 4A.13 of the London Plan (2008), Policy DEV21 of Tower Hamlets IPG (2007) and Policy SP04 of the Core Strategy (2010) which seek to reduce the risk and impact of flooding.

(vi) The encroachment of the northern bridge landing into the deepest part of the river is considered to have adverse impact on the navigational function of the river, and considered unacceptable by the Council and the Port of London Authority, contrary to Policy SP04 (4) of the Core Strategy (2010) and Policy OSN3 of the IPG (2007) which seek to deliver a network of high quality usable and accessible water spaces through protecting and safeguarding existing water spaces from inappropriate development and using water spaces for movement and transport.

(3) That notwithstanding the position outlined above, if LTGDC is minded to approve the application this should be subject to conditions relating to:

- Permission valid for 3 years
- Submission of reserved matters
- Approved plans
- Accordance with approved phasing plan
- Constructed in accordance with the drawings hereby approved
- Contamination remediation reports
- Landscape plan
- Details of disabled access and egress
- Details of emergency access and widening works
- Details and samples of external materials
- Ambient noise & noise insulation
- Refuse store details
- External lighting scheme
- Details of the proposed unit sizes for the A1- A5 uses
- Restriction to level of A5 floorspace
- Details of opening hours of non residential uses
- Details of directional signage and way finding
- Details of shared surfaces and cycling route
- Details of cycle storage

- Lifetime Homes
- 10% wheelchair accessible units
- Security management scheme & secured by design details
- Sustainable Homes Code Level 4
- BREEAM rating of excellent
- Details on CHP, swimming pool heat load and site heat network.
- Further details regarding PV technologies
- Construction management plan
- Environmental management plan
- Details of ventilation/extraction for non-residential uses
- Details of shared surface and boundary treatment
- Details of post excavation work (following previous programme of recording and historic analysis)
- Design details and method statements for ground floor structures to ensure the proposed location of Crossrail structures and tunnels.
- Details on fire brigade access and water supplies and ring main
- Drainage plans including details of minimum water pressure head and flow rates
- Details of en-route aviation obstruction lighting at the top of the tallest structure
- Separate systems of drainage for foul and surface water
- No building/other obstruction within 3m of public sewer
- Restriction of 1995 Permitted Development Rights
- 20% electric vehicle charging points
- Further potential work required regarding the precise location of proposed bus stop
- Car park management strategy
- Further details showing design of Building N
- Ecological Improvements, including details of:
  - Reed bed planting and intertidal terraces
  - At least 6,000sqm of brown roofs
  - Timber baulking on all sections of river wall
  - Nest boxes for peregrine falcons on tall buildings.
  - A swift tower to provide multiple nest sites for swifts
  - 11 nest sites in the river walls for kingfishers and sand martins.
  - Other nest boxes for birds including black redstarts, house martins and grey wagtails
- Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Corporate Director Development & Renewal.

(4) That Members of the Strategic Development Committee be kept informed of the results of this objection and the progress of the application.

## **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

It was agreed that Members so wishing should contact the Development Control Manager for a briefing on the Huntingdon Estate/Fleet Street Hill application before this is submitted to Committee.

**Kevan Collins**  
**CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

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