

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 13 JUNE 2013**

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

**Members Present:**

Councillor Helal Abbas (Chair)  
Councillor Zara Davis  
Councillor Dr. Emma Jones  
Councillor Denise Jones  
Councillor Marc Francis  
Councillor Kabir Ahmed  
Councillor Md. Maium Miah  
Councillor Joshua Peck (Substitute for  
Councillor Rajib Ahmed)

**Other Councillors Present:**

Councillor Peter Golds

**Officers Present:**

Pete Smith	– (Development Control Manager, Development & Renewal)
Jerry Bell	– (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Fleur Brunton	– (Senior Lawyer - Planning Chief Executive's)
Amy Thompson	– (Deputy Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Graham Harrington	– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Sripriya Sudhakar	– (Development Design & Conservation Officer, Development and Renewal)
Zoe Folley	– (Committee Officer, Democratic Services Chief Executive's)

**1. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR FOR 2013/2014.**

It was proposed by Councillor Helal Abbas and seconded by Councillor Denise Jones and **RESOLVED**

That Councillor Marc Francis be elected Vice-Chair of the Strategic Development Committee for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2013/2014

## **2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Carli-Harper Penman and Rajib Ahmed for who Councillor Joshua Peck was deputising.

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

Councillor Joshua Peck declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in agenda items 9.2, City Pride Public House, 15 Westferry Road, London, E14 8JH (PA/12/03248) and 9.3 Island Point, Site At 443 To 451, Westferry Road, London (PA/12/03247). The declaration was made on the basis that his employer had a contract with the landowner. He indicated that he would leave the room for the consideration of these items.

## **4. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES**

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 18<sup>th</sup> April 2013 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## **5. 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

## **6. PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS**

The Committee noted the procedure for hearing objections, together with details of persons who had registered to speak at the meeting.

## **7. STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE, QUORUM, MEMBERSHIP AND DATES OF MEETINGS**

That the Strategic Development Committee's Terms of Reference, Quorum, Membership and Dates of future meetings as set out in Appendices 1, 2 and 3 to the committee report be noted.

## **8. DEFERRED ITEMS**

Nil items

## **9. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION**

### **9.1 Land adjacent to Langdon Park Station, corner of Cording Street and Chrisp Street, 134-156 Chrisp Street, London E14 (PA/12/00637)**

Update Report Tabled.

Pete Smith (Development Committee Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the item regarding Land adjacent to Langdon Park Station for the redevelopment of the site to provide a residential mixed use development with a new nursery space and associated works.

Members were reminded that on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2013, the Committee were minded to refuse the application for a number of reasons. Since that time, the applicant had made major changes to the scheme to address the concerns. In view of this and also the changes in the membership of the Committee at the annual Council meeting, the scheme was now being reported to the Committee as a new application.

Graham Harrington (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report and the update. He described in detail the scheme and surrounds including the proximity of the Town Centre, the Docklands Light Railway (DLR) station and the Langdon Park Conservation Area. He described the changes made to the scheme following the March meeting relating to the housing mix including the increase in affordable and family sized units. He also highlighted the plans to relocate the community space and on site child play space and the public realm improvements.

It was also now proposed to use the commercial space for D1 use only and provide additional contributions for affordable housing.

He advised of the outcome of the consultation (that was carried out again). Further letters of objection had been submitted as well as letters of support. The materials fitted in with the surrounding area that were a variety of designs. The s106 fully complied with the Council's SPD. Overall, Officers considered that this was a much improved scheme with no symptoms of overdevelopment area taking into the height and density. The scheme was recommended for approval.

In response to Members, Officers described the height of the surrounding tall buildings in the area that generally were of comparable heights to the proposal. This included tall buildings on the nearby East India Dock Road. Officers also explained the plans to rationalise the housing tenure mix that had helped add value. As a result of which, and the increase in sales values, the applicant was now able to offer the additional contributions for offsite affordable housing. Officers considered that these plans were acceptable

given the circumstances. There were conditions on the application to mitigate any noise and vibration from the DLR. Any plans to change the D1 nursery would need a separate application and permission. The proposal would help reinforce the area as a landmark point along with the existing tall building near the DLR. There would be an opportunity to review the housing mix, before the scheme commenced, to see if more affordable housing could be provided should market conditions improve. It was planned to provide several areas of open space that would be open to the public (including the semi open space).

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

1. That planning permission (PA/12/00637) at Land adjacent to Langdon Park Station, corner of Cording Street and Chrisp Street, 134-156 Chrisp Street, London E14 be **GRANTED** for the redevelopment of the site to provide a residential led mixed use development, comprising the erection of part 5 to 22 storey buildings to provide 206 dwellings and 129 sqm of new nursery space falling within use class D1, plus car parking spaces, cycle parking, refuse/recycling facilities and access together with landscaping including public, communal and private amenity space.

Subject to

2. Any direction by The London Mayor
3. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the committee report.
4. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above acting within normal delegated authority.
5. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to impose conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the matters set out in the report and the additional condition in the update.
6. Any other conditions(s) and informatives considered necessary by the Corporate Director Development & Renewal
7. That, if within 3 months of the date of this committee the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to refuse planning permission.

**9.2 City Pride Public House, 15 Westferry Road, London, E14 8JH  
(PA/12/03248)**

Update Report Tabled

Councillor Joshua Peck left the meeting for the consideration of the remaining items of business.

Pete Smith (Development Committee Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the items regarding the City Pride Public House for a new residential 75 storey tower and the linked Island Point scheme (Item 9.3) providing 173 residential units and associated works.

**Note:** It was agreed that the Committee would consider the presentations on the two schemes (9.2 & 9.3) together (including the speakers cases, Members questions and debate) as the applications were closely linked. However, the Committee would vote on the items separately.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Gill Crawford spoke in objection to the scheme. In terms of the City Pride scheme, she objected that the height was 23 metres higher than the approved scheme. She objected to the density that exceeded the London Plan guidance and the Council's policies. There would be an overconcentration of units in the area that would result in a loss of privacy for both the future and existing occupants. The plans would also have a negative impact on daylight and sunlight due to the height. The plans would increase traffic congestion. It would also place undue pressure on infrastructure (i.e. schools, transport, the utilities and water system) that were already stretched to capacity in the Isle of Dogs area.

In terms of Island Point, the scheme would have an overbearing impact on Julian House and Lockesfield Place Estate that were much lower in height. Locksfield Place would experience a loss of daylight and privacy due to the proposed boundary for the development. There would also be an overconcentration of social housing that would create a ghetto. The scheme would also place an undue pressure on infrastructure that was already at full capacity in the Isle of Dogs area. The contributions were insufficient to mitigate the impact on infrastructure for both schemes.

Edward Buckenham spoke in objection to the scheme as the Planning consultant for Lockesfield Place Estate residents. He objected to the segregation in housing mix on both sites. The argument for this centred on viability. However, he did not believe that this justified such a deviation from Council policy that encouraged mixed communities. The Greater London Authority (GLA) considered that the concentration of housing types was a concern. The applicant should explore having some affordable units in the City Pride scheme. He referred to the recent Skylines application refused by the Committee due to height and density. The same decision should be made here for consistency. He referred to an independent study of the daylight

impact that was submitted to the Council on behalf of the Lockesfield Place Estate. This showed that there would be a major loss of light within Lockesfield Place and BRE guidelines were exceeded.

Councillor Peter Golds spoke in objection to the schemes as a local Councillor. He referred to the detailed letter by the GLA on the schemes. He considered that the lack of mixed housing was out of keeping with the surrounding buildings that promoted social cohesion. The proposal was regressive and may create social problems. He objected to the impact on the infrastructure especially the bus network and advised that there were already problems with water pressure. He had personally carried out a study of customers using the bus route from Lambourne Place to Westferry Road and found that many passengers already used this route in a short space of time. He expressed concern about the impact on the health services and school places together with the newly consented schemes such as the ASDA scheme. The nearest health centres were already at full capacity. He feared that the City Pride units would be used as short term lets at the expense of community cohesion. In response to Members, he underlined the GLA concerns about the housing tenure.

Julian Carter spoke in support as the applicant's agent. The applicant had commissioned a review of the extant schemes. The study found that there was no real market for the proposed hotel use and the extant Island Point scheme was undeliverable. The new scheme was the outcome of this review. He explained the scope of the consultation carried out by the applicant including a pre-application briefing with the Committee and a consultation event with the community. The scheme had been amended in response to the concerns.

The height of the City Pride development had been increased but was of similar height to the surrounding buildings. There had also been an increase in the affordable housing including a large percentage of family housing with gardens. This had been independently assessed. He stressed the need for the housing mix in the area as shown by a postcode based analysis of the area.

In response to Members, he did not consider that overlooking at Island Point would be a problem due to the careful orientation of the windows. However, he was prepared to impose a condition that there would be no access to the roof top terraces in respect of the Island Point scheme in view of the concerns raised by the speaker.

Peter Exton of Tower Hamlets Community Housing (THCH) spoke in support. THCH has been appointed as the housing partner for the two schemes. He reported on the work undertaken to see if a greater mix of tenure could be provided on both sites. Based on these results, THCH were supportive of the split in tenures as it would allow them to manage the scheme at a more affordable level that would benefit the residents. The housing at Island Point would have separate kitchens, front doors and gardens that could not be delivered if sited at the City Point scheme due to the site constraints. In

response to Members, he confirmed that it would be easier for THCH to manage the schemes separately in terms of efficiency and would be more affordable for residents.

Amy Thompson (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report and update. She explained the site location for the City Pride scheme including the surrounding developments and consents of a similar height. She explained the outcome of the statutory consultation and drew comparisons to the extant permission which was a material consideration. She explained the policy support for locating the building in the area recognised as a location for high density developments. She described the floor plans, the amenity space, the measures to protect amenity and details of the housing mix.

She also explained the Island Point scheme in similar detail with comparisons to the extant scheme that was a material consideration. This included the outcome of the consultation, the new layout, the play space, the community and private space. There were measures to protect privacy and off set overlooking.

The schemes supplied 37% affordable housing (across both sites) with a greater concentration of family housing on Island Point due to the greater levels of open space at Island Point.

On balance, Officers were recommending that both schemes should be granted.

In response, Members expressed concern at the following issues:

- The division in housing tenures across the two sites. It was considered that that the plans departed from Council policy that supported mixed tenures and was inconsistent with other approved schemes in the area such as the Wood Wharf scheme.
- Affordable housing. There was a shortage of affordable rooms given the policy requirement of 50% when off site housing is offered.
- The height of the City Pride scheme given the height of the residential towers in the nearby area. The plans conflicted with Council policy that required that developments should step down in height from Canary Wharf not increase in height as in this case.
- The density range. Members noted that the density range exceeded the London Plan matrix and the extant scheme in a significant way. Therefore, it could cause overdevelopment.
- Amenity space. Concern was expressed at the shortfall of amenity space for both schemes given the number of occupants and the impact on existing open space.
- Impact on day light and sunlight. Members noted the shortfalls in terms of daylight and sunlight including the existing residents of the Landmark building. Some of the units would experience major losses to living rooms that would impact on their quality of life.
- The impact on views of the Greenwich World Heritage Site.

- Support was expressed for a condition on the roof top pavilion at the Island Point to prevent overlooking.

In response, Officers addressed each point. It was noted that the policy sought to encourage mixed development but also to maximize affordable housing and to meet the housing targets in the Borough. The scheme would greatly assist the Council in meeting the housing targets for the Borough and the delivery of affordable housing. Taking these factors into account, the scheme should be considered in the balance.

Officers stressed the need for the number of units at the City Pride site and the housing mix to fund the affordable housing at Island Point (as shown by the viability assessment). It was considered appropriate in this case to separate the tenures to maximize the affordable housing.

The meeting heard from the viability experts who had assessed the scheme. They confirmed that the developer did explore the option of mixing the tenures. However, it was found that this would result in much less affordable housing if mixed. The additional units at City Pride would also help mitigate the loss of housing grant (that would have been available when the extant scheme was granted) in terms of the affordable housing. The assessment showed that the maximum levels of affordable housing had been achieved. They also highlighted the quality of the City Pride building. It was considered that it would respond well and be in keeping with the emerging landscape. In this context, Officers considered that the bulk and height of the scheme was acceptable.

The Council's urban design expert addressed the Committee in respect of the acceptability of the building height and views. She advised that there are a number of tall buildings in the area establishing the context for tall buildings, and that there is a pattern of taller buildings defining the end of the docks, which the proposed City Pride building would continue. It was her advice that the Council needed to look at the height in accordance with town center hierarchy and there was no blanket approach to heights. In terms of views from Greenwich the new tower would appear in the cluster of towers which would form its background and within the context of consented schemes. Officers were satisfied that there would not be an adverse impact on views.

It was considered that the level of amenity space was acceptable taking into account the site constraints. There had been an increase in amenity space at the ground floor level at the City Pride site, made possible by the taller and slimmer building. The targets in policy regarding community space were in reality difficult to achieve in the Borough because of density and therefore it was important to make sure open space is of a good quality. The scheme showed no real symptoms of overdevelopment (in terms of the key impacts) despite the density range exceeding the London Plan guidance. Therefore, the density of the scheme was considered acceptable. Whilst there would be some impact on light, it was considered that, on balance, this was acceptable for a development of this nature and it was noted that the extant scheme had a greater impact in terms of daylight and sunlight.



Officers also outlined the s106 offer that complied with the Council's SPD.

On a vote of 2 in favour of the Officer recommendation, 4 against and 1 abstention the Committee **RESOLVED**:

That the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission (PA/12/03248) at City Pride Public House, 15 Westferry Road, London, E14 8JH be **NOT ACCEPTED** for the erection of residential (Class C3) led mixed use 75 storey tower (239mAOD) comprising 822 residential units and 162 serviced apartments (Class C1), and associated amenity floors, roof terrace, basement car parking, cycle storage and plant, together with an amenity pavilion including retail (Class A1-A4) and open space.

The Committee were minded to refuse the application due to concerns over:

- Height and scale in relation to the stepping down policy for tall buildings in the Canary Wharf area in Council policy.
- Density in relation to the London Plan and the number of units in the extant scheme.
- Lack of public open space.
- Housing mix and the lack of mixed tenure.

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, along with the implications of the decision.

(The Members that voted on this item were Councillors Helal Abbas, Zara Davis, Dr Emma Jones, Denise Jones Marc Francis, Md. Miah Maium and Kabir Ahmed)

### **9.3 Island Point, Site At 443 To 451, Westferry Road, London (PA/12/03247)**

Update Report Tabled

For a summary of the presentation and debate on this item, see previous item 9.2 City Pride Public House, 15 Westferry Road, London, E14 8JH (PA/12/03248)

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

That planning permission (PA/12/03247) at Island Point, Site At 443 To 451, Westferry Road, London be **DEFERRED** for the erection of buildings ranging in height from 3 to 5 storeys with rooftop pavillions rising to 6 storeys, providing 173 residential units (Use Class C3) with underground parking, open space, plant and associated community building (Class D1).

The Committee were minded to defer the scheme in view of the decision to not accept the previous linked scheme City Pride Public House, 15 Westferry Road, London, E14 8JH (PA/12/03248)

(The Members that voted on this item were Councillors Helal Abbas, Zara Davis, Dr Emma Jones, Denise Jones Marc Francis, Md. Miah Maium and Kabir Ahmed)

The meeting ended at 10.05 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Helal Abbas  
Strategic Development Committee