

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 12 DECEMBER 2012

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

Members Present:

Councillor Helal Abbas (Chair)
Councillor Kosru Uddin
Councillor Craig Aston
Councillor Khaled Uddin Ahmed
(Substitute for Councillor Anwar Khan)

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Peter Golds

Officers Present:

Jerry Bell	– (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Fleur Brunton	– (Senior Lawyer - Planning Chief Executive's)
Nasser Farooq	– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Graham Harrington	– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Zoe Folley	– (Committee Officer, Democratic Services Chief Executive's)
	–

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Shiria Khatun, Md. Maium Miah and Anwar Khan for whom Councillor Khaled Uddin Ahmed was deputising.

2. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made.

3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14th November 2012 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, together with details of persons who had registered to speak at the meeting.

6. DEFERRED ITEMS

Nil items.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

7.1 Betty May Gray House and St Johns House, Pier Street, London, E14 (PA/12/01803)

Update Report tabled.

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader) introduced the report at Betty May Gray House and St Johns House, Pier Street, London, E14.

The Chair invited the registered speakers to address the meeting.

Councillor Peter Golds addressed the meeting as the ward Councillor for the site location. A key concern was the density that was in excess of policy. The Isle of Dogs area was already overdeveloped. There would be a lack of infrastructure in the area to support the scheme, (i.e lack of roads, schools etc). The s106 was inadequate to mitigate the impact of the scheme. Betty May Gray House was an outstanding landmark on the island. Whilst it needed work, this scheme was inappropriate. It was not the solution given: the loss of trees, the inappropriate terraces, design etc.

Councillor Golds had spoken to the residents of the Betty May Gray House and he could not find any resident that supported it. The application should be refused and referred back to the applicant for further amendment.

John Walton the applicant's agent spoke in support of the scheme. The applicant had been in consultation with the Council and the community since 2011 regarding the application. The applicant had carefully consulted the residents with regular meetings and had listened to their concerns. The feedback was positive and the residents appeared to support the scheme. He was therefore surprised by the comments that no one from the Betty May Gray House supported the scheme. There were measures to minimise disruption which he listed.

He highlighted the benefits. The scheme sought to provide modern fit for purpose units. This including modernising and providing new older persons units so they complied with modern standards. As well as providing them with greater choice (in terms of tenure options). It would create a new area of open space for residents. The present space was of poor quality. The proposal would be car free. There would be no loss of parking for existing residents. The scheme was fully viable given the GLA grant and private sale units.

Overall it would greatly regenerate the site with superior housing, landscaping and open space. The proposal should be granted.

In reply to Members, Mr Walton referred to the plans to replace the community centre on the existing site. The new facility would be open to the public to use.

Nasser Farooq (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report. He described the site layout and the existing use. He described the plans to demolish the buildings, the new buildings, the proposed housing mix, the plans for transferring occupants and the design and materials.

In response to the consultation, 5 letters of objection had been received. Mr Farooq addressed the concerns and the material issues.

In terms of daylight, most of the properties tested fell within an acceptable range and therefore complied with policy. A small number would see slightly greater losses. However, due the circumstances, it was considered that the impact on such properties was acceptable.

Mr Farooq explained the affordable housing offer that exceeded policy. He described the conditions to replace trees and promote biodiversity. The communal space was in excess of requirements. All of the proposed units would have some private amenity space.

He described the s106. The scheme was unable to support a full s106 due to the costs of the scheme on viability. However, it was considered that the offer was acceptable given the overall benefits of the scheme.

In summary, Officers recommended that the scheme should be approved.

Members sought clarity on a number of issues from Officers:

In reply, Officers considered that the density was acceptable given the lack of impact overall. Furthermore any reduction in density could require a reduction in the family sized units. It was considered logical to keep these units given the shortage of such units in the area.

The notice letters to residents were dispatched on 7th July 2012 and there was also site notices and an advert in the East End Life newspaper.

On a vote of 2 for 1 against and 1 abstention, the Committee RESOLVED:

1. That planning permission Betty May Gray House and St Johns House, Pier Street, London, E14 (PA/12/01803) be GRANTED for the regeneration of the Betty May Gray Estate including the refurbishment of existing homes, provision of new homes and replacement of St John's homes subject to:
2. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the report;
3. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above.
4. 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;
5. That if, within three months of the date of this committee the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director of Development & Renewal is delegated power to refuse planning permission.

7.2 Wood Wharf, Preston's Road E14 (PA/12/02584)

Update Report Tabled

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader) introduced the report at Wood Wharf, Preston's Road E14 (PA/12/02584).

There were no speakers registered.

Graham Harrington (Planning Officer) presented the report. The application sought to extend the existing temporary permission for the site to enable the development of the long term plans for the site.

The applicant had applied for a two year extension of the permission. However, Officers were recommending a one year permission to facilitate monitoring. Mr Harrington explained the site location and the character of the

nearby properties. The application site comprised two plots (A&B). The proposals for each plot were outlined.

Mr Harrington explained the activities provided at the site over the last 16 months. Environmental Health had received some complaints about events. As a result, Officers were proposing additional conditions and changes to the Management Plan to address these. This included greater monitoring of events, keeping the bridge open for longer and the provision of a hot line for reporting issues.

This new application sought to provide live music. This was a new proposal. However it was anticipated that this would only be for small scale events.

It also sought changes to the delivery and servicing arrangements to increase flexibility.

Members asked a number of questions of Officers.

In reply, Officers explained the measures to control noise and live events. There were measures in the Management Plan to manage such impacts. As a result, it was unnecessary for Officers to obtain a detailed schedule of live events. It would also be reasonable to allow the applicant some flexibility in planning live events so they could be responsive. There were also additional conditions, separate to the Management Plan, to mitigate the impact as well as the Environmental health law.

The intention was to give residents prior notice of events. Leaflets would be delivered to the nearby properties within a given radius. There would be a notice on the website prior to events.

There was a commitment to staff the hotline for reporting any issues. The Chair considered that this was very important and that the hotline was widely publicised, especially for larger events, so that residents amenity was not compromised.

On a unanimous vote, the Committee RESOLVED:

That planning permission Wood Wharf, Preston's Road E14 (PA/12/02584) be GRANTED subject to the conditions, informatives and the S106 Obligations set out in the report for the Temporary change of use to Class D1 (non-residential institution) and D2 (assembly and leisure), up to 2400 sq.m. of Class A3 (restaurants and cafès) and A4 (drinking establishments) floorspace and sui generis (theatre, outdoor exhibition uses, falling outside Class D1) and ancillary uses, to comprise no more than 14,999 sq.m. of enclosed floorspace; erection of a temporary bridge; erection of temporary structures; works of hard and soft landscaping, parking and other works incidental to the application for a period of one year.

8. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

The meeting ended at 7.50 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Helal Abbas
Development Committee