

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 5.30 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 24 JULY 2014

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

Members Present:

Councillor Marc Francis (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Suluk Ahmed
Councillor Shah Alam
Councillor Chris Chapman
Councillor Rajib Ahmed (Substitute for
Councillor Shiria Khatun)
Councillor Asma Begum (Substitute for
Councillor Sirajul Islam)

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Amy Whitelock Gibbs

Apologies:

Councillor Gulam Kibria Choudhury, Councillor Sirajul Islam and Councillor Shiria Khatun

Officers Present:

Paul Buckenham	(Development Control Manager, Development and Renewal)
Gerard McCormack	Planning Enforcement Team Leader, Development and Renewal
Shahara Ali-Hempstead	(Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Steen Smedegaard	(Legal Officer, Directorate, Law Probity and Governance)
Zoe Folley	(Committee Officer, Directorate Law, Probity and Governance)

1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made.

Councillors Marc Francis declared an interest in agenda item 7.1, Phoenix School, 49 Bow Road, London, E3 2AD (PA/14/01070). This was because that, as Cabinet Member, the Councillor had made a decision about a phase at Phoenix School. However the interest did not relate to or affect his capacity to participate in the determination of this application.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 25th June 2014 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Development Committee held on 9 April 2014 – Amendment

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 9th April 2014 be amended in respect of minute item 5.2 375 Cable Street, London, E1 0AH (PA/13/02251) as follows:

That the second sentence in paragraph seven:

“He explained the source of their evidence showing the presence of such bins and when the photographs were taken”

To be replaced by:

“He explained that the photograph used in the presentation had been sourced from Google Street View but could not advise the committee of the date of the photograph.”

3. 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

4. PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS AND MEETING GUIDANCE

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

5. DEFERRED ITEMS

None.

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

6.1 113-115 Roman Road, London, E2 0QN (PA/14/00662)

Update Report tabled.

Paul Buckenham (Development Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the application for the demolition of existing three storey 13 bedroom hotel and construction of a new four storey building to create a 31 bedroom hotel with no primary cooking on the premises.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee

Carla Mitchell spoke in opposition to the application representing the local Four Corners centre at 119-121 Roman Road, London E2 0QN. Her comments were that there would be a significant loss of light to the property from the proposal. Their green roof would also be damaged by the proposal and it would adversely affect the setting (character and appearance) of the Conservation Area.

There was no mention in the report of the loss of light to 119 Roman Road even though the property was very close to the application site and that the occupants had made Planning Services aware of the concerns. The applicant had a track record of enforcement issues and retrospective planning applications with other properties.

Michael Hartnett spoke in opposition representing 111 Roman Road. He objected to the impact on sunlight and overshadowing to this property from the proposal. He considered that the four storey extension would extend outwards by over 3 meters. The extensions would be unduly prominent and obstruct windows. He requested that the four and three storey extensions should be set back to protect amenity and preserve the area.

Councillor Amy Whitelock Gibbs spoke in objection highlighting the level of objections to the scheme amongst the community. There had been a petition in opposition with 100 signatures. She considered that the impact on the surrounding properties from the proposal in terms of overlooking and loss of light had not been fully taken into account. These impacts would be significant. It would also harm the green roof of a nearby property and would result in overdevelopment. This was unacceptable in the Conservation Area. Given the extent of this harm, particularly from the rear building, the application was unacceptable.

In response to questions about the measures to address the issues, Councillor Whitelock Gibbs did not consider that the conditions would address the key issues about the height and the impact on amenity.

Teymour Ali spoke in support of the application as the agent. He explained the scope of the daylight and sunlight assessment in respect of the

neighboring properties including 119-121 Roman Road. The assessments, including a site visit, showed that the impact would be minimal in relation to the BRE guidance. He therefore questioned the assumptions in the letters from the objectors about this issue.

He also referred to the assessment of the amenity impact on 111 and 117 Roman Road that showed that the rooms would continue to receive adequate levels of light. The nearest windows to the property passed the tests. The scheme had been amended at the rearward block to address the concerns about the height. Enforcements issues were not a relevant consideration. The height was in keeping with the surrounding buildings.

In response to Members, he explained that there had also been changes to the waste collection arrangements and the access plans amongst other matters.

Gerard McCormack (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report, highlighting the site location in the Conservation Area. He explained the outcome of the consultation, the proposed layout, the improvements to the scheme, the extensions in relation to the neighbours, the design and materials. It was considered that the scheme would have a minimal impact on daylight and sunlight levels and the green roof, which due to its orientation, already experienced some overshadowing. The site had a good public transport levels. It was recommended that a condition be added to prevent the use of the terraces by guests.

Overall, it was considered that the proposal would enhance the setting (character and appearance) of the Conservation Area with minimal amenity impact. Therefore, officers were recommending that the application was granted.

In response to Members about the sunlight and daylight concerns, it was confirmed the applicant carried out further testing of the impact on the neighboring properties following receipt of the representations. Officers were satisfied with the result of the testing as set out in the report. The proposal would be in close proximity to the boundary of 111 Roman Road.

It had been necessary to reconfigure the internal layout of the scheme following the amendments at the rear building. The advice of the LBTH Design and Conservation Officer had been sought. Based on this, it was considered that the existing unlisted building had a neutral impact on the setting of the Conservation Area given the loss of many original features and alterations. However, this well designed replacement would enhance the setting of the Conservation Area.

The new building would be significantly larger than the existing building in terms of floor area, but fell below the threshold of 1000 sqm for planning obligations as set out in the Council's Planning Obligations SPD.

If approved, it was discussed whether a condition should be added to restrict the hours of construction on Saturday to minimize the impact on residential amenity.

On a vote of 0 in favour of the Officer recommendation to grant and 6 against, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That the Officer recommendation to grant Planning Permission (PA/14/00662) at 113-115 Roman Road, London, E2 0QN be **NOT ACCEPTED** for the demolition of existing three storey 13 bedroom hotel and construction of a new four storey (including roof extension and basement) building dropping down to three and one storey at the rear to create a 31 bedroom hotel with no primary cooking on the premises.

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

- The proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Globe Road Conservation Area.
- Bulk and mass of the proposal excessive in terms of the overall proposal and in particularly the southern and middle part of the proposal.
- Adverse impact on overlooking.
- Loss of daylight and sunlight from the proposal.
- Detrimental impact on the environment.

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.

(Members present: Councillors Marc Francis, Rajib Ahmed, Asma Begum, Suluk Ahmed, Shah Alam and Chris Chapman).

7. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

7.1 Phoenix School, 49 Bow Road, London, E3 2AD (PA/14/01070)

Shahara Ali-Hempstead, Planning Officer, gave a presentation on the application highlighting the plans for the proposed extension, the storage space, the bin store area and the new courtyard with landscaping. She also explained the materials for the scheme and the proximity of the scheme to the boundary and relationship to the surrounding area.

The proposal would preserve the character of the Conservation Area and English Heritage had no concerns.

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

That the application (PA/14/01070) at Phoenix School, 49 Bow Road, London, E3 2AD for the erection of a single storey L shape extension to accommodate an office with meeting room, storage space and bin store with associated landscaping **be REFERRED** to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government with the recommendation that the Council would be minded to grant Listed Building Consent subject to conditions set out in the Committee report.

The meeting ended at 6.45 p.m.

Chair,
Development Committee