

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 20 AUGUST 2014

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

Members Present:

Councillor Sirajul Islam (Chair)
Councillor Marc Francis (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Suluk Ahmed
Councillor Gulam Kibria Choudhury
Councillor Shah Alam
Councillor Chris Chapman

Other Councillors Present:

None.

Apologies:

Councillor Shiria Khatun

Officers Present:

Paul Buckenham	(Development Control Manager, Development and Renewal)
Tim Ross	(Deputy Team Leader - Pre-application Team, Development and Renewal)
Shay Bugler	(Strategic Applications Planner, 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.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 24th July 2014 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

In response to a Member, Officers confirmed that the deferred application 113-115 Roman Road, London, E2 0QN (PA/14/00662) would be brought back to the 15th September 2014 meeting of the Committee for further consideration.

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 and guidance.

5. DEFERRED ITEMS

None.

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

6.1 65 Tredegar Square, London, E3 (PA/14/104)

Update Report tabled.

Paul Buckenham (Development Control Manager) introduced the application at 65 Tredegar Square for a development that was very similar to an extant scheme granted by the Development Committee in November 2013.

Katherine Emmett spoke in objection as a resident of Mile End Road. She stated that she was speaking on behalf of many residents of Mile End Road and Tredegar Square on the side nearest the proposal. She was not opposed to the redevelopment of this site. However, she objected to overlooking from the roof terraces to neighbours properties given the separation distances. The terraces would harm privacy. She considered that these problems were due to the overdevelopment of the site. The wall at Mile End Gardens should be retained to protect residents safety and security in view of the history of such issues here.

She also objected to the inconsistencies in the information about the increase in the roof height. This would worsen the impact on neighbouring amenity from the proposal. Councillor Peck, who spoke in support of the previous application at the last Committee meeting in October 2013, had concerns with this revised application and had withdrawn his support. In response to a Member, she explained that Councillor Peck's main concern was the perceived increase in the height of the roof and the lack of clarity about this. Other neighbours had raised objections about the roof terraces from other sides of the development.

Jonathan Freegard spoke in support as the architect for the scheme. He considered that the design of the scheme (i.e. the roof terraces, the size of the gardens, the orientation of the windows) were not atypical for this area. Such features were often standard for an urban setting. Therefore, the impact on existing levels of privacy would be negligible. The amenity space exceeded policy. All of the conditions for the extant scheme would be added to this scheme.

In response to a Member about the measures to protect privacy, he explained that the windows at the northern side of the development would be fitted with opaque glazing due to the proximity to the boundary. On the south side, the roof terraces would be set back to restrict overlooking. The boundary wall would be retained.

Tim Ross (Planning Officer) gave a presentation on the application. He drew attention to the extant scheme for the site. Whilst very similar, this application introduced a number of new features. Specifically: the inclusion of a strip of land leading to a revised design, the introduction of four inset roof terraces and the conversion of the previously approved attic storage rooms into study/bedrooms.

The land use had already been established by the extant scheme given the shortcomings of the site for other uses and the provision of new family housing in a mainly residential area.

It was considered that the impact on amenity was acceptable due to the separation distances, the minor height increase, the opaque glazing and the set back roof terraces amongst other features. The scheme would be in keeping with the Conservation Area, replacing the existing building which was considered to make a neutral contribution to the Conservation Area. The housing mix was broadly acceptable given the site constraints which meant that the site lent itself to family sized units.

Mr Ross also advised of layout of the scheme and the outcome of the local consultation. Officers were satisfied that these issues could be addressed by condition and had been addressed in the Committee report.

In conclusion, in view of the merits of the scheme (the provision of new housing, a more comprehensive development and that the resulting impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents due to the additional roof terraces was considerable acceptable) Officers were recommending that the scheme

should be granted planning permission.

In response to Members, it was confirmed that the scheme involved minor increases in height at certain parts of the roof ridge compared to the height of the warehouse. It was acknowledged that there were some inconsistencies in the information provided on this matter on the previous application. Officers had received a Members Enquiry from Councillor Peck asking about the height of the scheme in this application and the previous permission. However in this, he did not say whether or not he was supportive of the scheme and he hadn't made a formal representation on this application.

Regarding the extant scheme, it was recommended in the Committee report that the application should be refused. This was due to concerns over the housing mix, the quality of the design and the issues within the development itself as a result of such matters – i.e. the relationship of the proposed houses to one another rather than their surroundings. The height of the scheme was not an issue. The Committee's decision to grant the scheme in November 2013 was a material consideration for the Committee now to consider (rather than the Officers recommendation on that application). This needed to be given due consideration. The extant consent would be taken into account at any appeal.

In response to questions about the privacy impact from the roof terraces, it was confirmed that the separation distances to neighbouring properties complied with policy. There was one house with a bay window slightly closer to the neighbours. However, given its orientation at 90 degrees the impact on amenity should be minimal. The inset balconies would be small and not designed for use by many people.

Regarding the outhouse at 449 Mile End Road, it was evident from a planning application for the building that they were habitable rooms used as auxiliary living accommodation to the main dwelling house. The impact of the proposal had been assessed on this basis and due to the orientation of the roof lights in relation to the proposal, there should be no direct overlooking to the outhouse.

Should the permission be granted it was proposed that additional conditions be imposed for a car free agreement and to deal with the boundary wall treatment, (formally dealt with under the Conservation Area Consent) as detailed in the update report.

A Member expressed some concern about the impact of the additional roof terraces, however, taking into account the extant permission, was minded to approve the scheme.

On a vote of 3 in favour 2 against and 0 abstentions, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission at 65 Tredegar Square London, E3 (PA/14/104) be **GRANTED** for the demolition of existing warehouse and erection of 8 no self-contained houses with 2 no on site car parking

spaces with the clarifications regarding the housing mix detailed in the update report.

2. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated authority to recommend the imposition of conditions, variation and informatives in relation to the matters set out in the Committee report and the additional conditions for a car free agreement and to deal with the boundary wall issues as detailed in the update report.

Councillor Suluk Ahmed could not vote on this application having not been present from the start of the item.

8. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

None.

The meeting ended at 8.00 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Sirajul Islam
Development Committee