

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 19 NOVEMBER 2014

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

Members Present:

Councillor Sirajul Islam (Chair)
Councillor Shiria Khatun (Deputy Leader of the Labour Group)
Councillor Suluk Ahmed
Councillor Gulam Kibria Choudhury
Councillor Shah Alam
Councillor Asma Begum (Substitute for
Councillor Marc Francis)
Councillor Andrew Wood (Substitute for
Councillor Chris Chapman)

Other Councillors Present

None.

Apologies:

Councillor Marc Francis (because he was a Board Member of Old Ford Housing in relation to item 6.1) and Councillor Chris Chapman

Officers Present:

Paul Buckenham (Development Control Manager,
Development and Renewal)
Christopher Hunt (Senior Planning Lawyer, Directorate
Law, Probity and Governance)
Shahara Ali-Hempstead (Planning Officer, Development and
Renewal)
Jane Jin (Deputy Team Leader, Development and
Renewal)
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 15th October 2014 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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 meeting guidance.

5. DEFERRED ITEMS

5.1 11 Havannah Street, London E14 8NA (PA/14/01807)

Update Report tabled.

Jane Jin (Planning Officer) gave a brief presentation on the application. It was noted that at the last meeting of the Committee, Members were minded to approve the application contrary to the Officers recommendation to refuse. Members were reminded of their reasons for supporting the scheme and the Officers concerns about the application.

Accordingly, the application was deferred to allow Officers to prepare a further report on the planning implications of a decision to approve and suggested conditions.

The Officers recommendation remained to refuse the scheme as set out in the deferred report. However, if Members were minded to approve the scheme, they were invited to approve the conditions set out in the deferred report and as amended in update report.

On a vote of 0 favour of the Officer recommendation to refuse, this was lost.

Councillor Sirajul Islam seconded by Councillor Shiria Khatun moved a motion to grant the application for the suggested reasons and planning conditions set out in the deferred report.

On a vote of 3 in favour, 3 against with the Chair using his casting vote in favour it was **RESOLVED**:

That planning permission at 11 Havannah Street, London E14 8NA (PA/14/01807) be **GRANTED** for the conservatory extension at ground floor level and first floor extension subject to the conditions set out in the deferred Committee report and the update report.

Councillor Andrew Wood left the Committee for this item having not sat on the Committee when this item was previously considered and having spoken in support of the item at that previous Committee meeting as a registered speaker.

5.2 Land to the south of Rainhill Way, Bow Cross Estate, London, E3 (PA/14/01486)

Application withdrawn by the Applicant for further consultation.

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

6.1 Land at rear of 81-147 Candy Street And Wendon Street, London, E3 (PA/14/00623)

Update Report tabled.

Shahara Ali-Hempstead (Planning Officer) gave a presentation on the application. She firstly explained that the application was not referable to the London Mayor and drew attention to the holding objection from the London Legacy Development Corporation. Both of these matters were detailed in the update report.

It was reported that the site sits within a mainly residential area bounded by the A12 dual carriageway and near to the Crown Close bridge. The site had no specific policy designation and was brownfield land that was largely vacant. Given this, the redevelopment of the site to provide affordable housing was strongly supported in policy.

Consultation had been carried out on the application. Three objections had been received from the occupants of the bungalows on the site and the Disability Advocate about displacement of these occupants. However, it was proposed that these occupants would be rehoused in the development in accessible units, designed to meet the current occupiers specific needs, at social rent levels with assured tenancies.

The scheme comprised three sites - I, J and K. The nature of the proposals for each were explained. Overall, it was considered that the buildings were of a high quality design and would fit in and enhance the local street scene. There would be 45 new affordable units (100% of the units) with a split of 31 as affordable rent (in line with the Council's affordable rent levels) and 14 as intermediate. It was considered that the overprovision of family units in this case was acceptable given the need for such housing in the Borough and that the scheme would not adversely affect the housing mix in the area. The quality of the units met or exceeded policy requirements and there were measures to minimise noise disturbance.

Attention was drawn to the level of child play space on site. Whilst there was a shortfall of such space, there were a number of good quality parks and open spaces nearby that had recently been enhanced. This would compensate for the shortfall.

Contributions had been secured to mitigate the impact of the scheme. It was considered that the shortfall in contributions was acceptable taking into account the results of the independent viability testing and the substantial benefits of the scheme including 100% affordable housing. The car free agreement and parking options were also noted.

In summary, the application generally complied with policy. In view of the benefits, Officers were recommending that the scheme be granted.

In response to questions about noise from the A12, it was confirmed none of the habitable rooms in site J would directly face the dual carriageway. The majority of family units would be located on this site. The separation distance between site J and the highway measured 10 metres taking into account the land reserved for the DLR. The windows to the rear of the development would be non-opening save for essential maintenance.

Whilst there would be a small number of habitable rooms on site K facing the A12, the separation distance from site K to the A12 was even greater at 15 - 20 metres. The A12 runs in a cutting at this point, below an embankment and then rises to the north.

In relation to the comments from the Environmental Health, it was considered that sufficient measures could be employed to minimise adverse noise impacts since it was a Noise Exposure Category D site in terms of national policy. If granted, Officers would work with Environmental Health to ensure the required standard was met.

Overall, in view of the above and the level of affordable housing amongst the other benefits, Officers felt that on balance, the scheme was acceptable in terms of noise impact.

In response to further questions, it was explained that the scheme would be car free, but there would be scope for the future occupants to secure on street parking spaces. The options to enable this were explained and the CIL

contribution. It was noted that the density of the scheme exceeded the London Plan guidance. However, given the quality of the scheme and the measures to minimise any impact, it was unlikely that a refusal on the grounds of density could be sustained.

Following on from the questions, Officers explained in further detail the holding objection from the London Legacy Development Corporation dated 19th November 2014. The letter requested that the item should be deferred whilst the Legacy Corporation was given time to review the application and its impact on the potential enhancements to the Crown Close bridge connection, which was a shared aspiration with LBTH.

It was reported that Officers had considered this objection in the context of the relevant policies (Council's Adopted Fish Island Action Plan and the draft London Legacy Development Corporation Local Plan). Officers were of the view that the proposal would not have any adverse implications to any future improvements of the bridge.

However, to improve the relationship between the proposed development and the bridge, Officers consider that there could be design amendments that could be secured by planning condition.

A summary of the LLDC's concerns were set out in the update report and a copy of their letter was circulated at the meeting.

Councillor Shiria Khatun seconded by Councillor Asma Begum moved that the application be deferred pending further discussion with the London Legacy Development Corporation regarding their comments about the bridge.

On a vote of 6 in favour of this proposal, 0 against and 1 abstention, this proposal was carried and the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission at Land at rear of 81-147 Candy Street And Wendon Street, London, E3 (PA/14/00623) be **DEFERRED** for the demolition of existing garages and 2 bungalows and the construction of 45 residential dwellings (15 x 1 bed, 15 x 2 bed, 9 x 3 bed and 6 x 4 bed) with associated infrastructure provision pending further discussion with the London Legacy Development Corporation about the impact on potential future enhancements to the Crown Close pedestrian and cycle bridge as set out in their holding objection.

7. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

7.1 Old Poplar Baths, 170 East India Dock Road, London E14 0EH (PA/14/02592)

Jane Jin (Planning Officer) gave a presentation on the proposal. She explained the nature of the proposed amendments to the listed baths to facilitate its use as an indoor leisure and sports facility. The application sought

to address amendments to the extant 2013 consent, required to improve the internal layout of the building, including separate entrance and changing facilities for school children. The Council's Conservation Officer and English Heritage were supportive of the scheme given the improvements and public benefits of the proposed works.

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

That listed building consent application at Old Poplar Baths, 170 East India Dock Road, London E14 0EH (PA/14/02592) be **REFERRED** to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for internal and external alterations and refurbishment works to the Grade II Listed Poplar Baths to facilitate its use as a new indoor and outdoor sports and leisure facility, with a swimming pool (in place of the second class pool), a new learner pool at basement level, badminton courts in the retained first class pool area, new gym facility, studio areas and roof top games area (MUGA); the existing Vapour Baths and plunge pool would also be retained and relocated. New changing and toilet facilities are also proposed together with landscaped forecourt and a new café at ground floor. **AMENDED PROPOSAL** - internal alterations/amendments to basement and ground floor levels and other minor works with the recommendation that the Council would be minded to **GRANT** Listed Building Consent subject to conditions as set in the Committee report.

The meeting ended at 8.10 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Sirajul Islam
Development Committee