

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 4 JUNE 2015

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

Members Present:

Councillor Sirajul Islam (Chair)
Councillor Md. Maium Miah (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Danny Hassell
Councillor John Pierce
Councillor Helal Uddin
Councillor Julia Dockerill

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Andrew Wood

Apologies:

Councillor Amina Ali
Councillor Suluk Ahmed
Councillor Muhammad Ansar Mustaqim

Officers Present:

Paul Buckenham	– (Development Control Manager, Development and Renewal)
Jerry Bell	– (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Gillian Dawson	– (Legal Services, Law, Probity and Governance)
Nasser Farooq	– (Deputy Team Leader, Planning Services, Development and Renewal)
Alison Thomas	– (Private Sector and Affordable Housing Manager, 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.

All Members present (Councillors Sirajul Islam, Maium Miah, Danny Hassell, John Pierce, Helal Uddin and Julia Dockerill) declared an interest in item 6.1 Site 1 Land at 3 Millharbour and Site 2 Land at 6, 7 and 8 South Quay Square, South Quay Square, London (PA/14/03195) as they had received correspondence on the application.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 23rd April 2015 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 for hearing objections, together with details of persons who had registered to speak at the meeting.

5. DEFERRED ITEMS

There were no items.

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

6.1 Site 1 Land at 3 Millharbour and Site 2 Land at 6, 7 and 8 South Quay Square, South Quay Square, London (PA/14/03195)

Update Report Tabled

Paul Buckenham (Development Control Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the item.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the meeting.

Janet Viola (Lanterns Centre of Arts, Care & Education) spoke in objection to the proposal. She sought clarification as to whether the facility would be provided to Lanterns in the D1 community space in the development in accordance with the original plans. The developer had originally agreed to this and this was part of the public consultation. However, the developer has since stated that this was dependant on whether Lanterns could raise the funds. If not, they would need to make alternative plans. The application should be deferred until this issue had been clarified.

She stressed the need for the facility in view of the community benefits and that its relocation into the D1 space would comply with policy. She also referred to the inclusion of the facilities in the Lanterns Court development in 2008 to ensure its survival secured via the legal agreement.

In response to questions, she explained that the facility catered for everyone in the community. It included a commercial nursery and a theatre. She was under the impression that all of the businesses were to be relocated.

She also answered questions about: the level of engagement with the developer and Officers over the plans; the nature of the previous s106 agreement, the shortage of nursery places in the area in view of the new developments and clarified the capacity of the proposed nursery. She also explained the design of the theatre highlighting the many unique aspects.

Richard Horwood (Pan Peninsula Leaseholders and Residents Association) and Councillor Andrew Wood (Ward Councillor) also spoke in objection to the scheme. They objected to the density of the scheme. The scheme would add a further 3000 residents to the area adding to the huge increase in population already guaranteed from the recently approved schemes in South Quay. There would be a fourfold increase in population from these developments, unprecedented in the UK, without any plan in place for dealing with the infrastructure requirements. The area would have the largest density in the UK and the impact on services would be 'endless'. Whilst the new school and parks were welcomed, demand would still greatly outstrip supply. For example the child yield from the Wood Wharf scheme alone would fill the school. There would also be a lack of child play space for the whole area. The suggested reasons for refusing item 6.2 of the agenda, 50 Marsh Wall also applied to this scheme given the similarities in the schemes

The speakers also questioned whether two large vehicles could pass along the route at Millharbour East. They also expressed concern about the impact from vehicles trips from the development and shared Ms Viola's concerns about the future of Lanterns in the development.

In view of these issues, the speakers considered that the application should be deferred for a site visit to explore these issues.

David West (Applicant's Architect) spoke in support of the scheme, describing the merits of the design, based on lengthy consultation with Council Officers. The Greater London Authority (GLA) had described the scheme as an exemplary approach to high density living. He also explained the merits of the scheme including the new two form entry school, good quality open spaces and the destination play ground. In response to questions about the D1 community use, he explained that the unit had been designed with Lanterns in mind. However, it was a matter for the applicant themselves not the design team to determine the end user for the unit.

Paula Carney (Applicant's Agent), spoke in support of the application. She referred to the plans to relocate the three education uses into the development. All three had been designed into the scheme following consultation with each. Whilst mindful of the concerns about infrastructure, this scheme satisfied all the requirements in this regard (including child play space and CIL contributions). Highway Services had assessed the impact of the scheme and had no objections. In response to questions, it was confirmed that the new school would be a Local Authority School.

Janet Pearson, (River House Montessori School) also spoke in support welcoming the relocation of the school within the development (currently located in temporary accommodation). The plans would give the school the security that they needed and had lacked for a long time. She also explained the nature of their services and that the plans would allow them to improve and expand their services.

Nasser Farooq, (Deputy Team Leader, Development and Renewal) gave a detailed presentation on the scheme, explaining the site location, proximity to the transport network and to the schemes approved at the April Committee meeting in the Millharbour area.

The plans complied with the site allocation in policy for comprehensive mixed use development. The application successfully overcame the previous reasons for refusal of the 2009 application. The 'principles' adopted to ensure this were explained. The application broadly complied with the Urban Development Framework (UDF) to manage the development of the Millharbour Area.

There had been 12 representations in objection and 1 in support which were addressed in the Committee report. In addition, 6 additional representations had been received as set out in the update report.

Members were advised of the key features of the scheme including the layout, design, the education uses, the residential units, the community and child play space. The level of which exceeded policy. In terms of the housing, it was explained that the majority of affordable units would be family sized units. Furthermore, the affordable rents were in line with Borough Framework rents.

The impact on amenity was acceptable given the generous separation distances amongst other matters

Highways Services were satisfied with the scheme including the servicing route at Millharbour East. The service was satisfied that two large vehicles could pass along this route having seen a swept path analysis demonstrating this.

Members also noted CGI images of the new school, details of the phasing plans to deliver the education facilities first to ensure the continuation of services and details of the CIL and other contributions.

In view of the merits of the scheme, Officers were recommending that the application was granted planning permission.

In response to the presentation, Members sought clarity about the level and nature of the child play space. In particular, Members questioned the level of roof top play space. It was felt that the scheme would deliver an unprecedented amount and the outcome of this was unknown. It was also questioned whether the surplus in play space would compensate for the shortfall at the neighbouring 2 Millharbour site.

Officers confirmed that the scheme would deliver a generous level of play space in excess of LBTH policy requirements. Whilst each site was considered on its own merits, this could compensate for the shortfall at the neighbouring site. As a result, there would be a net surplus of play space across the two sites. The play space for the school had been excluded from the play space assessment. Officers also clarified the amount of play space within each of the four blocks (G1-G4) and that a large amount of the new parks would be play space.

Members also raised concerns about the affordability of the three bed intermediate units. It was felt that there was an overprovision of such units given the concerns expressed at the last Committee meeting regarding the demand for them in the Borough. It was questioned whether, as per the 2 Millharbour scheme, they could be converted into additional affordable units. In response, Alison Thomas (Private Sector and Affordable Housing Manager LBTH) clarified the cost of shared ownership properties in this tenure.

Questions were also asked about whether there would be shared entrances for the private and affordable housing blocks. Members expressed a preference for shared entrances where possible. In response, Officers clarified the distribution in tenures across the development. It was explained that Block G2, comprising private and intermediate units, would have shared entrances. Block G1 comprising both private and rented units would have separate entrances. Blocks G3 and G4 would be mono tenure buildings.

Members also questioned whether the Lanterns facility would be accommodated into the scheme given the concerns expressed by the speakers.

Officers responded that whilst the planning policy required that the community use should be re – provided, it was beyond planning policy to require that it be allocated to a particular end user. This was a commercial matter between the applicant and Lanterns. Furthermore, the applicant had made every effort to tailor the community space according to the groups requirements, above and beyond the policy requirements.

It was clarified that there was no agreement in place at present between the two parties.

Members also asked about the impact from traffic queuing at the traffic lights near the entrance to the development. They also noted the concerns (raised by the speaker) regarding the servicing route and capacity for two large vehicles to pass. In response, Officers clarified that additional space could be made available such as a lay by along the servicing route. It was confirmed that the Council's Highway Services team had considered the impact of the scheme and that they had no major concerns with the scheme.

In response to further questions about the impact on infrastructure, it was clarified that the plans included a new school and would re - provide the existing education uses along with other features. There was also a CIL contribution to address infrastructure needs across the Borough. Officers were therefore satisfied with the level of mitigation. The process for allocating the CIL and the differences with the s106 regime were outlined.

Officers also answered questions about the ownership of the public open space and how it would be managed to prevent public nuisance.

Councillor John Pierce, seconded by Councillor Danny Hassell proposed that the application be deferred for the following reasons.

On a vote of 5 in favour 0 against and 1 abstention, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission be **DEFERRED** at Site 1 Land at 3 Millharbour and Site 2 Land at 6, 7 and 8 South Quay Square, South Quay Square, London for the demolition and redevelopment with four buildings: Building G1, a podium with two towers of 10 - 38 storeys and of 12 - 44 storeys; Building G2, a four floor podium with two towers of 34 and 38 storeys inclusive of podium; Building G3, a tower rising to 44 storeys; and Building G4, a four floor podium with a tower of 31 storeys inclusive of podium (PA/14/03195)

Members were minded to defer the scheme to carry out a site visit to better understand the impact of the scheme.

Members also raised concerns about the affordability of the three bed intermediate units; the separate entrances for the different tenure types; the amount and nature of the child play space (including the amount of roof top play space); the impact on infrastructure from the scheme ;the D1 community

use; the servicing route along Millharbour East and the impact from traffic queuing at the traffic lights near the entrance to the development.

In accordance with Development Procedural Rules, the application was **DEFERRED** to enable the site visit to be carried out and for Officers to prepare a supplementary report addressing the other issues.

**6.2 50 Marsh Wall, 63-69 And 68-70 Manilla Street London, E14 9TP
(PA/14/03281)**

Application withdrawn at the request of the Applicant

The meeting ended at 8.40 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Sirajul Islam
Strategic Development Committee