

STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 4 OCTOBER 2017

DECISIONS ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

No declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests were declared.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 17th August 2017 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendments:

Item 5.2, 562 Mile End Road & 1a, 1b, 1c Burdett Road (PA/16/00943)

That in respect of the second paragraph of the minute:

'Mrs McGinley' be replaced by 'Ms McGinley'

That 'They welcomed the inclusion of the nightclub' be replaced by 'Mr Whitfield and Councillor Golds welcomed the inclusion of the nightclub'

3. RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS AND MEETING GUIDANCE

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, Place 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, Place is delegated authority to do so, provided always that the Corporate Director does not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision
- 3) To note the procedure for hearing objections at meetings of the Development Committee and the meeting guidance

4. DEFERRED ITEMS

4.1 Enterprise House, 21 Buckle Street, London E1 8NN (PA/16/03352)

Update report tabled.

On a vote of 0 in favour of the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission, 4 against and 0 abstentions, the Committee did not agree the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission.

Accordingly, Councillor Marc Francis proposed a motion that the planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in the Committee report dated 4th October 2017 as amended in the Committee update report (in respect of the third reason for refusal). On a vote of 4 in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission be **REFUSED** at Enterprise House, 21 Buckle Street, London E1 8NN for the demolition of existing office building and erection of a 13 storey building (plus enclosed roof top level plant storey) rising to 56.32m (AOD) containing 103 unit aparthotel (C1 Use) with B1 Use Class office workspace at ground and mezzanine level with an ancillary café (A3 Use Class) and hotel reception space at ground floor, together with ancillary facilities, waste storage and associated cycle parking store(PA/16/03352) for the following reasons as set out in the 4th October 2017 Committee report as amended in the Committee update report as detailed below:

(1) Harm to residential amenity

The proposed development would cause significant harm to the amenities and living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties through both major and moderate losses of daylight and sunlight, excessive loss of outlook resulting from the overbearing nature of the development including an undue sense of enclosure. As such the development would be contrary to NPPF, as set out paragraphs 14, 17 and 56 of the NPPF and the Local Plan including Policy SP10 of the Core Strategy (2010) and DM25 of the Managing Development Document (2013) which seek to protect the amenity of residents including ensuring that development does not result in unacceptable material deterioration of daylight and sunlight conditions for future and existing residents.

(2) Overdevelopment

The proposed development exhibits clear and demonstrable signs of overdevelopment by virtue of:

a) its adverse amenity impacts to residential neighbours;

b) from its detrimental townscape impacts resulting from the proposed height, scale and mass of the development set on a small, tightly confined site edged by two narrow streets and set within an established lower scale urban street block;

c) resultant harm to the significance of the setting of the Grade II* listed St George's German Church and to the Grade II listed Dispensary Building, the former St George's German and English Schools, the former St George's German and English Infants' School, that are not outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme, by reason of the height, scale, mass of the development set in immediate proximity to these designated heritage assets and the proposed schemes impacts upon local townscape views of this cluster of listed buildings

d) unacceptable relationships to other developments that limits the opportunity to achieve a tall building on site or increase significantly the height of the existing building envelope on site such that it is compatible with the objectives of sustainable development and delivering high quality place-making within Aldgate.

As such the scheme would fail to provide a sustainable form of development in accordance with NPPF including paragraphs 17, 56, 61, 128-134 and would be contrary to the development plan in particular policies 7.4, 7.5, 7.6 and 7.7 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), policies SP02, SP06, SP10 and SP12 of the Tower Hamlets' Core Strategy (2010) and policies, DM0, DM23, DM24, DM25, DM26, DM27 the Tower Hamlets' Managing Development Document and the Borough's vision for Aldgate, that taken as a whole, have an overarching objective of achieving place-making of the highest quality.

- (3) Need for short-stay accommodation insufficient to outweigh amenity harm, loss of office floorspace and harm to heritage assets.

The need for additional short stay accommodation to serve visitors and the borough's economy has not been adequately demonstrated given the strong pipeline supply of short stay accommodation, the limited contribution to the local economy arising from the proposed development, and the discernible disbenefits to the local economy arising from a net loss of office floorspace and associated net loss of local jobs. In addition any need for additional short stay visitor accommodation in the Borough would not outweigh the harm to residential amenity, local townscape and heritage assets.

As a result the proposal is not considered to be in accordance with the development plan including Policies DM0, DM7, DM24, DM25 of the Managing Development Document, Core Strategies Policies, SP06, SP010, London Plan Policies 2.13, 4.1, 4.2 7.4.

- (4) Lack of a legal agreement to secure mitigation

In the absence of a legal agreement to secure agreed and policy compliant financial and non-financial contributions including for employment, skills, training and enterprise and transport matters the development fails to mitigate its impact on local services, amenities and infrastructure. The above would be contrary to the requirements of Policies SP02 and SP13 of the LBTH Core Strategy, Policies 8.2 of the London Plan (2016) and LBTH's Planning Obligations SPD (2016).

4.2 225 Marsh Wall, E14 9FW (PA/16/02808)

Update report tabled.

On a vote of 0 in favour of the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission, 3 against and 0 abstentions, the Committee did not agree the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission.

Accordingly, Councillor Marc Francis proposed a motion that the planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 5.3 of the Committee report dated 4th October 2017 including the additional proposed condition set out in paragraph 1.1 of the Committee update report. On a vote of 3 in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions, the Committee **RESOLVED**:

That planning permission at 225 Marsh Wall, E14 9FW be **REFUSED** for Full planning application for the demolition of all existing structures and the redevelopment of the site to provide a building of ground plus 48 storey (maximum AOD height 163.08m) comprising 332 residential units (Use Class C3); 810 square metres of flexible community/ office floorspace (use class D1/ B1); 79 square metres of flexible retail/restaurant/community (Use Class A1/A3/D1), basement cycle parking; resident amenities; public realm improvements; and other associated works (PA/16/02808) for the following reasons set out in paragraph 5.3 of the 4th October 2017 Committee report and paragraph 1.1 in the update report .

1. The excessive scale and height of the proposed development within its local context would not be proportionate to the sites position outside of the Canary Wharf major centre and would not maintain the transition in height between Canary Wharf to the north and the lower rise buildings to the south and east. The proposed scale, height and massing would result in a development that fails to present a human scale of development at street level, is too large for the plot size, is overbearing, is unduly prominent in local views and detracts from the low-rise character of the area to the south and east. The proposed development therefore fails to respect the features that contribute to the area's character and local distinctiveness and demonstrates clear symptoms of over development and excessive density. This is contrary to Strategic Objectives SO22 & SO23 and Strategic Policies SP10 and SP12 of the Core Strategy (2010), Policies DM24, DM26 and DM27 of the Managing Development Document (2013) and Policies 3.5, 7.4, 7.6, 7.7 & 7.8 of the London Plan (2016).
2. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure agreed and policy complaint financial and non financial contributions including for employment, skills training and enterprise and transport matters the developer fails to mitigate its impact on local services, amenities and infrastructure. The above would be contrary to the requirements of Policies SP02 and SP13 of the LBTH Core Strategy, Polices 8.2 of the London Plan, (2016) and LBTH Planning Obligations SPD, (2016).

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

5.1 1-3 Corbridge Crescent and 1-4 The Oval, E2 9DS (PA/16/03771)

Update report tabled.

On a vote of 0 in favour of the Officers recommendation, 6 against and 0 abstentions, the Committee did not agree the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission.

Accordingly, Councillor Marc Francis proposed a motion that the planning permission be not accepted (for the reasons set out below) and on a vote of 6 in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission be **NOT ACCEPTED** at 1-3 Corbridge Crescent and 1-4 The Oval, E2 9DS for the demolition of existing single storey commercial buildings, with the retention, restoration, external alteration and residential conversion of the existing Regency and Victorian Cottages, together with the erection of three linked blocks of 4, 5 and 10 storeys to provide 57 residential dwellings (Use Class C3), with associated private and communal amenity space, cycle parking and refuse storage, and 461sqm of dual use office/community floorspace (Use Class B1/D1). (PA/16/03771)

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

- Land use and lack of employment use.
- Height, bulk and massing of Block A.
- Impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- Level of affordable housing.
- Environmental concerns arising from use of the site as a coach depot.

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

6. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

6.1 1-3 Corbridge Crescent and 1-4 The Oval, E2 9DS (PA/16/03773)

Update report tabled.

On a vote of 0 in favour , 6 against and 0 abstentions, the Committee did not agree the Officer recommendation that were it empowered to determine the planning permission, the Council would have GRANTED permission.

Accordingly, Councillor Marc Francis proposed a motion that were it empowered to determine the planning permission, the Council would have

REFUSED the planning permission (for the reasons set out below) and on a vote of 6 in favour , 0 against and 0 abstentions the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That the Committee resolves to inform the Planning Inspectorate that were it empowered to determine the application for planning permission the Council would have **REFUSED** permission at 1-3 Corbridge Crescent and 1-4 The Oval, E2 9DS for the demolition of existing single storey commercial buildings, with the retention, restoration, external alteration and residential conversion of the existing Regency and Victorian Cottages, together with the erection of three linked blocks of 4, 5 and 8 storeys to provide 51 residential dwellings (Use Class C3), with associated private and communal amenity space, cycle parking and refuse storage, and 461sqm of dual use office/community floorspace (Use Class B1/D1) (PA/16/03773) due to concerns over the following issues:

- Land use and lack of employment use.
- Height, bulk and massing of Block A.
- Impact on the character and appearance of Conservation Area.
- Level of affordable housing.

WILL TUCKLEY, CHIEF EXECUTIVE

(Please note that the wording in this document may not reflect the final wording used in the minutes.)