

# STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Thursday 19th February 2009 at 7.30pm

## UPDATE REPORT OF HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT DECISIONS

### INDEX

Agenda Item No.	Reference No.	Location	Proposal
7.1	PA/08/02093	Bede Estate, Bow Common Lane, E3	Refurbishment of the existing dwellings on the Bede Estate, demolition of ten bed-sit units in Pickard House, demolition of office accommodation on Wager Street, the erection of 24 buildings providing 236 residential units (22 x studio, 77 x 1 bed, 92 x 2 bed, 40 x 3 bed, 2 x 5 bed and 3 x 6 bed) to a maximum height of 8 storeys, a new community centre of 273sq.m and 219sq.m of new retail and storage floorspace and introduction of an estate wide landscaping scheme.
7.2	PA/08/2249; PA/08/2250; PA/08/2251	Site south of Westferry Circus and west of Westferry Road, E14	<p><b>1)</b> Amendments to development approved on the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2008, PA/07/935 for the erection of Class B1 office buildings (341.924m<sup>2</sup>) comprising of two towers (max 241.1m and 191.34m high) with a lower central link building (80.05m high) together with an ancillary parking service and access roads, public open space and riverside walkway, landscaping including public art and other ancillary works (ref. no: PA/08/2249)</p> <p><b>2)</b> Erection of a pedestrian bridge over Westferry Road together with access stair and lift (ref. no: PA/08/2250)</p> <p><b>3)</b> Alterations to the highway, new signalling and pedestrian crossings and landscaping works at Westferry Road and Heron Quays Roundabout (PA/08/2251)</p>

7.3	PA/08/2292	443-451 Westferry Road, E14 (Island Point)	Erection of six buildings from 2 to 8 storeys in height to provide 189 residential units, with provision of basement and surface car parking, associated servicing and landscaping, together with other works incidental to the proposals.
7.4	PA/08/2293	The City Pride Public House, 15 Westferry Road, E14	Erection of a 62-storey tower including basements, comprising 430 residential apartments (Class C3), amenity spaces and car parking; a nine storey podium building comprising a 203 bedroom hotel (Class C1), together with ancillary restaurants, conference facilities, health club and servicing and parking areas including drop-off facility; provision of a Class A3 and/or A4 use and/or amenity space at levels 60/61; provision of a unit for use either for Class A1 (Shop), A2 (Financial and professional services), A3 (Food and drink) and/or A4 (Drinking establishment) at ground floor; associated landscaping; together with incidental works.

## LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

<b>Agenda Item number:</b>	7.1
<b>Reference number:</b>	PA/08/02093
<b>Location:</b>	Bede Estate, Bow Common Lane
<b>Proposal:</b>	Refurbishment of the existing dwellings on the Bede Estate, demolition of ten bed-sit units in Pickard House, demolition of office accommodation on Wager Street, the erection of 24 buildings providing 236 residential units (22 x studio, 77 x 1 bed, 92 x 2 bed, 40 x 3 bed, 2 x 5 bed and 3 x 6 bed) to a maximum height of 8 storeys, a new community centre of 273sq.m and 219sq.m of new retail and storage floorspace and introduction of an estate wide landscaping scheme.

### 1. CLARIFICATIONS/CORRECTIONS

- 1.1 Paragraph 3.1 part (g) should state £10,650,000 rather than £10,680,000.
- 1.2 Table in Section 8.21 should state that 77 x 1 bed units are provided.
- 1.3 Paragraph 8.102 states that 23 disabled spaces will be provided. The agent has confirmed that 28 designated disabled parking spaces will now be provided.
- 1.4 The agent has confirmed that the scheme as submitted can only be delivered if grant funding is received.

### 2. ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 2.1 Three further letters of objection have been received. Two of letters are additional comments from people who have previously submitted representations.
- 2.2 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application
  - Revisions not beneficial;
  - Loss of garage;
  - Poor quality of new build;
  - New ball court – fencing proposed not long lasting;
  - Impact of downturn of property market.

Officer Comment: Full details of landscaping will be required by condition including details of fences. In terms of the property market, the S.106 will require that a sum of £10,650,000 is spent on the upgrade of the Bede Estate. All these points have been addressed in the committee report.

- 2.3 The following issues were raised in representations, but they are not material to the determination of the application:
  - Impact on service charges

Officer Comment: This is not a matter that can be taken into consideration

### **3. ENERGY**

- 3.1 The GLA have taken a pragmatic view on centralised heating for the site and in considering the potential carbon savings that are already being made as a result of the proposed regeneration of the estate, the GLA has accepted that there would be little to be gained, at this stage, from the implementation of a site wide heating network. The GLA will not, therefore, be asking for a district heating system for this scheme.
- 3.2 The applicant has agreed to ensure the protection of suitable access space for a communal heating approach to be adopted in the future, should the proposed Olympic heat network or other heat network be extended to the area. This will be secured through the section 106 or as a condition, where the applicant would provide a plan showing the areas to be safeguarded, to be agreed with LBTH in consultation with the GLA.
- 3.3 In relation to the renewable energy component. Whilst the GLA recognises the enormous carbon savings being achieved across the site, the applicant has agreed to providing an element of renewable energy on the site details of which will be dealt with by condition.

### **4. TRANSPORT FOR LONDON COMMENTS (TFL)**

- 4.1 Given TFL's concerns in relation to the re-opening the existing underground car park, Eastend Homes are willing to accept the following S106 obligations to mitigate any impacts:
- Contributions for bus stop upgrades in the sum of £50,000
  - Way finding measures within the site
  - Investigate the feasibility of setting up a car club and allocating spaces for its operation.

These matters will be secured in the S.106 agreement.

- 4.2 With regards the DAISY boards, however, EastendHomes believe that this is not a practical obligation for the following reasons:

There are in the region of 45 foyers across the existing and proposed residential blocks within the site that could, potentially have DAISY boards depending on their size, although the size and layout of many of the lobby's do not lend themselves to containing such boards. The applicant contends that they have significant experience in managing this and other estates for many years and they believe it is very likely the DAISY boards will get vandalised. In addition, they believe it unlikely that they will be able to properly maintain them in so many locations.

The applicant is seeking to regenerate this estate and should these be installed and then fall into disrepair, it will be damaging to the efforts in raising the standards of the estate and the cost to keep these functioning will be prohibitive.

It is considered that the applicant is seeking to achieve estate wide improvements within a limited budget and therefore the introduction of renewable technologies and the £50,000 contribution towards bus stop upgrades is sufficient to maintain a positive recommendation.

**5 . OTHER**

The Ward in the main report is indicated as Bow West. This is a typographical error and should read Mile End East.

**6. RECOMMENDATION**

6.1 The recommendation to GRANT planning permission is unchanged.

## LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

<b>Agenda Item number:</b>	7.2
<b>Reference number:</b>	PA/08/2249; PA/08/2250 & PA/08/2251
<b>Location:</b>	Site south of Westferry Circus and west of Westferry Road, London, E14
<b>Proposals:</b>	<p><b>1)</b> Amendments to development approved on the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2008, PA/07/935 for the erection of Class B1 office buildings (341.924m<sup>2</sup>) comprising of two towers (max 241.1m and 191.34m high) with a lower central link building (80.05m high) together with an ancillary parking service and access roads, public open space and riverside walkway, landscaping including public art and other ancillary works (ref. no: PA/08/2249)</p> <p><b>2)</b> Erection of a pedestrian bridge over Westferry Road together with access stair and lift (ref. no: PA/08/2250)</p> <p><b>3)</b> Alterations to the highway, new signalling and pedestrian crossings and landscaping works at Westferry Road and Heron Quays Roundabout (PA/08/2251)</p>

### 1. RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 The recommendation outlined in sections 3.1-3.7 in the committee report relates solely to Proposal no.1, for the erection of Class B1 office buildings (341.924m<sup>2</sup>) comprising of two towers (max 241.1m and 191.34m AOD) with a lower central link building (80.05m AOD), together with an ancillary parking service and access roads, public open space and riverside walkway plus landscaping including public art and other ancillary works (total floor space 341, 924 sqm)
- 1.2 The recommendation for Proposal no. 2, for the erection of a pedestrian bridge over Westferry Road together with access stair and lift (PA/08/2250) is to GRANT planning permission. The head of Development Decisions is delegated power to impose the following conditions and informatives:

#### Conditions

- Time limited (3 years)
- Samples of all external materials
- Any other condition(s) considered necessary by the Head of Development Decisions

### Informative

- S106 Agreement required
- Consult LBTH Highways regarding an oversailing licence for the pedestrian bridge
- Any other informative(s) considered necessary by the Head of Development Decisions

1.3 The recommendation for Proposal no 3, for alterations to the highway, new signalling and pedestrian crossings and landscaping works at Westferry Road and Heron Quays roundabout (PA/08/2251), is to GRANT planning permission . The Head of Development Decisions is delegated power to impose conditions and informatives on the planning permission for the following:

### Conditions

- Time Limit (3 years)
- 24 hour access on the Waterfront and the footway on Westferry Road
- Details of landscaping
- Construction Management Plan
- Any other condition(s) considered necessary by the Head of Development Decisions

### Informatives

- S106 Agreement
- Consult with Highways department
- Any other informative(s) considered necessary by the Head of Development Decisions

1.4 The Legal Agreement will incorporate all 3 planning proposals. The delivery of the pedestrian bridge and Highway works will therefore be secured in the S106 Agreement as explained in paragraph 3.3 of the original report.

## **2.0 AMENDMENTS TO THE REPORT**

2.1 Paragraph 3.8 should read as follows:

*“That if by three months following receipt of the Mayors Stage 2 the legal agreement has not been completed to the satisfaction of the Chief legal Officer, the Head of Development Decisions be given delegated power to refuse planning permission”.*

## **3.0 FURTHER COMMENT**

3.1 TfL have reiterated on the 19<sup>th</sup> February 2009 that a contribution of £2.57 million for Crossrail should be sought and secured in the legal agreement. The Council considers that this request is a matter for the Mayor to determine at Stage II referral.

<b>Agenda Item number:</b>	7.3
<b>Reference number:</b>	PA/08/2292
<b>Location:</b>	443-451 Westferry Road, E14 (Island Point)
<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of six buildings from 2 to 8 storeys in height to provide 189 residential units, with provision of basement and surface car parking, associated servicing and landscaping, together with other works incidental to the proposals.

## 1.0 Report Correction

- 1.1 On page 91, paragraph 4.6, the case officer report states that 96 car parking spaces and 37 motorcycle spaces are proposed. However, this should be corrected as the scheme proposes 95 car parking spaces and 18 motorcycle spaces as noted in paragraph 8.66.
- 1.2 Through the report (pp 86, 87, 115-7,124), references to 41% affordable housing per habitable room are incorrect. The correct affordable housing percentage is 40% by habitable room.

## 2.0 Further neighbour comments received

- 2.1 A further 61 submissions were received following finalisation of the Committee report, comprising of:
- 53 letters of objection, including:
    - 46 were pro-former (identical) letters
    - 3 petitions with a grand total of 47 signatures
  - 7 letters of support, including:
    - 5 were pro-former letters
    - 1 petition with 110 signatures
  - 1 neutral response requiring further details

### Objecting

- 2.2 The objections raised the following issues:
- Density
  - Housing mix including trade-off between City Pride and Island point sites
  - Height and impact to the conservation area
  - Appearance and impact external facing materials proposed
  - Design detail of Julian Place (walls and gates) of Julian Place as either a pedestrian and/or access road
  - Overlooking
  - Loss of light
  - Pollution
  - Social problems associated with Julian Place (crime, littering, privacy impact)
  - Traffic and parking impacts
  - Unsatisfactory provision of rubbish bins
- 2.3 These have been previously considered in the case officer report.



2.4 The following additional objections have been raised and are considered below:

- Noise – created by the development in general  
(Officer comment: Any noise generated by the scheme is considered to reflect the residential use which is acceptable in this location. It should be noted that no significant adverse noise impact was identified within the Environmental Statement or in the assessment by Council's Environmental Health Team. Further, any unreasonable or excessive noise is covered by the environmental health legislation rather than planning legislation).
- Pollution (unspecified)  
(Officer comment: The range of potential impacts was considered in the Environmental Impact Assessment and not found to be significant to warrant refusal).

2.4 The following issues have been raised but are not material to the assessment of the application:

- Query concerning the effectiveness of the future management regime (Glenkerrin) in dealing with issues such as security and policing;
- Seeking assistance for new and old communities in the area to come together for leisure and play; and
- Issue that properties in Julian Place were not consulted by the developer prior to lodging the previous and current applications formerly with the Council.
- An excess of flats in the area and more flats seems completely unnecessary

#### Supporting

2.5 The following points were made by neighbours in support of the development:

- Affordable housing will address housing need in the area and take many people off waiting lists;
- Good quality affordable housing is proposed in this scheme and should be supported;
- The greenspace proposed as part of the application is welcomed;
- Represents an excellent development for a site that is currently derelict and an eyesore.

### **3.0 Additional consultation responses**

3.1 The following external consultees also provided additional comments.

#### GLA

3.2 *Affordable housing*

- On balance and given the circumstances of the two site, the affordable housing provision is considered to be a good offer over both sites providing this is the maximum amount deliverable.

- Any increase in the quantum of affordable housing would result in a higher proportion of affordable housing at City Pride and the unsuitability of the City Pride site for affordable housing has already been established in the discussions around the provision for off-site affordable housing. The provision of more affordable housing would increase the need for amenity space on the constrained City Pride site, as the number of children in the development would be likely to increase. In addition the smaller units in the City Pride development would be unlikely to attract grant funding. In contrast, the Island Point development will provide good quality affordable housing with large family units with access to high quality amenity and children's playspace.

### 3.3 *Housing*

- Overall, a good standard of accommodation is provided for families.

### 3.4 *Children's play space*

- Whilst it is disappointing the indoor kick about area has been removed from the scheme, given the quantum and quality of the proposed child play space and the proximity and quality of the surrounding play facilities for children over 12 years of age, the proposal will meet the needs of residents.
- The stage 1 report stated that there is an under provision of child playspace of 517sqm. The applicant has confirmed that, with the inclusion of the semi-private gardens to the east of block C of approximately 566sqm, the proposal provides an overprovision of playspace. This alteration is supported.

### 3.5 *Climate change and mitigation*

- Whilst the lack of photovoltaic panels is disappointing, the GLA raises no further objections to the proposed energy strategy for Island Point.

(Officer comment: The GLA confirms that additional information has addressed all queries and the scheme is compliant with London Plan Policy in these respects).

### CABE

3.6 Advise that there are no further comments to make in respect of the Environmental Statement.

(Officer comment: Note that CABE already commented on the design. Refer to section 8 of the case officer report for details)

### London Borough of Lewisham

3.7.1 Lewisham have considered the application and raised no objection.

### London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

3.8 The Authority considers the proposal to be satisfactory.

## 4.1 Recommendation

4.1 The issues raised in the additional consultation responses and objections have been addressed within the scope of the committee report and this addendum. They were found to be acceptable.

4.2 There is no change to the recommendation except clause 3.1(B)(a). This should read:

*“(a) To provide 40% of the residential accommodation across both the City Pride, 15 Westferry Road and Island Point (443-451 Westferry Road) sites as affordable housing measured by habitable rooms with a tenure split of the affordable accommodation being 73% social rented and 27% intermediate housing with a mechanism to ensure that the affordable housing at the Island Point site is provided prior to the on-site market housing at both sites is completed.”*

<b>Agenda Item number:</b>	7.4
<b>Reference number:</b>	PA/08/2293
<b>Location:</b>	The City Pride Public House, 15 Westferry Road, E14.
<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of a 62-storey tower including basements, comprising 430 residential apartments (Class C3), amenity spaces and car parking; a nine storey podium building comprising a 203 bedroom hotel (Class C1), together with ancillary restaurants, conference facilities, health club and servicing and parking areas including drop-off facility; provision of a Class A3 and/or A4 use and/or amenity space at levels 60/61; provision of a unit for use either for Class A1 (Shop), A2 (Financial and professional services), A3 (Food and drink) and/or A4 (Drinking establishment) at ground floor; associated landscaping; together with incidental works.

## 1.0 Report Correction

- 1.1 Through the report (pp 129, 130, 161-3, 168), references to 41% affordable housing per habitable room are incorrect. The correct affordable housing percentage is 40% by habitable room.

## 2.0 Additional consultation responses

- 2.1 The following external consultees also provided additional comments.

### GLA

#### 2.2 *Affordable housing*

- On balance and given the circumstances of the two sites, the affordable housing provision is considered to be a good offer over both sites providing this is the maximum amount deliverable.
- Any increase in the quantum of affordable housing would result in a higher proportion of affordable housing at City Pride and the unsuitability of the City Pride site for affordable housing has already been established in the discussions around the provision for off-site affordable housing. The provision of more affordable housing would increase the need for amenity space on the constrained City Pride site, as the number of children in the development would be likely to increase. In addition the smaller units in the City Pride development would be unlikely to attract grant funding. In contrast, the Island Point development will provide good quality affordable housing with large family units with access to high quality amenity and children's playspace.

#### 2.3 *Housing*

- Overall, a good standard of accommodation is provided for families.

#### 2.4 *Children's play space*

- The provision of 220sqm of child play space for the under 5s is acceptable.
- Given the location of the development and the constraints of the site, the provision of off-site play space for children over 5 years old is acceptable.

## 2.5 *Climate change and mitigation*

- The applicant has provided further information confirming the proposal will exceed Building Regulation standards using energy demand reduction measures.
- The proposals for heating provision to the development do not fully comply with London policies. This is because the proposals include the installation of individual heat pumps in the dwellings to provide space heating. There are a range of technical queries that need to be understood as to why this is the case and what alternatives the GLA would like to see. Before going into the detail of these discussions, the applicant needs to clarify whether the Barkantine heat network could provide all the heating requirements of the City Pride development.

(Officer comment: Following further discussions with the GLA, Council's Energy Officer is satisfied that these outstanding matters can be resolved by an appropriately worded condition requiring details to be agreed in writing).

### CABE

## 2.6 Advise that there are no further comments to make in respect of the Environmental Statement.

(Officer comment: Note that CABE already commented on the design. Refer to section 8 of the case officer report for details)

### London Borough of Lewisham

## 2.7 Lewisham have considered the application and raised no objection.

## **3.0 Recommendation**

### 3.1 The issues raised in the additional consultation responses have been addressed within the scope of the committee report and this addendum. They were found to be acceptable.

### 3.2 There is no change to the recommendation except clause 3.1(B)(a). This should read:

*“(a) To provide 40% of the residential accommodation across both the City Pride and Island Point (443-451 Westferry Road) sites as affordable housing measured by habitable rooms with a tenure split of the affordable accommodation being 73% social rented and 27% intermediate housing with a mechanism to ensure that the affordable housing at the Island Point site is provided prior to the on-site market housing at both sites is completed.”*