

UPDATE REPORT OF DIVISIONAL DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
4.1	PA/16/03352	Enterprise House, 21 Buckle Street, E14 9FW	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

**1.0 CLARIFICATIONS AND CORRECTIONS**

- 1.1 Paragraph 3.1 to be amended as follows "...a further 65 52 moderate adverse VSC impacts to neighbouring residential windows..."
- 1.2 Paragraph 3.11 to be amended as follows "...the application site lies within the identified inner outer core of the City Fringe OAPF..."
- 1.4 Paragraph 3.9 to be amended as follows "...~~should seek to re-provide at least the same quantum of employment floor mixed-use schemes should still seek to provide significant employment space where proposals including demolition of existing employment space...~~"
- 1.5 Paragraph 5.5 to be amended as follows "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 Strategy Policies SP06, SP010, London Plan Policies 2.13, 4.1, 4.2, 7.4 and the objectives of the City Fringe OAPF including objectives of Paragraph 3.9 in respect of avoiding a net loss of employment floor space within the OAPF Inner Core."

**Local Representations - 17<sup>th</sup> August Development Committee Report**

- 1.6 Paragraph 9.2 of the Report to the 17th August Strategic Development Committee it was reported that there were 22 individual representations who objected to the scheme. This is an error there were 22 individual representations who objected to the scheme and 1 additional representations received in support (9 in total as opposed to 8). The representations received in support were all received via the planning agent.

**2.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 Officer's recommendation remains to grant planning permission remain unchanged.
- 2.2 However if Members are minded to refuse scheme the 3<sup>rd</sup> reason of refusal is recommended to be amended as per paragraph 1.5 above.

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
4.2	PA/16/02808	225 Marsh Wall, London, E14 9FW	<p>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 community floorspace (use class D1); 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.</p> <p>The application is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment.</p>

## 1.0 CLARIFICATIONS AND CORRECTIONS

- 1.1 An additional reason for refusal has been drafted in addition to those under section 3 'Committee reasons for refusal' within the deferral report (page 77) dated 4<sup>th</sup> October 2017. The wording is as follows:

*'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).'*

- 1.2 It is considered that this is robust reason for refusal and would be defensible at appeal.

## 2.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 Officer's recommendation remains to grant planning permission remain unchanged.
- 2.2 However if Members are minded to refuse scheme the 2<sup>nd</sup> reason of refusal is recommended to be included as per paragraph 1.1 above.

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.1 & [6.1]	PA/16/03771 & [PA/16/03773]	1-3 Corbridge Crescent And 1-4 The Oval, London E2 9DS	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 [8] storeys to provide 57 [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).

## 1.0 CLARIFICATIONS AND CORRECTIONS

### Paragraphs 2.6, 10.5.12 and 10.9.2 – Early stage viability review

- 1.1 In error, these paragraphs state that the viability review mechanism would be triggered within 18 months from grant of permission if the development has not been implemented. This should refer to 24 months which is in accordance with the Mayor of London's SPG and the Tower Hamlets Viability SPD.
- 1.2 Paragraph 10.9.8 to be amended as follows "...is predicted to have a population yield of ~~77~~15 [10] children...."

## 2.0 ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATION

- 2.1 Since the publication of the committee report, the Council has received an additional objection for PA/16/03771 - 10 storey scheme. The following points are raised:
- The ability to redevelop the site at 5-6 The Oval which is also located within the site allocation including
    - Separation distances;
    - Daylight and sunlight effects;
    - Pedestrian connectivity.
- 2.2 These matters have been considered in the officer's report and also by the inspector during the planning Inquiry. The inspector notes in paragraph 48 and 49 of the decision that the proposals would not fetter redevelopment of adjacent plots or physically impede or prejudice the redevelopment of the remaining parts of Site Allocation 2.
- 2.3 Officers have also considered this in their report and are mindful that other sides within the site allocation will be brought forward.

## 3.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 Officer's recommendations to grant planning permission remain unchanged.

