

Committee: Strategic Development	Date: 2 nd February 2010	Classification: Unrestricted	Agenda Item Number: 7.2
--------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Report of: Director of Development and Renewal	Title: Town Planning Application
Case Officer: Laura Webster	Ref No: PA/09/2100
	Ward: East India and Lansbury

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Location:	Brownfield Estate, London, E14
Existing Use:	(Site E - Willis Street car park site, Site G - 132-154 Brownfield Street, Site I(1) - site south of 15-37 Ida Street and site I(2) - 1-19 Follett Street). Housing / car park
Proposal:	Demolition of existing buildings at 132-154 Brownfield Street, site south of 15-37 Ida Street and 1-19 Follett Street, E14 (Sites G, I (1) & I (2)).
	Erection of a 20 storey building on the Willis Street Car Park (66 spaces) site and its use as 112 residential units (50 x 1 bed, 43 x 2 bed & 19 x 3 bed) and 150 sq.m community facility (Class D1) - Site E
	Erection of a part 4 & part 5 storey building and its use as 23 residential units (8 x 2 bed, 4 x 3 bed, 10 x 4 bed & 1 x 5 bed) - Site G
	Erection of a two storey building and its use as 4 four bedroom houses. - Site I (1)
	Erection of a three storey building and its use as 2 four bedroom and 3 five bedroom houses - Site I (2).
Drawing Nos/Documents:	Drawing numbers:
	<u>Site Wide</u> AA0319_2.3_000, AA0319_2.1_000, AA0319_2.3_010, AA0319_2.3_011
	<u>Site E</u> AA0319_2.1_100, AA0319_2.1_101, AA0319_2.1_102 Rev A, AA0319_2.1_103, AA0319_2.1_110, AA0319_2.1_111, AA0319_2.0_100, AA0319_2.3_110 Rev A, AA0319_2.3_111 Rev A, AA0319_2.3_112 Rev A, AA0319_2.3_113, AA0319_2.3_114, AA0319_2.3_115, AA0319_2.3_116, AA0319_2.3_117, AA0319_2.3_118, AA0319_2.3_119, AA0319_2.3_120

Site G

AA0319_2.1_300 rev A, AA0319_2.1_201,
AA0319_2.1_202, AA0319_2.1_203, AA0319_2.1_204
Rev A, AA0319_2.1_205, AA0319_2.1_206,
AA0319_2.3_206, AA0319_2.3_207,
AA0319_2.3_208, AA0319_2.3_209,
AA0319_2.3_210, AA0319_2.3_211,
AA0319_2.1_220, AA0319_2.1_214

Site I(1)

AA0319_2.1_301, AA0319_2.3_302,
AA0319_2.1_303, AA0319_2.1_304, AA0319_2.1_311

Site I(2)

AA0319_2.1_311, AA0319_2.3_312,
AA0319_2.3_313, AA0319_2.3_314, AA0319_2.3_315

Supporting Documents:

Planning Statement dated October 2009
Design and Access Statement
Environmental Statement October 2009
Sustainability Assessment October 2009
Renewable Energy Statement November 2009
Site Waste Management Plan 12th October 2009
Environmental Report Volume 1 October 2009
Environmental Report Volume 3 October 2009
Heritage and Visual Assessment October 2009
Visual Impact Assessment October 2009
Air Quality Revision A November 2009

Applicant:

Poplar Harca

Ownership:

Mr M A Bharadia and Association Estates Ltd

Historic Building:

Balfron Tower, Carradale House

Conservation Area:

Balfron Tower Conservation Area

2. SUMMARY OF MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 2.1 The Local Planning Authority has considered the particular circumstances of this application against the Council's approved planning policies contained in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets Unitary Development Plan, the Council's Interim Planning Guidance (2007), Tower Hamlets Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009), associated supplementary planning guidance, the London Plan and Government Planning Policy Guidance and has found that:
- a) The proposal will help facilitate regeneration improvements within the area and provide high quality housing. This is in accordance with the Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (November 2005) and Policy HSG5 in the Council's Interim Planning Guidance (2007), which support the principle of estate regeneration proposals and the delivery of new housing in suitable locations.
 - b) The loss of the public house on site G is considered acceptable given the need for housing within this location and given the availability of a public house within approximately 300m at Chrisp Street. The proposed demolition is therefore considered acceptable in line with policy RT6 in the Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007).
 - c) Given the sustainable location, the proposal would be acceptable in terms of density

and would result in 322 habitable rooms per hectare across the Brownfield Estate as a whole. The proposed development is considered to be sensitive to the context of the surrounding area, by reason of its site coverage, massing, scale and height. The development is therefore in accordance with Policy 3A.3 London Plan Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (Consolidated with alterations since 2004) which seeks to ensure the maximum intensity of use, compatible with local context.

- d) The proposal provides an acceptable amount of affordable housing (44% by habitable room) and mix of units overall. As such the proposal accords with the criteria set out in policies 3A.5 and 3A.9 of the London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004), policy HSG7 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan 1998, policies CP22, HSG2 and HSG3 of the Council's Interim Planning Guidance (2007) and policy SP02 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009) which seek to ensure that new developments offer a range of housing choices.
- e) The height, scale and design of the proposed buildings are acceptable and in line with policy criteria set out in 4B.1, 4B.9 and 4B.10 within the London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004), policies DEV1 and DEV2 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan 1998, policies DEV1 and DEV2 of the Council's Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) and policy SP10 in the Core Strategy (December 2009) which seek to ensure buildings are of a high quality design and suitably located.
- f) The scale, design and detailed architectural design of buildings, in, or near, Conservation Areas, is considered sensitive to the character of these areas. As such, it accords with the requirements of saved policy DEV28 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan 1998, policy CON2 in the Council's Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007), policy SP10 in the Core Strategy (December 2009) and advice in PPG15, which seek to ensure high quality development that enhances the character of Conservation Areas.
- g) The proposal is an appropriate scale and location and would not adversely affect the setting of listed buildings within the Brownfield Estate. Balfron Tower would remain the tallest, most dominant building within the area. As such, the proposals would protect the setting of the nearby listed buildings, in accordance with saved Policy DEV1 in the UDP 1998, policy DEV2 and CON1 in the Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) and policy SP10 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009) which seek to ensure development protects the setting of listed buildings.
- h) The proposed development would improve the overall quality of amenity space provision for existing and future residents. The development therefore accords with PPS3, policies 3A.6, 3D.13 and 4B.1 of the London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004), policies DEV1, DEV12 and HSG16 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan 1998, policies OSN2, DEV2, DEV 3, DEV4 and HSG7 of the Council's Interim Planning Guidance (2007) and policy SP02 and SP04 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009) which seek to improve amenity and liveability for residents.
- i) The loss of the car park (site E) is considered acceptable and the loss of these car parking spaces can be accommodated within the surrounding street network and therefore there would not be an unacceptable impact on the surrounding streets. As such the proposal is in line with sustainable transport policies DEV17, DEV18 and DEV19 of the Council's Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) and policy SP08 in the Core Strategy (December 2009) which seek to promote sustainable transport methods and minimise reliance upon the car.

- j) Transport matters, including parking, access and servicing are acceptable and in line with policies DEV1 and T16 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan 1998, policies DEV17, DEV18 and DEV19 of the Council's Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) and policy SP08 in the Core Strategy (December 2009) which seek to ensure developments can be supported within the existing transport infrastructure.
- k) The impact of the development on the amenity of neighbours in terms of loss of light, overshadowing, loss of privacy, sense of enclosure and noise is acceptable given the urban context of the development. As such, it accords with policies DEV1 and DEV2 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan 1998, policies DEV1 and DEV2 of Council's Interim Planning Guidance (2007) and policy SP02 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009) which seek to ensure development does not have an adverse impact on neighbouring amenity.
- l) Sustainability matters, including energy, are acceptable and accord with policies 4A.4, 4A.6, 4A.7, 4A.14 and 4B.2 of the London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004), policies DEV5 to DEV9 of the Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) and policy SP11 in the Core Strategy (December 2009) which seek to promote sustainable development.
- m) Planning contributions have been secured towards education, health care and leisure, in line with Government Circular 05/2005, policy DEV4 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan 1998, policy IMP1 of the Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) and policy SP13 in the Core Strategy (December 2009) which seek to secure contributions towards infrastructure and services required to facilitate proposed development.

3. RECOMMENDATION

3.1 That the Committee resolve to **GRANT** planning permission subject to:

3.2 A. Any **direction** by **The Mayor**

3.3 B. The prior completion of a **legal agreement** to secure the following planning obligations:

Financial Contributions

- a) Provide a contribution of **£155,881** towards the provision of future health and social care facilities.
- b) Provide a contribution of **£296,208** towards the provision of primary school places.
- c) Provide a contribution of **£84,733** towards the provision of Leisure facilities

Non-financial Contributions

d) Affordable Housing (44%)

e) Clause requiring residual value after Stamp Duty Land Tax – SDLT to be spent on estate upgrades within the Poplar area

f) Car Free Development for all new units

g) Employment Initiatives to use reasonable endeavours to employ local people during the construction and end user phases of the development.

h) Travel Plan to encourage sustainable travel to and from the development by residents.

i) Construction Logistics Management Plan

j) TV reception

i) Any other planning obligation(s) considered necessary by the Corporate Director Development & Renewal.

3.4 That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above.

3.5 That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to impose conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the following matters:

Conditions

1. Time Limit
2. Contaminated land survey
3. Full details of refuse stores
4. Full details of cycle parking
5. Full landscaping details to be approved
6. Proposed disabled parking to be implemented prior to occupation of the units and retained.
7. Samples / pallet board of all external facing materials
8. Hours of operation for the community use (9:00 – 21:00 Mon-Sun)
9. Hours of construction (08.00 until 17.00 Monday to Friday; 08.00 until 13:00 Saturday. No work on Sundays or Bank Holidays)
10. Control of hammer driven piling or impact breaking development works (Only 10:00 – 16:00 Monday to Friday. No works Saturday, Sunday or bank holidays).
11. Impact piling method statement to be approved
12. All residential accommodation to be completed to lifetimes homes standards
13. At least 10% of homes wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable
14. Code for Sustainable Homes Assessment (level 3)
15. Scheme of Highways improvements (S.278 agreement)
16. Verification report regarding potential water pollutants to be approved
17. Remediation strategy if water pollutants are found during development
18. No infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground
19. Drainage details to be submitted and approved
20. Details of any fencing / boundary treatments prior to erection

Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Corporate Director Development & Renewal

Informatives

1. Contact Thames Water
2. Contact Building Control
3. S278 Highways Agreement
4. Environment Agency information
5. Any other informative(s) considered necessary by the Corporate Director Development & Renewal

3.6 That, if by 29th March 2010 the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to refuse planning permission.

4. PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

- 4.1 The application seeks to redevelop 4 previously developed sites within the Brownfield Estate. The proposal includes:-
- Demolition of existing buildings at 132-154 Brownfield Street, site south of 15-37 Ida Street and 1-19 Follett Street, E14 (Sites G, I (1) & I (2)).
 - Erection of a 20 storey building on the Willis Street Car Park site and its use as 112 residential units (50 x 1 bed, 43 x 2 bed & 19 x 3 bed) and 150 sq.m community facility (Class D1). The provision of 792sqm public open space within the site - Site E
 - Erection of a part 4 & part 5 storey building and its use as 23 residential units (8 x 2 bed, 4 x 3 bed, 10 x 4 bed & 1 x 5 bed) - Site G
 - Erection of a two storey building and its use as 4 four bedroom houses. - Site I (1)
 - Erection of a three storey building and its use as 2 four bedroom and 3 five bedroom houses - Site I (2).
- 4.2 The scheme is linked to Poplar Harca's 'Reshaping Polar' initiative dedicated to the regeneration and renewal of the Brownfield Estate and the wider Poplar area.

Site and Surroundings

- 4.3 The Brownfield Estate is situated within Poplar to the east of Chrisp Street Market and to north of East India Dock Road. The site is approximately rectangular in shape bounded by the A12 Blackwall tunnel approach to the east, Follett Street/Susannah Street to the south, the Docklands Light Railway (DLR) to the west and Burcham Street to the north.
- 4.4 The site itself is predominately residential with the exception of a few of shops on Burcham Street and St Leonard's Road. Surrounding the site there are a variety of uses including residential, commercial, retail and cafes within Chrisp Street Market and along East India Dock Road.
- 4.5 The estate is planned around the two residential blocks known as Balfron Tower and Carradale House designed by Ernö Goldfinger for the London County Council in the 1960's. The estate is dominated by the Grade II listed 27 storey Balfron Tower and the 11 storey Carradale House. The 14 storey Glenkerry House is also dominant. The estate comprises a collection of buildings of various scales from high rise tower blocks to the single storey commercial pavilions and two-storey terraced flats. Integral to the layout of the estate are a series of green spaces and landscaped areas.
- 4.6 The Brownfield Estate is now recognised as a fine example of planned 1960s social housing. Part of the estate has been designated as a conservation area and both Balfron Tower and Carradale House are Grade II listed. Within this application proposal, site E is situated within the Balfron Tower conservation area. The site lies approximately 220 metres away from the listed buildings (Balfron Tower and Carradale House). Sites G, I-1 and I-2 are not situated within the conservation area.
- 4.7 Site E is currently a car park situated on a prominent corner bounded by Willis Street, Hay Currie Street and Burcham Street. Site G comprises of a former pub which was closed and later demolished and a 3 storey residential block. Site I(1) and I(2) currently comprise two

storey residential blocks that are small bedsit units.

- 4.8 The Brownfield Estate is situated within 300m from both Langdon Park and All Saints DLR station and 7 bus services are within 400m of the site. As a whole, the Brownfield Estate has a PTAL range of between 2 at the eastern end up to 4 in the west.

Planning History

- 4.9 **PA/08/1132** - Refurbishment of 411 existing homes and associated external works and the erection of six new buildings ranging in height from 4 to 22 Storeys to provide 139 new dwelling comprising 38 x one bedroom, 61 x two bedroom, 16 x three bedroom and 24 x four bedroom units, 2493 sq m. of new commercial/community space, associated car parking, landscaping, public open space, new vehicular, cycle and pedestrian routes.

Application Withdrawn 4th September 2009 following officer advice.

5 POLICY FRAMEWORK

- 5.1 For details of the status of relevant policies see the front sheet for "Planning Applications for Determination" agenda items. The following policies are relevant to the application:

Government Planning Policy Guidance/Statements

- | | | |
|-----|-------|-----------------------------------------------|
| 5.2 | PPS1 | Delivering Sustainable Development |
| | PPS3 | Housing |
| | PPS22 | Renewable Energy |
| | PPS23 | Planning and Pollution Control |
| | PPG13 | Transport |
| | PPG15 | Planning and the Historic Environment |
| | PPG17 | Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation |
| | PPG24 | Planning and Noise |

Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (London Plan) Consolidated with alterations since 2004.

- | | | |
|-----|-------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| 5.3 | 2A.1 | Sustainability Criteria |
| | 2A.2 | Spatial Strategy for Development |
| | 2A.6 | Areas for Intensification |
| | 2A.7 | Areas for Regeneration |
| | 3A.1 | Increasing London's Supply of Housing |
| | 3A.2 | Borough Housing Targets |
| | 3A.3 | Maximising the Potential of Sites |
| | 3A.5 | Housing Choice |
| | 3A.6 | Quality of New Housing Provision |
| | 3A.7 | Large Residential Developments |
| | 3A.8 | Definition of affordable Housing |
| | 3A.9 | Affordable Housing Targets |
| | 3A.10 | Negotiating Affordable Housing |
| | 3A.11 | Affordable Housing Thresholds |
| | 3A.13 | Special needs and Specialist Housing |
| | 3A.15 | Loss of Housing and Affordable Housing |
| | 3A.17 | Addressing the Needs of London's Diverse Population |
| | 3A.18 | Protection and Enhancement of London's Infrastructure |
| | 3A.19 | The Voluntary and Community Sector |
| | 3A.20 | Health Objectives |
| | 3A.23 | Health Impacts |
| | 3A.24 | Education Facilities |

3B.3	Mixed Use Development
3C.1	Integrating Transport and Development
3C.2	Matching Development to Transport Capacity
3C.3	Sustainable Transport in London
3C.14	Enhanced Bus Priority
3C.16	Road Scheme Proposals
3C.20	Improving Conditions for Buses
3C.21	Improving Conditions for Walking
3C.22	Improving Conditions for Cycling
3C.23	Parking Strategy
3C.3	Maintaining and Improving Retail Facilities
3D.8	Realising the Value of Open Space and Green Infrastructure
3D.11	Open Space Provision
3D.12	Open Space Strategies
3D.13	Play and Informal Recreation Strategies
3D.14	Biodiversity and Nature Conservation
4A.1	Tackling Climate Change
4A.2	Mitigating Climate Change
4A.3	Sustainable Design and Construction
4A.4	Energy Assessment
4A.5	Provision of Heating and Cooling Networks
4A.6	Decentralised Energy; Heating, Cooling and Power
4A.7	Renewable Energy
4A.9	Adaptation to Climate Change
4A.12	Flooding
4A.13	Flood Risk Management
4A.16	Water Supplies and Resources
4A.18	Water Sewerage and Infrastructure
4A.19	Improving Air Quality
4A.20	Reducing Noise
4B.1	Design Principles for a Compact City
4B.3	Enhancing the Quality of the Public Realm
4B.4	London's Buildings: Retrofitting
4B.5	Creating an Inclusive Environment
4B.6	Safety, Security and Fire Prevention and Protection
4B.8	Local context
4B.9	Tall Buildings
4B.10	Large Scale Buildings
4B.12	Heritage conservation

Unitary Development Plan 1998 (as saved September 2007)

5.4	Proposals:	None
	Policies:	ST1 Deliver and Implementation of Policy
		ST12 Cultural and Leisure Facilities
		ST15 Encourage a Wide Range of Activities
		ST23 Quality of Housing Provision
		ST25 Provision of Social and Physical Infrastructure
		ST26 Protect existing residential accommodation
		ST28 Restrain Private Car
		ST30 Safety and Movement of Road Users
		ST34 Provision of Quality Shopping
		ST37 Improve of Local Environment
		ST41 Provision of Adequate Space for Local Business
		ST43 Use of High Quality Art

ST49	Provision of Social and Community Facilities
ST51	Public Utilities
DEV1	Design Requirements
DEV2	Environmental Requirements
DEV3	Mixed Use Development
DEV4	Planning Obligations
DEV9	Minor Works
DEV12	Landscaping
DEV15	Retention/Replacement of Mature Trees
DEV27	Minor Alterations in Conservation Areas
DEV28	Proposals for Demolition in Conservation Areas
DEV30	Additional Roof Storeys
DEV50	Noise
DEV51	Contaminated Land
DEV55	Development and Waste Disposal
DEV63	Greenchains
S10	Shopfronts
EMP1	Employment Uses
EMP6	Employing Local People
EMP8	Small Businesses
HSG4	Loss of Housing
HSG7	Dwelling Mix
HSG13	Internal Standards for Residential Development
HSG15	Preserving Residential Character
HSG16	Amenity Space
T8	New Road
T10	Traffic Management
T16	Impact on Traffic
T18	Pedestrians
T21	Pedestrians
OS7	Loss of Open Space
OS9	Children's Play Space
OS13	Youth Provision
SCF11	Meeting Places

Interim Planning Guidance for the purposes of Development Control

5.5	Proposals:	Leaside Area Action Plan
	Core Strategies:	IMP1 Planning Obligations
		CP1 Creating Sustainable Communities
		CP3 Sustainable Environment
		CP4 Good Design
		CP5 Supporting Infrastructure
		CP19 New Housing Provision
		CP20 Sustainable Residential Density
		CP21 Dwelling and Mix Type
		CP22 Affordable Housing
		CP23 Efficient Use and Retention of Existing Housing
		CP24 Special Needs and Specialist Housing
		CP25 Housing Amenity Space
		CP27 Social and Community Facilities to Support Growth
		CP29 Improving Education and Skills
		CP30 Improving the Quality and Quantity of Open Spaces
		CP31 Biodiversity
		CP38 Energy Efficiency and Production of Renewable Energy
		CP39 Waste Management Plan

	CP40	Sustainable Transport Network
	CP41	Integrating Transport with Development
	CP42	Streets for People
	CP43	Better Public Transport
	CP46	Accessible and Inclusive Environments
	CP47	Community Safety
	CP48	Tall Buildings
Policies:	DEV1	Amenity
	DEV2	Character and Design
	DEV3	Accessibility and Inclusive Design
	DEV4	Safety and Security
	DEV5	Sustainable Design
	DEV6	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy
	DEV7	Water Quality and Conservation
	DEV8	Sustainable Drainage
	DEV9	Sustainable Construction Materials
	DEV10	Disturbance from Noise Pollution
	DEV11	Air Quality and Air Pollution
	DEV12	Management of Demolition and Construction
	DEV13	Landscaping and Tree Preservation
	DEV15	Waste and Recyclable Storage
	DEV16	Walking and Cycling Routes and Facilities
	DEV17	Transport Assessments
	DEV18	Travel Plans
	DEV19	Parking for Motor Vehicles
	DEV20	Capability of Utility Infrastructure
	DEV22	Contaminated Land
	DEV24	Accessible Amenities and Services
	DEV25	Social Impact Assessment
	DEV27	Tall Buildings Assessment
	CON2	Conservation Areas
	HSG1	Determining Residential Density
	HSG2	Housing Mix
	HSG3	Affordable Housing Provisions
	HSG4	Varying the Ratio of Social Rented to Intermediate Housing
	HSG5	Estate Regeneration Schemes
	HSG7	Housing Amenity Space
	HSG9	Accessible and Adaptable Homes
	HSG10	Calculating the Provision of Affordable Housing
	SCF1	Social and Community Facilities
	OSN2	Open Space
	RT6	Loss of Public Houses
	PS1	Noise
	PS2	Residential Water Refuse and Recycling Provision
	PS3	Parking
	PS4	Density Matrix
	PS5	Lifetime Homes

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Submission version December 2009)

5.6	Policies	SP01	Town Centre Activity
		SP02	Housing and sustainable communities
		SP03	Healthy Lifestyles
		SP04	Open Space
		SP05	Waste Management
		SP06	Economy and Employment

SP07	Education and Training
SP08	Transport Network
SP09	Pedestrians and Streets
SP10	Heritage and Good Design
SP11	Sustainability and Climate Change
SP12	Placemaking
SP13	Planning Obligations

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

- 5.7 Residential Space
Designing Out Crime
Landscape Requirements

- 5.8 **Community Plan** The following Community Plan objectives relate to the application:
A better place for living safely
A better place for living well
A better place for creating and sharing prosperity
A better place for learning, achievement and leisure
A better place for excellent public services

6. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

- 6.1 The views of officers within the Directorate of Development and Renewal are expressed in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section below.

The following were consulted regarding the application:

London Borough of Tower Hamlets - Environmental Health

- 6.2 Contaminated Land – The site and surrounding area have been subjected to former industrial uses. A contamination condition requiring contamination risk to be fully identified and appropriately mitigated prior to development should be attached to any permission granted.

Daylight and Sunlight – The Environmental Statement by Scott Wilson dated October 2009 which contained the daylight/sunlight report has been reviewed. There is no unacceptable overshadowing on any open space as a result of the proposed development. However, the Langdon Park School that would experience up to 3 hours which is less than BRE criteria. There would be some impact in daylight to the Heath Centre on Chrisp Street and 2-22 Burcham Street. Further information has been requested by Environmental Health.

(OFFICER COMMENT: Given the health centre is non-habitable a refusal cannot be substantiated on these grounds. The overshadowing is discussed in further detail within section 8 of this report).

London Borough of Tower Hamlets - Highways

- 6.3 SITE E

Car Parking

- The car free development proposed is supported subject to the provision and implementation of sustainable travel measures via a Travel Plan.
- In line with policy, provision needs to be made for disabled parking. Policy requires a minimum of one accessible space. Provision for the community use also needs to be

considered.

- Site E is currently a privately owned and maintained residential car park containing approximately 66 spaces. More information is required in relation to who uses the car park and the level of usage. This needs to be fully considered and quantified to understand the net impact on public amenity.

Cycle Parking

- The numbers shown on the D&A and TA vary. Levels proposed need to be confirmed.
- Policy requires a minimum of 1 space per residential unit and 1 per 10 units for visitors. Whilst for D1 use policy requires a minimum of 1 per 10 staff and 1 per 5 staff for visitors.
- The cycle storage area for the respective residential and community use needs to be clearly identified on plan.
- The layout of the cycle stands located within the basement area seems too tight, hindering accessibility. This needs to be revised in accordance with Council Standards.
- Access to the basement cycle storage needs to be clarified.

Servicing / Refuse / Emergency Arrangements

- The proposed servicing arrangements are not clear and further details are required.
- An appropriately dimensioned on-site loading bay (e.g. for delivery and removals vans, plant room) should be shown on plan, with a clear servicing link from the loading area to the community and residential units.
- The refuse store needs to be clearly identified on plan.
- Swept path analysis may be required.

Community Use

- No information has been provided in relation to the type of community use proposed and its operation.
- The London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) needs to be consulted to ensure that the scheme design is in accordance with Fire Safety Guidance Note GN29 and Building Regulations Document B (Fire Safety) Volume 1 or 2.
- The community use was excluded from the trip generation exercise. This needs to be included.

Layout

- The red line boundary shown on the Design and Access Statement is incorrect as there is a portion of Willis Street (up to the junction with Brownfield Street) which is public highway. This would affect the proposal the applicant seems to have for Willis Street (i.e. raised shared surface).

(OFFICER COMMENT: The red line boundary is correct and notice has been served on LBTH Highways for the part of the site within their ownership).

SITE G

Car Parking

- Minimal parking provision would be sought.
- The TA mentions that 9 car parking spaces shall be allocated for this site (5 off-street and privately managed and 4 on-street via permit spaces as existing). On-street spaces are not allocated for use by a specific site as they can be used by anybody in possession of a permit. Clarification is sought on exactly what is being proposed.
- Agreement is sought that all future occupiers of the development cannot apply or obtain an on-street parking permit to park a vehicle on the public highway.
- Scaled plans need to be submitted showing clearly the location of the off-street parking spaces proposed.
- In line with policy, provision needs to be made for disabled parking. Policy requires a

minimum of the greater of 2 spaces or 10% of total parking be allocated for accessible parking.

Cycle Parking

- 27 cycle spaces are proposed. This complies with policy and is acceptable.
- All cycle parking facilities should be provided in an accessible, well-lit, safe, sheltered and secure location. This can be appropriately conditioned.
- The layout of the cycle stands located within the ground floor area seems too tight, hindering accessibility. This needs to be revised in accordance with Council Standards.

Servicing / Refuse / Emergency Arrangements

- Please see comments for Site G above.

Layout

- Location of car parking bays proposed need to be clearly identified.
- The width of the access road seems too narrow for two-way movement and should be revised in accordance with guidance contained within DfT's 'Manual for Streets'.

SITE I (1 & 2)

Car Parking

- Minimal parking provision would be sought.
- The TA states that off-street the proposed 'parking allocation for Site I (combining I-1 and I-2) is 20 spaces.' It then goes on to mention that the spaces shall be shared with approximately 30 properties fronting Ida Street. Clarification is sought.
- How are spaces along the stretch of Ida Street going to be managed?
- If as stated, 20 spaces are allocated for Sites I1 & I2, this would not be acceptable as it does not comply with policy.
- Agreement is sought that all future occupiers of the development cannot apply or obtain an on-street parking permit to park a vehicle on the public highway. This is required to be appropriately conditioned.
- Scaled plans need to be submitted showing clearly the location of the off-street parking spaces proposed.
- In line with policy, provision needs to be made for disabled parking. Policy requires a minimum of the greater of 2 spaces or 10% of total parking be allocated for accessible parking.

Cycle Parking

- No formal cycle spaces are proposed. If what is being proposed are houses, as opposed to flats, then it is accepted that cycles can be stored within the curtilage of each individual property.

Servicing / Refuse / Emergency Arrangements

- Please see comments for Site G above. If what is being proposed are individual houses, it is considered that an appropriately sized bay on Ida Street be allocated for service / delivery vehicles.

Layout

- Location of car parking bays proposed need to be clearly identified.
- The width of the entry point to the access road seems too narrow for two-way movement and should be revised in accordance with guidance contained within DfT's 'Manual for Streets'.

TRAVEL PLAN

- A full scale Travel Plan shall be required in accordance with TfL guidelines.

- As part of the Travel Plan, there needs to be provision for a car club facility, cycle facilities and a restriction on the take up of on street parking permits.

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLAN

- A Construction Management Plan should be submitted to the Council for approval. This relates to such issues as to separate contractors' access, construction traffic, guarded pedestrian access, the phased construction methodology and its implications for the safe operation of surrounding premises.

CONTRIBUTIONS (S106/S278)

- A financial contribution of £200,000 is sought for transport and traffic management improvement measures in the surrounding area.
- S278 condition required for necessary highways improvements to serve the development.
- Please include the following informative: In accordance with the Highways Act 1980, all highway works shall be carried out under section 278 agreement.

(OFFICER COMMENT: Following the highways comments, the applicant has submitted additional information in response to the issues and queries raised. Further information has been provided and are discussed within section 8 of the report. The recommended conditions, informatives and S.278 agreement would be applied to any planning permission granted. Contributions have been secured towards health care, education and leisure. This can be considered as mitigation for the increase in population. It is not considered the proposals would have a significant impact on the highway network and it is not considered that the requested highways contribution can be prioritised given the financial restraints of the scheme).

Further Highways comments, following additional information received 6/01/10:

- Many of the issues are to be dealt with via a revised TA and plans. I await submission - More data is required in order to justify the assumption that the community use would not have a material impact.
- It still considered that there would be operational and management issues in terms of issuing on-street permits to a small number of units whilst excluding the rest.
- The width of the access road (Ida Street) is still an issue as it is too narrow for two-way movement.
- The design should incorporate improvements to the operation of this access (e.g. waiting space near the entrance so that vehicles can wait off the public highway).
- It should be shown that the future conversion of disabled spaces is physically possible as they are larger than the standard bays.
- For Site I, the location of waiting vehicles which serve the site should be indicated on plan.

(OFFICER COMMENT: The issues raised are considered under the highways section of this report).

London Borough of Tower Hamlets – Waste Management

6.4 No comments received to date.

London Borough of Tower Hamlets - Energy

6.5 No comments received to date.

London Borough of Tower Hamlets – Crime Prevention

6.6 Site E.

- The park/green space between Willis St and Burcham street needs to be

sympathetically designed, to avoid it becoming a meeting place for groups and from that anti-social behaviour.

- Care should be taken that the ground floor balconies/amenity space do not contribute to climbing. This can be designed out with careful and considerate tweaking of the design of the balconies at ground and first floor levels.
- The access controlled communal entrance to the residential block should be video controlled, with no trades buttons, to prevent casual and planned illegal access. Post boxes should be within the lobby or individual front doors.

Site G

- Concerns here are the ground floor wheelchair unit (5b8p). The climbing issue raises its head again, and care must be taken to ensure the ground floor balconies/amenity space are designed to give both protection to the occupants of this apartment, but also to not allow climbing to upper floor balconies.
- As with Site E, access control systems into the blocks should be video systems for SBD purposes, and no trades buttons. Plus SBD standards for doors/windows/glass.

Site I - 1 & I - 2

- Generally these new buildings add to the active street scene, and the design does not appear to cause increased crime or ASB problems. Because the buildings have corners onto other streets, security to rear gardens is important.

London Borough of Tower Hamlets – Landscaping and Trees

- 6.7 No objections to works proceeding, few trees present and not worthy of preservation. Request an extensive landscape plan for the sites and also detail some tree planting for the site.

London Borough of Tower Hamlets – Access Officer

- 6.8 No comments received to date.

London Borough of Tower Hamlets – Communities Leisure and Culture

- 6.9 Cultural Services note that the increased permanent population generated by the development will increase demand on community, cultural and leisure facilities.

In priority order;

Leisure facilities

The proposed development will increase demand on leisure facilities and our emerging leisure centre strategy identifies the need to develop further leisure opportunities to align with population growth. Sport England (the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) agency tasked with implementing sports policy) have developed a sports facility calculator for s106 purposes. This calculates (based on population figures and research based demand data) the amount of water space and sports hall required to cater for the population of new developments. It then uses building cost index figures to calculate the cost associated. A population of 205 was inserted into the model and this generates a total leisure contribution of **£84,733.00**.

Open space

An off-site contribution should be sought to mitigate for the impact on existing open space. Based on the cost of laying out open space as agreed during the Wood Wharf negotiations, this would be £260/sqm x 1,470sqm = **£382,200.00**.

Library/Idea Store Facilities

Museums, Libraries and Archives (the sector DCMS agency) has developed a tariff approach to s106 contributions towards libraries and archives. This assumes a requirement of 30sqm of library space per 1,000 pop based on national research. The standard uses construction index figures and applies a cost of £3,465/sqm for London. This results in a per capita cost of £104. The site is likely to generate a population of 205. This means: $205 * £104/pop =$ **£21,320.00**.

Other

We would like to highlight that the purpose of the 150spm of Community Space proposed onsite is not clear. If there is currently no defined purpose, it may be more appropriate for the developer to utilise the space for residential or commercial uses and pay a financial contribution towards community facilities in a town centre (in line with the LDF).

(OFFICER COMMENT: It is not considered that the requested contribution towards open space, libraries and community facilities can be justified for this scheme. Given the scheme would provide and increase in open space on the site and a community facility is being provided, in conjunction with the financial constraints of the scheme, the open space and community facilities contribution will not be sought. It is considered that given the Tower Hamlets 'Planning for Population Growth' Capacity Assessment Report 2009 shows that there is an overprovision of library space within the area, this contribution cannot be justified and will not be sought. Contributions have been secured towards healthcare, education and leisure. This can be considered as mitigation for the increase in population and is acceptable).

London Borough of Tower Hamlets – Education

- 6.10 The proposed dwelling mix has been assessed for the impact on the provision of primary school places. The mix is assessed as requiring a contribution towards the provision of 24 additional primary school places @ £12,342 = **£296,208**. This funding will be pooled with other resources to support the LA's programme for the borough of providing additional places to meet need.

(OFFICER COMMENT: This contribution would be secured as part of the S.106 obligation).

Tower Hamlets Primary Care Trust

- 6.11 Based on the calculated additional population, a contribution of **£155,881** is sought.

(OFFICER COMMENT: This contribution would be secured as part of the S.106 obligation).

Greater London Authority (GLA)

- 6.12 Housing – 44% Affordable housing would be provided once demolition is taken into account. A viability appraisal should be submitted with regard to the level of affordable housing, as well as the wider benefits of the scheme. Equipped LEAP play space should be provided. Density and dwelling mix is generally acceptable.

Urban Design – The approach is mostly acceptable, but there is insufficient justification on the massing approach of block G. There are also concerns regarding the treatment of the side elevation of block G (facing Ida Street). More information on building materials should be submitted and the purpose of the routes and landscaping to the rear of block G, I1 and I2 clarified. Further landscaping information is required regarding how it would relate to the surroundings and desire lines of pedestrian routes on site E need to be carefully considered.

Transport and Parking – There is unlikely to be a significant impact on the transport network however a travel plan should be submitted. Disabled parking is required and electric parking spaces should be considered. Occupants' rights to parking permits for the wider estate should be restricted. Cycle parking to be clarified. Improvements to local cycle and pedestrian routes should be considered. Introduction of a DLR real-time notification system is requested within the lobby of block E. A construction logistics plan and delivery and service plan are requested.

Access – Disabled parking required.

Sustainable development – The approaches to energy provision and carbon dioxide reductions are acceptable in principle. Need to demonstrate that enough space has been allocated for the communal heating scheme as well as allowing for future expansion, and further information for energy strategies on sites G, I1 and I2 should be provided. Further information on cooling requirements, photovoltaic panels and biomass boilers, especially with regard to air quality. Justification should be provided for not incorporating grey water recycling, roof water runoff collections and green/brown roofs.

(OFFICER COMMENT: Issues raised by the GLA are considered in the Material Planning Considerations (Section 8) of the report. Since the above comments were received, the applicant has submitted further information in response with regard to viability appraisal, materials, block G, landscaping strategy, cycle and disabled parking and sustainability. With regard to provision of DLR real-time notification system within the lobby of block E and other transport improvements requested, given the financial constraints of the scheme, it is not considered that these can be prioritised).

Transport for London (TfL)

6.13 Trip Generation

- When the existing retained units are taken into account across the Brownfield estate the new development represents a net gain of 114 units. TfL notes that with the trip rate methodology there are discrepancies between the PTAL, car parking provision and locations of the sites selected from TRAVL. However, TfL consider the results acceptable and that does not require further assessment to support this application.

Car Parking

- TfL supports the proposals for a car free development for Site E and the applicant's willingness to remove the occupant's right for on-street parking permit; this should be secured by way of a S106 agreement
- It is outlined that Site G will provide 9 car parking spaces, 4 of which are to be retained as on-street residential permit spaces on Brownfield Street. Based on a quantum of 23 units and unit size, this is compliant with parking standards within the London Plan, policy 3C.23, 'Parking Strategy and draft revised London Plan policy 6.13 *'Parking'*.
- TfL note that 20 spaces will be allocated for Site I-1 and I-2. The 20 spaces will replace on-street parking on Ida Street. As a result, TfL considers the proposals acceptable and suggests that occupant's (Sites G, I-1 and I-2), rights to parking permits for the wider estate are also removed.
- In line with London plan Policy 3C.23, *'Parking Strategy'* and draft revised London Plan policy 6.13 *'Parking'*, the applicant should provide adequate disabled parking across all sites.
- TfL additionally support any proposal to operate a car club scheme from the site.

Pedestrians

- TfL notes that the proposed scheme is within 960m of both All Saints and Langdon Park DLR stations. Site E is likely to generate the vast majority of new trips from Langdon Park Station whilst Sites G and I are likely to use All Saints DLR station due to the pedestrian link along Ida Street.
- TfL recommends that the borough investigate pedestrian improvements along the link routes to the two stations. Contributions should be secured by way of a S106 agreement in order to improve access to the DLR.
- TfL encourages the removal of guard railing across the estate wherever possible to increase the permeability of walking routes. As the site is within 900m of two DLR stations, TfL recommend the developer adopts a way finding and signage strategy that incorporates the principles of 'Legible London' Further information can be provided about this upon request.
- TfL encourages the development to make provision for real time travel information for the Docklands Light Railway, using the DAISY (Docklands Arrival Information System). This system should be located in communal areas accessible for all uses within the development. It is therefore recommended that a minimum contribution of £20,000 is set aside for the installation of this system, secured by way of a S106 agreement.

Buses

- The site is well served by local bus services. As such, TfL accepts that there is sufficient capacity on those services as to have minimal impact on the bus network.
- TfL would welcome the opportunity to discuss if bus routes could better serve the area. During the construction phases of sites E, G and I, consideration needs to be given to bus route 309, to minimise disruption, avoiding diversions where possible. This should be included within a Construction and Logistics Plan as discussed below.

Cycling

- TfL requests that the introduction of a cycle route along the eastern fringes of East India Dock Road and along Cotton Street should be considered.
- TfL supports the proposal to provide 147 cycle parking spaces for sites E and G. However, to ensure compliance with cycle parking standards as set out in London Plan Policy 3C.22 '*Improving conditions for cycling*', a minimum of 18 cycle parking spaces should be provided for site I.

Travel Plan

- TfL notes that the travel plan framework is acceptable in its current form and has passed the ATTrBuTE assessment. Nevertheless, TfL requires a full travel plan to be submitted to support this application, to ensure compliance with London Plan policy 3C.3, '*Matching development to transport capacity*' and draft revised London Plan policy 6.3 '*Assessing transport capacity*.'
- The travel plan should include site specific objectives and measurable and time bound targets.
- TfL expects the development to be supported by a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) and a Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP). Both of these plans should be secured by section 106 agreement with the borough.

Conclusion

- Provided that the development is mitigated to TfL's satisfaction following the above comments, TfL considers this development could accord with transport policies of the London Plan.

(OFFICER COMMENT: With regard to provision of DLR real-time notification system within the lobby of block E and other transport improvements requested, given the financial

constraints of the scheme, it is not considered that these can be prioritised).

English Heritage

6.14 No comments on the proposal

Environment Agency

6.15 Originally, objected to the application due to lack of sequential test.

Further comments received 13/01/10 confirm the following:

As the four development sites subject to this application appear to fall outside the flood risk zone then we are satisfied that evidence of the Sequential Test does not need to be provided to us. In light of this we WITHDRAW our OBJECTION to the proposed development.

We therefore have no objection in principle to the proposed development provided the following planning conditions are imposed on any planning permission granted:

1. scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority
2. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority for, an amendment to the remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with.
3. No infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground is permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority,
4. Development shall not begin until drainage details, incorporating sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro-geological context of the development, have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Commission for Architecture and Built Environment (CABE)

6.16 The following issues were raised by the design review panel:

- Design quality needs further work and depth of thinking to ensure a positive impact on this part of Poplar
- The wider issues of the estate in terms of public space, relations between the proposed and existing building and future developments beyond the site have not been taken into account
- Detailed analysis of the context required, which should inform the strategies for the site, the scale of development and height and design of buildings
- Quality of information insufficient
- Whilst a case for a tall building could be made on this site, it is not considered the proposal in its current form meet the high standards set out within tall building guidance
- Elevations of the tower need more work

(OFFICER COMMENT: It is considered that a lack of knowledge of the estate may have hindered the panel's review of the scheme. It is considered by officers that the context of the site and estate as a whole has been analysed and fed into the design of the scheme. Comments regarding presentation of the scheme, expression of the building and information required for landscaping, materials and detailing have been taken on board by the applicant. The applicant has produced further information to address concerns raised. Materials and

landscaping details would be conditioned as part of any planning permission granted).

London City Airport

6.17 No comments received to date.

National Air Traffic Services

6.18 No comments received to date.

Thames Water

6.19 No objection in principle, however recommend standard informatives and a condition regarding impact piling.

(OFFICER COMMENT: The suggested condition and informatives have been included within section 3 of the report).

BBC reception advice

6.20 No comments received to date.

Olympic Delivery Authority

6.21 No comment on the proposals.

London Thames gateway Development Corporation

6.22 No comments received to date.

20th Century Society

6.23 'The Society has had a series of pre-application meetings with PRP, in which both our remit and the designs for the new buildings were discussed and some of the Society's views clearly have been taken into account. One of the key considerations for the Society was height and that the new tower on the Willis St site should not rise above the existing Balfour Tower. Views east from the railway line across the conservation area would certainly be affected and the Society can see no proper justification for a tower any larger. The height, we believe, should be governed by the existed listed building in the conservation area.

The Society's second point regards design and again, this is something we discussed at length with PRP. Whilst we appreciated PRP's admiration of Goldfinger as an architect, the Society felt that any indication that PRP had borrowed from him, in external details or motifs, would be crude and not fully understanding of the way in which Goldfinger's internal design and layout translated onto the exterior of a building. The Society still feels that imitating any great architecture in this way is not honest or desirable. The new build should exhibit qualities of its own and from its own time'.

English Heritage (Archaeology)

6.24 No comments received to date.

7. LOCAL REPRESENTATION

- Willis Street car park is currently underused

8. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the committee must consider are:

1. Land Use

Acceptability of the proposed uses in this location.

2. Density

The acceptability of the proposed density

3. Housing

The acceptability of the proposed housing mix and tenure

4. Design and scale

Impact on the amenity of the surrounding area including amenity space.

5. Amenity

Impact on the amenity of the surrounding area.

6. Highways and parking

Transport and highways implications.

7. Sustainability

Sustainability principles

8. Impacts on local infrastructure / S106

Any required mitigation

Land Use

- 8.2 The existing land use of the Brownfield Estate is predominantly residential. There are no specific land use designations in the adopted UDP 1998 or Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007). The application proposes additional housing and a small community centre which, in principle, is acceptable in land use terms.
- 8.3 The application proposes 144 new build residential units in total. The demolition of 30 small bed-sit and 1 bedroom units and a Public House which are in a poor state of repair, would allow the redevelopment of site G, I1 and I2. The sites where demolition is proposed are not situated within the conservation area. The housing units lost are replaced with an additional number of better quality units and as such, there is no conflict with the objectives of UDP policy HSG4 and Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) policy CP23, which seeks to prevent the loss of housing.
- 8.4 Taking into account the demolition, a net gain of 114 units would be achieved. The provision of additional housing to facilitate the regeneration of the estate accords with the aims of London Plan Policy 3A.3 and Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) policies CP19 and CP20, which seek to maximise the supply of housing; and the aims of Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) policy CP23, which seeks to improve all existing housing stock. This is further reinforced by policy SP02 of the Core Strategy (December 2009). As such the proposed demolition and redevelopment in principle is considered acceptable.
- 8.5 The proposed community use would provide 148sqm floorspace and it is proposed that it

would serve residents of the estate as an information and resident centre. The proposed community centre would provide an active frontage and natural surveillance over the streetscene. The community use in principle is considered acceptable within this location.

- 8.6 Given that there are alternative Public Houses available within 300m of the site at Chrisp Street, in conjunction with the need for housing, the loss of the Public House on site G is considered acceptable in principle. In accordance with policy RT6 in the Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007).
- 8.7 In conclusion, the proposed land uses in this location are supported by the London Plan and local policy objectives.

Density

- 8.8 London Plan density matrix within policy 3A.3 suggests that densities within urban sites with good transport links should be within the range 450-700 habitable rooms per hectare. This is reinforced by Policy SP02 (2) of the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009) which seek to correspond housing density to public transport accessibility and proximity town centres.
- 8.9 Overall, the existing Brownfield Estate has a density of approximately 268 habitable rooms per hectare. The proposed density of the schemes on site E, G, I1 and I2 ranges from 223 to 894 habitable rooms per hectare with Site E accommodating 894 habitable rooms per hectare. Once built, this would give the Brownfield Estate an overall density of 322 habitable rooms per hectare.
- 8.10 The Brownfield Estate is situated within close proximity of numerous bus routes and the DLR stations at Langdon Park and All Saints. In particular, site E is located 150m away Langdon Park DLR station. The Town Centre at Chrisp Street is also a short walk away. Problems typically associated with excessive density are poor design, parking and lack of open space. Whilst the proposed development on site E exceeds the density guidance, given its sustainable location, appropriate design, car-free development and provision of open space, it is considered the density of the scheme is acceptable.

Housing

- 8.11 Policy 3A.9 of the London Plan states that Boroughs should seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing, taking into account the Mayor's strategic target that 50% of all new housing in London should be affordable and Boroughs' own affordable housing targets. Interim Planning Guidance policies CP22 and HSG3 seek to achieve 50% affordable housing provision from all sources across the Borough, and specify that individual developments should provide a minimum of 35% affordable housing. This is further supported by policy SP02 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009) which seeks between 35%-50% affordable home on sites providing 10 units or more.
- 8.12 The scheme provides a total of 54 affordable units which equates to 44% affordable housing by habitable room overall, taking into account the demolition of 30 units. The scheme is therefore acceptable and exceeds the minimum 35% as required by policy CP22 and HSG3 in the Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) and policy SP02 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009).
- 8.13 Policy SP02 (4) in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009) seeks a tenure split of 70% social rented and 30% intermediate within affordable housing provision. Overall, the scheme delivers 68% social rented and 32% intermediate which is considered acceptable and closely in line with policy SP02 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009). The proposal would comply with the Mayors emerging housing guidance which seeks a 60:40 split between

social and intermediate housing.

8.14 London Plan policy 3A.5 promotes housing choice including the provision of a range of dwelling sizes. Unitary Development Plan policy HSG7 requires new housing schemes to provide a mix of unit sizes including a substantial proportion of family dwellings of between 3 and 6 bedrooms. To reflect the local need for family sized accommodation within the borough, policies CP21 and HSG2 in Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) specify that a mix of unit sizes should be provided with 45% family sized (3 or more beds) accommodation within the social rented sector and 25% within the intermediate and market housing. Policy SP02 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009) reinforces that 30% of new housing should be family sized, including 45% of new social rented homes.

8.15 The application proposes the following mix of unit sizes for the new build. The target percentages given reflect those specified by policy HSG2 in the Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007):

		Affordable social rent			Intermediate			Market		
Unit	Total units	Units	%	Target	Units	%	Target	Units	%	target
Studio	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	1	1	25
1 bed	49	0	0	20	5	23	25	44	49	25
2 bed	51	8	25	35	13	59	25	30	33	25
3 bed	23	4	13	30	4	18	25	15	17	25
4 bed	16	16	50	10	0	0		0	0	
5 bed	4	4	13	5	0	0		0	0	
Totals	144	32	100%	100%	22	100%	100%	90	100%	100%

8.16 Overall, the scheme provides 36% family sized units (3 beds or more) across the entire scheme. The proposal would provide 76% family sized social rented units and 18% of the proposed dwellings would be family sized within the intermediate sector. Given the quality of the 4 and 5 bedrooms houses with gardens that would be provided in the social rented sector, the overall housing mix is considered acceptable and responds to local need in accordance with policy HSG2 in Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) and policy SP02 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009).

8.17 Policy HSG13 in the UDP 1998 requires all new development to provide adequate internal space. Supplementary planning guidance note 1: residential space sets minimum internal flat and room sizes. The proposed residential units within this application have acceptable internal space standards in line with policy HSG13 in the UDP 1998 which is further supported by policy SP02 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009).

8.18 Policy HSG7 in the Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) and policy SP02 (6) in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009) seeks adequate external amenity space for new dwellings.

8.19 All units, with the exception of one 1 bedroom market housing unit on site E have balconies. Balconies on site E range from 5sqm to 11sqm. Given that the units have private amenity space and the provision of new amenity space at the base of the building totalling 792sqm, amenity space provision for site E is acceptable. All units proposed on site G have access to private amenity space of at least 10sqm in the form of balconies or gardens. Site G has a communal garden for residents totalling 258sqm. The ground floor 4 bedroom maisonettes have private gardens of 18sqm. On site I1 and I2 all houses have at least 50sqm private gardens.

8.20 Overall, taking into account the provision of communal amenity space and private amenity

space provision, the proposal meets the requirement of policy HSG13 in the UDP 1998 which is further supported by policy SP02 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009) and amenity space provision for the proposed units is acceptable.

- 8.21 London Plan policy 3A.5 and Interim Planning Guidance policy HSG9 require housing to be designed to 'Lifetime Homes' standards and for 10% of all new housing to be wheelchair accessible. This is reinforced by policy SP02 (6) in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009).
- 8.22 In line with policy, a total 7 fully wheelchair accessible units are proposed and 10% overall will be designed to ensure that they could easily be converted for wheelchair users. All of the units would be constructed to Lifetimes Homes standards and the details of this would be required by condition.

Design

- 8.23 Good design is central to all objective of the London Plan and is specifically promoted by the policies contained in Chapter 4B of the London plan. Saved policy DEV1 in the UDP 1998 and Policy CP4 and DEV2 of the Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) states that developments are required to be of the highest quality design, incorporating the principles of good design. These principles are further supported by policy SP10 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009).
- 8.24 London Plan policies 4B.9 and 4B.10 seek to ensure tall buildings are of a appropriately designed and located to help create attractive landmarks and a catalyst for regeneration. In particular, London Plan policy 4B.10 sets out design criteria for tall buildings. These aims are further supported by policy CP48 and DEV27 in Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) and policy SP10 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009).
- 8.25 London Plan policy 4B.12 and policy CON2 in the Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) seek to preserve the character of conservation areas and heritage assets. These policies are reinforced by the aims of policy SP10 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009).

Site E – Willis Street

- 8.26 The application proposes a 20 storey building on the existing car park site. The proposed building is designed to be a free-standing structure set within its own landscaped setting, similar to the principles followed by Goldfinger for Balfron Tower and Carradale House. The proposal would provide 792sqm of publicly accessible open space within the site. Active uses at ground floor would be created by the residential entrances and community use, thus enhancing the streetscene.
- 8.27 The building has been designed incorporating principles of Goldfinger in terms of orientation of the taller elements and the juxtaposition of high-rise and low-rise within the estate. The site provides an opportunity to mark the entrance to Brownfield Estate and book-end the conservation area facing towards Glenkerry House and Balfron Tower. By siting the tower at the most westerly edge of the site and orientating the main elevations towards east-west, the building reflects the approach of Goldfinger and complements his approach to creating communal landscaped gardens around the base.
- 8.28 The building forms part of the panorama as seen from Greenwich Park viewpoint within the London Views Management Framework. The proposal would not dominate the view, and would appear smaller than adjacent buildings in the foreground such as Canary Wharf. As such, it is not considered the proposal would be detrimental to the panorama and will be an acceptable addition to the view.

8.29 Whilst tall, it is not considered that the proposal would appear an overly dominant addition to the area. Balfour Tower will remain the tallest and most striking building on the estate and given the distance, the proposal would not interfere with the setting of the listed Balfour Tower and Carradale House. The siting and design principles have been carefully considered to respect the form of the Brownfield Estate and conservation area.

8.30 The GLA stage 1 report states:

'With regards to the setting of the Conservation Area, the new building will provide a modernist form that draws elements of siting, footprint and scale from earlier buildings, without resorting to pastiche, and will be an appropriate addition.'

8.31 In terms of façade treatment, the Design and Access Statement reports that the approach for the new building is not to mimic, but to acknowledge the original architectural features and make reference to these so that the new and old can be read as part of the same neighbourhood in terms of their composition. Goldfinger expressed the structure of his high rise buildings and used the concrete frame to set a grid for the elevations. The walls to the flats are set back from the face of the concrete frame to increase the importance of the frame giving the façade a three dimensional quality.

8.32 The approach to site E has been to express a strong grid over the building with the main skin to the apartments set back slightly. The materials forming the structural grid are to be grey with a textured finish giving the appearance of an exposed aggregate. The solid vertical end panels would be darker in colour. Balconies would consist of glass balustrades and full height glazed windows to the apartments to allow sufficient light into the flats.

8.33 The applicants and urban design officers have discussed the proposed materials at length to reach the best possible solution. Full material details will be available to view at the committee meeting. High quality materials consisting of shades of grey stone cladding would emphasise the horizontal and vertical detailing of the facade. The façade approach and proposed materials would respect the context of the site and are considered acceptable, subject to condition requiring full details to be approved.

8.34 The proposed tall building within this location is considered acceptable and the scheme addresses the range of tall building policy criteria, particularly the detailed criteria of London Plan policy 4B.10 and policy DEV27 of the Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007), in the following key ways:

- The height, bulk, scale and external appearance is sensitive to the immediate and wider context;
- The scheme is considered to be high quality;
- There is no adverse impact upon strategic views and the scheme is an acceptable addition to the skyline;
- There is no adverse impact to the character of listed buildings or conservation areas;
- At ground floor level, the proposal would relate at a human scale, and integrate with the street;
- The proposal provides an increased amount of public open space;
- The proposal will contribute positively to vitality in the area with an active ground floor frontages;
- Other than in terms of daylight and sunlight impact, there are no significant amenity impacts posed;
- The proposal poses no adverse traffic and parking impacts given the proposed residential units would be car free;
- The s106 agreement will include a TV mitigation requirement to ensure that any potential impact to reception is addressed; and
- It is not considered to conflict with aviation requirements having been referred to the

relevant authorities for consideration.

- 8.35 The proposed building on site E would clearly have an impact given its height, However due to its freestanding nature and open setting, in conjunction with its design and respect for the character of the conservation area and Brownfield Estate as a whole, the impact is acceptable. The proposed design is considered acceptable and the proposal would preserve the character of the conservation area in accordance with design policies DEV1 in the UDP 1998, policy DEV2 and CON2 in the Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) and policy SP10 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009).
- 8.36 The proposed open space to the base of the proposed tower would not only provide a setting for the building, but would provide an overall increase in the amount of public open space for the estate. The space provided would be integrated with the existing adjacent open space to create a larger, high quality, more useable public open space. Play equipment would be incorporated into this space. Full landscaping details would be secured by condition. The approach is considered acceptable and accords with policy OSN2 in the Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) and policy SP04 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009) which seek to protect and enhance open space within the borough.

Site G – Brownfield Street

- 8.37 The site currently comprises a 3 storey residential block fronting Brownfield Street. The site also comprised a public house on the corner of Brownfield Street and Lodore Street. However, this has been demolished. A small green open space (Adderley Street Square) is located to the east of the site adjacent to Lodore Street.
- 8.38 The application proposes a single built form consisting two elements, a 4 storey linear block of maisonettes facing Brownfield Street and a 5 storey corner block of apartments facing Brownfield Street and Lodore Street.
- 8.39 The proposed footprint generally follows that of the previous and existing buildings on the site. The proposed scale respects the buildings immediately surrounding the site which are generally 4 storeys in height. The proposed siting and massing is considered appropriate in the context of the site.
- 8.40 The design rationale is a simple, brick building that seeks to respect the surrounding residential blocks. The GLA raised some queries in their comments regarding justification for the proposed design and materials approach. Their comments also requested further attention to the elevational detail of the blank gable end facing Ida Street. Since these comments, the applicant has submitted further information and has added windows to the gable end to ensure natural surveillance facing Ida Street. This approach is considered acceptable. Full details of materials would be conditioned.
- 8.41 The proposal on site G would provide dual aspect units with private amenity space. To the street elevations, the building would be set back providing defensible space for residents and front gardens for the maisonettes. A communal garden to the rear will be accessible to residents only of site G. The proposed site layout is considered acceptable.
- 8.42 The proposed design, scale and bulk of site G is considered acceptable in accordance with policy DEV1 in the UDP 1998, policy DEV2 in the Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) and policy SP10 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009) which seek to ensure developments incorporate good design principles and respect their context.

Site I1 and I2 – Ida Street

- 8.43 The sites currently comprise 2 storey residential blocks situated at the end of the terrace row. The application proposes to demolish these buildings and replace with two storey dwelling houses of 4 and 5 bedrooms. Site I2 would feature dormer windows within the roof slope.
- 8.44 The proposed dwellings would continue the building line of the existing streetscene. Each dwelling would be set back from the streetscene by a front garden. The properties would be a simple design constructed in brick which reflects the character of the existing properties within Ida Street. Each property would have a minimum 50sqm private rear garden. This is acceptable in line with amenity space policy HSG13 in the UDP 1998 which is further supported by policy SP02 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009).
- 8.45 The proposed design, scale and bulk of site I1 and I2 is considered acceptable in accordance with policy DEV1 in the UDP 1998, policy DEV2 in the Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) and policy SP10 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009) which seek to ensure developments incorporate good design principles and respect their context.

Conclusion

- 8.46 Overall, the proposal is acceptable in design terms. The proposal provides a high quality development that is an appropriate design and would contribute to housing need. A large number of family sized units would be created within the proposals and whilst a large proportion of units within site E would be for general market need, this helps to create a balanced community. In addition, this allows provision of affordable family sized units on the more suitable sites G and I1 and I2 which allows for the opportunity for larger units with larger private amenity space provision.

Amenity

- 8.47 Saved Policy DEV2 in the UDP 1998 and Policy DEV1 of the Interim Planning Guidance seek to ensure that development where possible protects and enhances the amenity of existing and future residents as well as the amenity of the public realm.

Overlooking

- 8.48 With regard to site E, given the location, distance and orientation of windows, it is not considered that there would be any unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers.
- 8.49 With regard to sites G, I1 and I2, given the location, distance and orientation of windows, it is not considered that there would be any unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers.

Loss of light

- 8.50 A report carried out by Scott Wilson dated October 2009 has been submitted in support of the application. This demonstrates that the health centre on Chrisp Street and 2-22 Burcham Street would experience some deterioration in daylight as a result of the development. However, the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours calculations demonstrate compliance with BRE standards for all but one surface. Given that the BRE guidance should be interpreted with some flexibility and the urban context of the site, it is considered that the impact is acceptable and a refusal could not be substantiated on daylight grounds. Given the health centre is non-residential, it is not considered that a refusal could be substantiated on daylight grounds. All other buildings would not be significantly affected in terms of daylight and sunlight as a result of the development.

Overshadowing

- 8.51 A report carried out by Scott Wilson dated October 2009 has been submitted in support of the application. This shows that a sports pitch of Langdon Park School, will be 100% overshadowed during March for approximately three hours a day. However, this overshadowed area is less than the allowable maximum of 40% that should be prevented from receiving any sunlight. The level of overshadowing is considered acceptable within the urban context and would not inhibit the use of the schools playground to an unacceptable level.
- 8.52 Given the orientation of the site, there would not be significant overshadowing impact on surrounding residential properties. Whilst there will be some overshadowing from the proposal on site E in the late afternoon to the properties at 2-22 Burcham Street, it is not considered that this impact is unacceptable and given the urban context, a refusal would not be substantiated on these grounds.
- 8.53 The applicants noted concern during public consultation from the residents of Glenkerry House regarding potential overshadowing by the new building proposed for Site E. Within the report by Scott Wilson dated October 2009, the results show, it is not predicted to be affected by overshadowing from Site E at any time. This is therefore acceptable.

Sense of enclosure

- 8.54 Given the location and orientation of the proposed buildings, it is not considered that the proposals would result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure to neighbouring residential occupiers.

Noise

- 8.55 Given the scale of the development, the applicant would be required to adhere to an approved construction management plan to minimise noise and disturbance to nearby residents caused by construction noise, debris and traffic. A comprehensive construction management plan secured by S.106 agreement, would ensure that the level of disturbance and disruption within the locality during construction is minimised and kept to an acceptable level. Construction hours would be controlled by planning condition.
- 8.56 It is not considered that the proposed uses would cause unacceptable noise and disturbance. A planning condition would restrict the operation hours of the community use to protect the residential amenity of neighbouring residential occupiers. Given the size of the community use, it is not considered that there would be unacceptable noise and disturbance as a result of the use.
- 8.57 Overall, the proposal is considered acceptable and would not cause unacceptable harm to residential amenity in terms of overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light and noise in accordance with policy DEV2 and DEV50 in the UDP 1998 and policy DEV1 and DEV10 in the Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007).

Transport & Highways

- 8.58 Both the Unitary Development Plan and the Interim Planning Guidance contain a number of policies which encourage the creation of a sustainable transport network which minimises the need for car travel, and supports movements by walking, cycling and public transport.
- 8.59 Following initial highway comments the applicant has submitted additional information

regarding cycle parking. The proposed cycle parking provision is considered to be sufficient for both the residential and community use in line with policy requirements and is therefore acceptable.

- 8.60 Given the scale of the proposed community use, location close to public transport and the intended local resident use it would cater for, it is not considered that the use would give rise to a high number of trips by car and therefore would not harm the local highway network.
- 8.61 Within site E, the proposed refuse storage would be underground and collected from Willis Street. Refuse storage for site G is provided for the apartments alongside the communal entrance and for the upper level maisonettes there is freestanding storage outside the main entrance. The lower level maisonettes will have individual refuse storage provided. The houses on Ida Street (site I1 and I2) would have individual refuse storage and recycling facilities at the front of the properties. A condition requiring full details of the refuse stores and the appearance would be attached to any permission granted. The refuse provision is considered acceptable in line with policy DEV15 in the Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) and SP05 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009).
- 8.62 In line with Highways comments, a dedicated servicing bay on Willis Street has been allocated for site E and is shown on the plans. This servicing bay would be controlled by the use of two drop down bollards. It is not considered that the lower density schemes at site G, I1 and I2 would require dedicated servicing bays as this could take place on-street.
- 8.63 The proposed car-free agreement for the new units is considered acceptable given the accessible location and provision of a Travel Plan within the S.106 agreement. The provision of disabled parking throughout the development has been confirmed by the applicant following initial highways comments and is considered acceptable in line with planning policy.
- 8.64 The principle of the loss of the car park (site E) is considered acceptable. A parking assessment carried out has shown that the loss of these car parking spaces, can be accommodated within the surrounding street network and therefore there would not be an unacceptable impact on the surrounding streets.
- 8.65 The proposals are considered acceptable in highways terms in accordance with policies DEV1 and T16 in the UDP 1998, policies DEV17, DEV18 and DEV19 of the Council's Interim Planning Guidance (October 2007) and policy SP08 in the Core Strategy (Submission Version 2009). A Travel Plan, Servicing Management Strategy, Construction Logistics Plan and the car free agreement are to be secure by planning conditions and via the S.106 agreement.

Sustainability

- 8.66 The approach to energy and sustainability is considered to be generally acceptable in principle. The applicant has broadly followed the energy hierarchy in policy 4A.1 in the London Plan. However further information has been requested to ensure acceptability in line with policy requirements. This information will be submitted by the applicant and additional comments will be circulated at the committee meeting.

9.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 9.1 All other relevant policies and considerations have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out in the SUMMARY OF MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS and the details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION at the beginning of this report.