LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.30 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 16 JUNE 2010

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

Members Present:

Councillor Carli Harper-Penman (Chair)

Councillor Judith Gardiner
Councillor Shelina Akhtar
Councillor Peter Golds
Councillor Ann Jackson
Councillor Mohammed Abdul Mukit MBE
Councillor Kosru Uddin

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Marc Francis

Officers Present:

Bridget Burt - (Senior Planning Lawyer, Legal Services, Chief

Executive's)

Alison Thomas – (Private Sector and Affordable Housing Manager)
Owen Whalley – (Service Head Major Projects, Development &

Renewal)

Ila Robertson – (Applications Manager Development and

Renewal)

Ann Sutcliffe – (Service Head Building Schools for the Future,

Children's Services)

Nasser Farooq – (Planning Officer Development and Renewal)
Anne Canning – (Service Head Learning & Achievement)

Alan Ingram – (Democratic Services)

COUNCILLOR CARLI HARPER-PENMAN (CHAIR) IN THE CHAIR

1. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR

Councillor Ann Jackson nominated Councillor Judith Gardiner to serve as Vice-Chair of the Committee for the remainder of the current Municipal Year

and this was seconded by Councillor Mohammed Abdul Mukit MBE. There being no further nominations, the Chair **Moved** and it was –

RESOLVED

That Councillor Judith Gardiner be elected Vice-Chair of the Development Committee for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2010/11.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The Committee received apologies for absence from Councillors Bill Turner and Amy Whitelock, Mile End and Globe Town Ward Members who were unable, due to work commitments, to attend in connection with agenda items 9.1 and 10.1.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members declared interests in items on the agenda for the meeting as set out below:

Councillor	Item(s)	Type of interest	Reason
Peter Golds	10.1	Personal	Had a long term involvement with measures for the preservation of Bancroft Road Library.
Carli Harper-Penman	9.2	Personal	Ward member for the area of the application.
Judith Gardiner	10.1	Personal	A member of English Heritage, which was a consultation partner for the application.

4. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 28 April 2010 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

5. DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE PROCEDURAL MATTERS

5.1 Development Committee Terms of Reference, Quorum, Membership and Dates of Meetings (DC001/011)

Mr A. Ingram, Democratic Services Officer, introduced the report detailing arrangements agreed at the Annual General Meeting of the Council held on 26 May 2010, for the Terms of Reference, Quorum, Membership and Dates of Meetings for the current Municipal Year.

The Chair Moved and it was -

RESOLVED

- (1) That the Terms of Reference, Quorum, Membership and dates of future meetings for the Committee be noted as set out in the appendices of the report.
- (2) That the start time for the remainder of meetings of the Committee in the Municipal Year be 7.00 p.m., rather than 7.30 p.m.

5.2 Development Committee Public Speaking Procedure (DC002/011)

Mr A. Ingram, Democratic Services Officer, introduced the report concerning proposed amendments to the Public Speaking Procedure at meetings of the Committee. He indicated that the proposed changes to the Committee's own procedures, if agreed, would be reported to the Council Meeting on 14 July 2010.

The Chair Moved and it was -

RESOLVED

- (1) That the proposed changes to the Council's Constitution in relation to the Public Speaking Procedure, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, be noted.
- (2) That the proposed changes to the Committee's own procedures, as set out in Appendix 2 of the report, be agreed with effect from 14 July 2010.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee **RESOLVED** that:

- In the event of changes being made to recommendations by the Committee, the task of formalising the wording of those changes is delegated to the Corporate Director, Development and Renewal along the broad lines indicated at the meeting; and
- In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the 2) Committee's decision (such as to delete. vary or add conditions/informatives/planning obligations for or reasons approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Corporate Director, Development and Renewal is delegated authority to do so, provided always that the Corporate Director does not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision.

7. PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS

The Committee noted the procedure for hearing objections and those who had registered to speak at the meeting.

8. DEFERRED ITEMS

There were no deferred items.

9. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

9.1 Harpley School, 110 Globe Road, London, E1 4DZ (DC003/011)

Mr O. Whalley, Service Head Major Projects, presented details of the site and proposal for the erection of a sports hall and other works at Harpley School, 110 Globe Road, London, E1 4DZ.

Mr Julian Cheyne, a local resident, spoke in objection to the scheme and commented that:

- Residents had already experienced severe behavioural problems with children from the school and were very concerned at how the addition of the sports hall would impact on their lives. This was not just a management issue but concerned the use of exits. The school had agreed there were serious problems with the Tollet Street entrance and had said it would not now be used in the afternoon as an exit because of the problems with the children's behaviour in the street but this was only a temporary solution. A long term solution to the entrance/exit needed to be found. There were alternative entrances off Massingham Street but the applicants had misstated which entrances were available.
- The scheme would have a seriously negative impact on street parking, which could be avoided by adopting alternative plans for the new parking area and the entrance. There was also some confusion over how delivery entrances would be used and their impact on parking. The proposed Tollet Street car park would have a negative visual impact on the Carlton Square Conservation Area. The Headmaster had also stated that he actually preferred the car park to be located off Globe Road.
- It was unnecessary to build the sports hall in a time of austerity, as the school was small and already had adequate facilities, some of which were underused. The scheme would be adding a fitness suite and a garden as an outdoor play area. Outdoors play was healthier.
- Contrary to what the applicants said, the school's facilities were not used by local residents and there were no concrete plans to alter this.
- The design of the sports hall was inappropriate to the fine school building and the Conservation Area. The school had already put up one inappropriate extension.

 The Headmaster had said he did not want the sports hall put on the Tollet Street side of the school and he had proposed putting the hall on the Globe Road frontage. There had to be a balance between the needs of the school and the concerns of residents, but the applicants had not paid attention to residents' objections.

Ms A. Canning, Service Head Learning & Development, stated that the school addressed the needs of some of the most very vulnerable children in the Borough and the plans for the school would give access to the full curriculum to prepare children for the future. Students there had experienced difficulties with mainstream education and the school would give them back self respect, with valuable opportunities for the future and an education suitable for the 21st century. The premises would be media rich with ICT facilities. Sympathetic internal and external landscaping would help them form positive relationships. The plans included improved facilities for evening use as a youth club. Members had to consider how the proposals would affect the young people and make a real difference in providing positive life opportunities.

Ms I. Robertson, Applications Manager, gave a detailed presentation of the proposals, as contained in the circulated report and commented that parking, design and amenity were key issues that had been addressed. She referred to points raised by local people on these matters as also included in the report, adding that the scheme was a high quality design for an improved learning environment.

Members then put forward questions that were answered by Planning Officers, relating to the expected number of pupils at the school; the use of the sports hall by local people in the evenings; staff car parking needs and management of the hall during evening use.

On a unanimous vote, the Committee RESOLVED

- (1) That planning permission be **GRANTED** at Harpley School, 110 Globe Road, London, E1 4DZ, for the erection of a new sports hall and associated storage located to the north east of the site adjoining Tollet Street; construction of new six bay car park with new entrance from Tollet Street; refurbishment of existing building to include introduction of full height light well; provision of additional bicycle parking and new landscaping; installation of external seating at ground floor level facing Massingham Street, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.
- (2) That Conservation Area consent be **GRANTED** at Harpley School, 110 Globe Road, London, E1 4DZ, for the demolition of the boundary wall to Tollet Street, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.
- (3) That the Head of Development Decisions be delegated power to impose the conditions and informatives on the planning permission and Conservation Area consent set out above to secure the matters listed in the report.

9.2 Car Park to rear of 2 to 82 Russia Lane, off Robinson Road, London, E2 (DC004/011)

Mr O. Whalley, Service Head Major Projects, introduced the site and proposal relating to the scheme for provision of residential homes and associated landscaping at the car park to rear of 2-82 Russia Lane, off Robinson Road, London, E2.

Mr Oliver Mezger, a local resident, spoke in objection to the scheme, commenting that:

- Many old people and families would be adversely affected by the proposals, especially where they did not have access to a wide space between their homes and the proposed development.
- The development should not encroach on an area of public open space and privacy would be seriously impacted for existing residents. The local community had fought to retain the space over a period of years.
- The playspace was likely to attract anti-social behaviour.
- Other residents had wanted to speak but were prevented from doing so by the short notification period given.

The Chair queried the notice given and Mr Whalley commented that residents had been consulted in accordance with appropriate procedures. He added that the Council's Constitution did not allow for further written material to be introduced during the Committee meeting, in response to Mr Mezger's request to submit a further petition to the meeting.

Mr Gavin Redfern of Stock Woolstencroft, speaking for the applicant, commented that his organisation had worked on various sites around the Borough with the key objective of maximising the provision of larger houses without affecting existing residents' facilities. The scheme aimed to provide five-bed homes to standards of high sustainability. The technical details in the application showed that there would be no unacceptable effects on access to light and existing trees would be kept. There had been a formal consultation event for residents on 23 February 2010, and subsequently only green open space would be provided as requested by local people. Tarmac would be replaced by greenery and would meet Borough playspace requirements.

Councillor Marc Francis declared a prejudicial interest in the items due to his position as a Cabinet Member and indicated that he would leave the meeting after making his statement in support of the application. Councillor Francis then commented that:

- Members had to take account of tensions arising from the need to provide housing in the Borough and the requirements of existing residents but it was essential to provide good quality homes for children.
- He wanted to protect the Borough's heritage and would ensure that no unnecessary developments would be implemented on sites owned by the Council. However, people must be given better living

- conditions. The proposals represented the first Council new build in 20 years and would help alleviate housing need in the East End.
- The play area, which had long been dead space, was now being renewed to provide better amenities for children.
- There were 1,000 families on the waiting list for larger homes and their needs had to be balanced against effects of the scheme on other residents.
- There was no reason to suspect that anti-social behaviour would arise.
- The north flank of the development was well away from other residents and the impact of the scheme was mitigated by the desperate need for additional houses.

Councillor Francis then left the meeting room.

Ms I. Robertson, Applications Manager, gave a detailed presentation of the proposals, as contained in the circulated report and commented that land use, design, amenity housing and transport were key issues that had been addressed. She referred to points raised by local people on these matters as also included in the report, adding that the scheme employed a number of sustainable measures such as green roofs and solar power and was far enough away from existing listed buildings so as not to have a detrimental impact. There was no adverse impact on daylight and made the best use of an underused car park.

Mr Whalley commented that use of obscure window glass ensured there would be no overlooking or loss of privacy for other residents.

Members then asked questions relating to the following matters, which were answered by Planning Officers: the advantages or otherwise of dedicating the scheme as a car free development; impact of the application on the views from residents' homes; separation distances between the new and existing houses; assessment of daylight impact; car park permits for existing residents; landscaping and provision of ambulance bays. During consideration of these issues, the Chair warned that continued disturbance from the public gallery might result in members of the public being asked to leave the meeting.

On a unanimous vote, the Committee RESOLVED

- (1) That planning permission be **GRANTED** at the car park to rear of 2 82 Russia Lane, off Robinson Road, London, E2, for the erection of four x five bedroom residential houses and associated landscaping on existing area of car parking/landscaping; amendments to entrance of Russia Lane Daycare Centre; associated works to existing hard landscaping and soft landscaping, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and any other conditions considered necessary by the Corporate Director Development & Renewal.
- (2) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated power to impose the conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the matters listed in the report.

9.3 12-50 Bow Common Lane & Furze Street, E3 (DC005/011)

Item withdrawn.

10. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

10.1 Bancroft Local History And Archives Library, 277 Bancroft Road, London, E1 4DQ (DC006/011)

Mr O. Whalley, Service Head Major Projects, introduced the site and proposals for upgrade of fire escape and further fire safety works at Bancroft Local History and Archives Library, 277 Bancroft Road, London, E1 4DQ. He added that, as the library was Council-owned and the application had been made by the Council, it could not be determined by the Council.

Ms I. Robertson, Applications Manager, gave a detailed presentation of the proposals, as contained in the circulated report and noted that English Heritage had raised no objections to the proposals.

On a unanimous vote the Committee RESOLVED

That the application for works at the Bancroft Local History and Archives Library, 277 Bancroft Road, London, E1 4DQ, in connection with the upgrade of fire escape, works to doors and screens and fire compartmentalisation of basement; upgrade of mechanical and electrical services and fire alarms with emergency lighting and escape signage; provision of a new wc for disabled persons; alterations to front entrance consisting of a new lobby and rank; be referred to the Government Office for London with the recommendation that the Council would be minded to grant Listed Building consent subject to the conditions as set out below:

- Time limit.
- Completed in accordance with approved drawings.
- Samples of materials used for construction of ramp.
- Proposed brick to block up doorway to match existing.

The meeting ended at 8.45 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Carli Harper-Penman Development Committee