

UPDATE REPORT, STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE, 30th March 2022

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.1	PA/20/02128	Cuba Street Site, Land At North East Junction Of Manilla Street And Tobago Street, Tobago Street, London	Erection of single tower block accommodating a high density residential led development (Use Class C3) with ancillary amenity and play space, along with the provision of a flexible retail space at ground floor (Use Class E), the provision of a new publicly accessible park and alterations to the public highway. This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

1. Consultation Update and Clarifications

- 1.1 A further representation expressing general support for the proposal was received since publication of the report.
- 1.2 Four additional objections have been received since the publication of the report which raise issues already identified within the officer's report.

2. Clarifications

- 2.1 The Planning obligations within section 8.2 of the officer's report should include a financial obligation of £42,197 towards Development Co-ordination.

3. Recommendation

- 3.1 Officer recommendation remains that planning permission should be GRANTED for the reasons set out in the main report.

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.2	PA/20/02588	30 Marsh Wall, London, E14 9TP	<p>Demolition of existing building and erection of a 48 storey building (plus basement and lift pit) to provide 1,068 student accommodation bedrooms and ancillary amenity spaces (Sui Generis Use) along with 184.6sqm of flexible retail / commercial floorspace (Use Class E), alterations to the public highway and public realm improvements, including the creation of a new north-south pedestrian route and replacement public stairs.</p> <p>This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.</p>

1. Executive Summary Clarification

1.1 The second paragraph of the Executive Summary should read as follows:

“In land use terms, the proposed student led mixed use scheme is acceptable in this accessible location, being just a short walk (500m) from Heron Quays and South Quay DLR stations and with bus stops being located directly on Marsh Wall served by route D8 which provides immediate access to Major and Central Activity Centres at Canary Wharf ensures that the proposed student accommodation use will be appropriately sited”.

2. Consultation Update

2.1 A further representation in support of the application was received by email on 24.03.22.

2.2 An additional objection was received by email on 29.03.22 raising concerns on the level of light received to the unit. The objector also questioned which university is in this area that there is a need for such accommodation. These matters have been dealt with within paragraphs 7.205 - 7.365 (daylight and sunlight) and 7.14-7.39 (student housing) of the committee report.

3. Committee Site Visit

3.1 A committee site visit took place on 28.03.22.

4. Utilities - Cadent Gas Update

4.1 Paragraph 7.500 of the committee report states that the applicant is awaiting a response from Cadent Gas. Within the Utilities Assessment document which was received by the council on 22.02.22, the applicant noted that Cadent Gas have since confirmed that there is sufficient capacity and have suggested a point of connection to serve the development within 10m of the site boundary.

5. Condition Clarifications

- 5.1 With reference to paragraph 5.67 of the committee report, GLAAS have confirmed that the trigger for the details of the foundation design and construction method condition can be amended to allow for demolition to ground floor slab rather than prior to the commencement of development.
- 5.2 Also, with reference to paragraph 7.193 of the committee report, GLAAS have confirmed that the trigger for the submission of a WSI can be amended to allow for demolition to ground floor slab rather than prior to the commencement of development
- 5.3 In terms of energy conditions, Paragraph 7.442 of the committee report states that a condition shall be attached requiring a viability assessment prior to the commencement of development. The Council have agreed that this trigger would be too early and that the trigger can be amended to 6 months post commencement of development.

6. CEMP Clarification

- 6.1 The Committee Report states at paragraph 7.386 that the overall construction period is 6 months. By way of clarification, the reference to the 6 months in the CEMP related to the time allowed by the applicant to the principal contractor for planning and preparation for construction work not the build. Overall site works duration is expected to be 178 weeks (estimated) as stated in the committee report.

7. Updated Figure 11 of the Committee Report

- 7.1 Figure 11 on page 130 is replaced to reflect the correct extant consent for the Westferry site (PA.15.2216)



Figure 11

8. Local Employment Obligations

- 8.1 As part of the draft Heads of Terms, the applicant is required to provide 33 construction phase apprenticeships. However, the applicant has informed the Council that it is not possible for Tide to provide 33 apprentices on site for a period of not less than 52 weeks as is currently required by the draft s106.
- 8.2 Tide have advised officers that the reason they can't provide the required apprenticeships and other modular developers can, is because Tide use a different type of modular system whereby component parts are flat packed or parts of the building are modular such as the walls or ceilings or they comprise a number of pre-fabricated elements. This means that they have more of a requirement for trades to be on-site longer to complete their developments, thereby enabling them to have apprentices on site for the required amount of time.
- 8.3 Tide use a volumetric modular system whereby their modules are constructed, fully fitted (including bathrooms, kitchens and even beds installed) and made fully watertight in their factories before being transported to site where they are craned into position. All plastering, tiling, flooring, plumbing, electrics are undertaken/installed in the modules in the factory. As a result, the construction of the modules accounts for 65% of the overall construction of the development. Given that so much work is undertaken within the factory, this means that trades are only on site for a maximum of 16 weeks whilst the various systems are connected.
- 8.4 As a result of 65% of the construction occurring off-site, Tide have advised that this means programme savings of up to 50% are achieved compared to traditional construction, there are 80% fewer vehicle movements and there is a significant reduction in the disruption to the local environment and surrounding communities with the construction system leading to less noise, dust, transport related emissions and air pollution. The Economic Benefits Report that was submitted as part of the application took into account the fact that this is a modular build and confirmed that over three years during construction:
- c.385 direct construction jobs will be created;
 - c.580 jobs will be created through indirect and induced employment;
 - An indirect and direct GVA of up to £80 million will be generated.
- 8.5 As such, as Tide cannot accommodate apprentices on site, they asked the Council whether officers would accept a financial contribution be paid that can be used for local apprenticeships. They further requested that in light of the fact that 65% of construction takes place off site that the requirement for 33 apprentices be reduced to 21 and that an agreed sum be paid for each apprentice not employed.
- 8.6 Upon consideration and discussions with the Council's Employment and Enterprise team, officers consider that this does not meet the policy test. Therefore, officers have rejected the applicant's request for a reduction of 33 apprenticeships to 21.
- 8.7 In light of the request for a financial contribution in lieu of the apprenticeship spaces, this has been calculated as follows:
- £2,040 (Cost of training per person) + £20,111 (35 hours p/w at LLW - £11.05) = £22,151
 - £22,151 x 33 = **£730,983**

- 8.8 The above is the maximum level of financial contribution that would be paid as the calculation for each apprenticeship not delivered and is payable on discharge of obligations at the end of the Construction Phase.
- 8.9 In terms of local jobs, as the development would create circa 385 jobs, the Council would expect Reasonable Endeavours to ensure that 20 per cent (77) of the job vacancies are filled by Local People for the Construction Period.
- 8.10 Tide has agreed to this financial contribution and to provide 20% local labour in construction.

9. Recommendation

- 8.1 Officer recommendation remains that planning permission should be GRANTED for the reasons set out in the main report.

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.3	PA/21/00900	Innovation Centre, 225 Marsh Wall, London, E14 9FW	Erection of a ground plus 55-storey residential building (Use Class C3), ground floor flexible commercial space (Use Class E), basement cycle storage, resident amenities, public realm improvements and other associated works. This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

1. Clarifications

1.1 A clarification is provided in relation to paragraph 7.24 to state that the proposed development increases the offer for 0.9% affordable housing, and not 0.7%, when compared to the original permission.

1.2 A clarification is provided in relation to the amendments to Tables 2 and 3 as follows:

Tenure	1-bed	2-bed	3-bed	4-bed	Total
Market	465	425	15	0	305
	161	127			303
Affordable	12	14	9	14	49
Intermediate	45	24	0	0	36
	19	19			38
Total	192	160	24	14	390

Amended Table 2. Proposed housing mix.

Unit type	Market		Intermediate		Affordable rented	
	Policy Target	Scheme	Policy Target	Scheme	Policy Target	Scheme
1 bed	30%	54%	15%	42%	25%	24%
		53%		50%		
2 bed	50%	41%	40%	58%	30%	29%
		42%		50%		
3 bed	20%	5%	45%	0%	30%	18%
4 bed					15%	29%

Amended Table 3. Proposed housing mix assessed against policy requirements.

2. Additional representation

- 2.1 An additional representation in support of the proposed development has been received. The representation particularly supports the increase in height.
- 2.2 No address details have been provided to ensure that an additional representation has been submitted by a Tower Hamlets resident or business.

3. Fire safety and HSE's comments

- 3.1 Health and Safety Executive Planning Gateway One provided further comments with respect to the submitted Fire Statement Form. The following concerns have been raised with respect to the proposed building:

- Additional clarification to be provided whether a 'what if' study has been undertaken;
- Lack of information whether residential and commercial uses use the same staircase;
- Single staircase connecting residential areas to ancillary areas and areas of special fire hazard, including plant rooms on Levels 12 and 55, a pressure break room on Level 39, and storage on Level 40;
- Single staircase descending to the two basement levels;
- Lifts which serve upper floors descending to basement levels if it is in a buildings served by only one escape stair;
- The relationship between ground floor commercial areas and first floor play spaces.

- 3.2 The applicant provided a following response to the HSE's comments:

- The fire strategy has been developed to include 'what if' cases;
- Commercial and residential uses do not use the same stairs as there are no commercial spaces above the ground floor which would be access and exited from Marsh Wall;
- None of the special fire hazard spaces connect directly to the staircase and include sprinkler protection and automatic detection;
- There is no direct connection from the upper staircase flights to the basement flights, which are separated by a solid fire rated wall;
- The proposed lifts would contain a smoke management system to protect the lifts and stairs;
- Child play spaces on Levels 1 and 2 would be for the use of residents only, and are separated from commercial space on the ground floor.

- 3.3 Officers raise no objections to the above responses.

4. RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 As per the original recommendation to REFUSE planning permission for the reasons set out in the Committee Report.