

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 10 MARCH 2011**

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

**Members Present:**

Councillor Carli Harper-Penman (Chair)

Councillor Ann Jackson  
Councillor Stephanie Eaton  
Councillor Craig Aston

**Other Councillors Present:**

**Officers Present:**

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| Pete Smith    | – Development Control Manager, Development and Renewal            |
| Ila Robertson | – (Applications Manager Development and Renewal)                  |
| Fleur Brunton | – (Senior Lawyer - Planning Chief Executive's)                    |
| Jen Pepper    | – (Affordable Housing Programme Manager, Development and Renewal) |
| Zoe Folley    | – (Committee Officer, Democratic Services Chief Executive's)      |
|               | –   |

**COUNCILLOR CARLI HARPER-PENMAN (CHAIR) IN THE CHAIR**

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Judith Gardiner, Peter Golds, Mohammed Abdul Mukit MBE and Kosru Uddin.

Councillor Craig Aston was deputising on behalf of Councillor Peter Golds.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

| <b>Councillor</b>     | <b>Item(s)</b>          | <b>Type of interest</b> | <b>Reason</b>   |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Carli Harper – Penman | 6.1,<br>7.1,7.2,<br>8.1 | Personal                | Had received representations from interested parties. |
| Ann Jackson           | 6.1,<br>7.1,7.2,<br>8.1 | Personal                | Had received representations from interested parties. |
|                       | 7.1, 8.1                | Personal                | Ward Member for Bow West                              |
| Stephanie Eaton       | 7.1                     | Personal                | Had received representations from interested parties  |

### 3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 10<sup>th</sup> February 2011 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### 4. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee **RESOLVED** that:

- 1) 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
- 2) In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/informatives/planning obligations or reasons for 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

### 5. PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS

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

## **6. DEFERRED ITEMS**

### **6.1 Land Adjacent to Bridge Wharf, Old Ford Road, London**

#### **RESOLVED**

That the item be deferred to a future meeting due to lack of quorum for the item.

In accordance with Section 11.4 of the Development Committee Procedural Rules, the Committee resolved to defer this application due to lack of Members present from the previous meeting. (The required number being three).

## **7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION**

### **7.1 Central Foundation School, Harley Grove & 41-47 Bow Road, London**

Update Report Tabled.

Mr Pete Smith (Development Control Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the application regarding the Central Foundation School, Harley Grove & 41-47 Bow Road, London

The Chair invited statements from persons who had previously registered to address the Committee.

Ms Pat Smith stated that she was speaking on behalf of residents of Coborn Street. She relayed their concerns at the waste collection arrangements and the removal of the parking bays. She reported that at present waste was collected on site at 7am in the morning when nobody was there with the vehicles reversing in. This present system worked well and should be preserved.

Four parking bays would be lost. Would alternatives spaces be found? The area was very congested during term time already. It would be especially busy during construction time. Where would the constructions vehicles park?

She expressed concern at the plans to put refuse bins on the street and that it would obstruct the pavement. How would children get round this when visiting the school?

In summary the refuse collection should still be done out of school hours and the site should have more parking bays.

Ms Isobel Cattermole (Corporate Director, Children Schools and Families) spoke in support of the application. The school was a popular, voluntary aided non denominational school. The school provided a wide training agenda for both children and teachers.

She explained the profile of the school (including a balanced BME student base, the percentage of school meals provided). Whilst attainment was good, the site was less good and in need of renovation. So the funding from government was to renovate the site.

She briefly explain the key elements of the scheme, located over two sites, including the redevelopment of 41-47 Bow Road site to provide a sixth form block, the provision of a new building and refurbishment of existing buildings. The Trustees had purchased 41- 47 Bow Road to redevelop the sixth form block. The block and the college terrace would be managed by the Trustees once the project had been completed.

At present there was poor circulation, little connectivity with the wider community. The Applicant was sympathetic to the objections and the comments of English Heritage, addressing many of them by amending the scheme. In relation to the concerns around refuse collection and parking, Ann Canning, Service Head for Learning and Achievement, would be working with Officers to identify ways to mitigate the concerns.

Ms Ila Robertson (Applications Manager, Development and Renewal) presented the report. She described in detail the proposed works including:

- Provision of the new six form college (L-Block);
- Renovations to the grade II listed building (A Block);
- Demolition of a number of listed buildings including St Anthony's House;
- The erection of a new building in place of St Anthony's House (B&C Blocks) extending along Coburn Street;
- Works to existing buildings (D&T Blocks).

She addressed the main planning matters around the demolition of the listed buildings. The buildings were of little heritage value given the number of alterations.

Overall it was considered that the loss of the assets was considered appropriate given the considerable public benefits. Due to this, it was justifiable on policy grounds. The new buildings would improve the character of the area and would also facilitate better interaction between the school and the community.

The works to the listed buildings were conditioned as set out in the Officer report and the update report. The works to the blocks were modest. Any further changes to the listed buildings would require a further consent so this was a safeguard.

Officers circulated images of the proposal showing views from the street scene.

The site had an excellent Public Transport Accessibility rating. The travel survey indicated that most of the trips to the school would be on foot. In relation to the waste collection arrangements, Highways were dissatisfied with the reverse manoeuvres for collection, and were recommending the system be changed. Accordingly, parking bays would be removed to facilitate the new servicing systems. Officers clarified the location of these spaces. The Construction Management Plan was subject to agreement with Environmental Health and Highways Officers. The scheme would also have no adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Overall the scheme would provide much needed educational improvements for the Borough. The public benefits far outweighed any harm and therefore should be approved.

In response, Members raised the following issues:

- That the net loss of car parking spaces be confirmed.
- Expressed concerns about existing parking congestion in Coborn Street and requested that Officers look into the feasibility of changing the Pay and Display bays to residential bays.
- The historic value of the St Antony's Building.
- Whether the community benefits could still be secured without its removal?
- Sought assurances that the views of English Heritage in the update report were up to date.
- The choice of colours for the exterior. Reasons for the lack of uniformity.
- The merits of changing the refuse servicing arrangements.
- Members questioned why the existing on site system needed to be changed as it worked already. It was asked whether this could be reviewed to save the loss of parking spaces?

In response, Ms Robertson reported the following issues –

- There would be a net loss of four parking spaces. The equivalent of eight metres on each street. (Coborn Street and Harley Grove)
- Any requests to change the parking bays would need to be referred to Community Localities and Culture, who managed such services, and subject to public consultation. Officers were happy to report the Committee's views around redesignating the bays to the Parking Services Department.
- Consideration could be given to retaining the on site refuse system.
- The reasons why St Antony's House was not considered worthy of statutory listing due to the number of the alterations.
- It was considered that the loss of the building was appropriate given the improvements. There was no chance such facilities could be provided without its removal. It would also enable better engagement between the school and the community.

- The views of English Heritage regarding the building were set out in the report. The comments in the update report related to Block T.
- Reasons for the choice of colour, designed to complement the listed buildings and create a modern appearance.

Accordingly Councillor Ann Jackson proposed an amendment, seconded by Councillor Carli Harper Penman, "That a condition be added that details of refuse servicing for the school be submitted in writing to the Council with a view to ensuring refuse servicing takes place on site". On being put to the vote, the amendment was declared **carried**.

On a vote of 2 for and 0 against with 1 abstention the Committee **RESOLVED**

- (1) That planning permission, listed building consent and conservation area consent for the redevelopment of the school, including the following matters, be **GRANTED** subject to the conditions and informative set out in the report.

Redevelopment of the school including:

- Use of 41 – 47 Bow Road as a sixth form college.
- Demolition of a number of buildings, included locally listed St Antony's building.
- Erection of building up to four storeys in height adjacent to the grade 11 listed building on Bow Road.
- Remodelling and refurbishment of existing buildings being retained.
- Installation of two glazed lifts to D&T block.

- (2) That a further condition be added as follows:

That details of refuse servicing for the school be submitted in writing to the Council with a view to ensuring refuse servicing takes place on site.

It was noted that Councillor Eaton could not vote on this item as she had not been present at the beginning of the item.

## 7.2 Oakfield House, Gale Street, London

Update Report Tabled.

Mr Pete Smith (Development Control Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the application regarding Oakfield House, Gale Street, London

The Chair invited statements from persons who had previously registered to address the Committee.

Mr Charlie Rabicano said that he was representing a large group of residents in the area. They had submitted petition and a report. Whilst they supported affordable housing on the site, this scheme was inappropriate for the site and it did not comply with policy. The site area had been wrongly calculated to

include adjacent land. It was unfair to include this as amenity land. The scheme was too high therefore would affect the amenity of the surrounding properties. It would cause loss of light. The figures for sunlight were in access of the BRE requirements. The worst affected windows were the main bedroom windows. Our report showed that there would also be overshadowing in evening when the residents would be coming back from work.

He considered that the internal space between the buildings would create a high fence and a back street. The Council should uphold the Planning guidance and refuse the Application.

(Note: The second registered speaker failed to attend the meeting. Therefore the two supporters were allocated 1 ½ minutes each to address the Committee).

Ms Sunara Begum spoke in support of the Application. She stated that the scheme would provide housing for large families. She and her large family had lived in the Borough for nine years in a tiny overcrowded flat with no play area for her children. Many of her friends and family also lived in similar conditions. Therefore there was a real need for decent family homes in the Borough. Whilst noting the concerns about parking, she considered that many of the parking spaces in the area were underused. The scheme would also provide additional green space.

Mr David Black speaking in support of the application considered that the site area had been calculated in the correct way. The density of the buildings complied with requirements. Mr Black read from the sunlight assessment submitted by the applicant. He objected to the assertion made by the objector that some of the results had not 'passed' the BRE tests. The term was not used in the BRE guidance. He argued that proposals met BRE requirements. In relation to the internal space, this would provide communal open space. There would also be balconies providing private amenity space.

Ms Ila Robertson (Applications Manager, Development and Renewal) made a detailed presentation explaining the scheme. She explained the site and the outcome of the public consultation. The responses included: 4 individual responses (3 for 1 against), 1 supporting and 1 objecting petition.

She addressed each of the planning issues around land use, density, height, design and appearance, affordable housing, amenity and highways.

The scheme would provide much needed affordable housing given the housing shortages in the Borough. The density calculation complied with the government and the Council's guidance. It was also considered that the design and scale of the building was appropriate given the character of the area. In terms of amenity, Officers considered that the overall amenity impact would be acceptable with no significant concerns.

The daylight/sunlight report showed that most of the habitable rooms would receive adequate light. Although there would be some loss of light, this was not strong enough to warrant a refusal.

The parking survey showed that in the immediate surrounding area there was sufficient capacity to accommodate the displaced bays. Overall it would provide much needed affordable family sized housing on a brown field site in line with policy. Therefore it should be granted.

The Committee considered images of the proposals.

The Committee then asked questions around the following issues:

- Overlooking to the gardens from the balconies above.
- That the advice about parking permits be clarified.
- The measures to protect green spaces, given the Green Grid Strategy.

Ms Robertson addressed each of the Committee's points.

She advised that overlooking from the balconies above would be practically impossible. Therefore the privacy of the occupiers would be protected in line with policy.

The car free agreement only related to on street parking. The future residents could apply for alternative off street spaces if they wished. The recent parking survey found that there was an abundant number of parking spaces in the area enough to accommodate the displaced bays.

Ms Robertson also clarified the reasons why contributions to the Green Grid were not required.

On a unanimous vote the Committee **RESOLVED**

- (1) That planning permission for the demolition of existing 8 dwellings (4 x bedsit and 4 x one bed flats) and erection of a building up to 5 storeys in height to provide 18 new residential units (5 x 2 bed flats, 6 x 3 bed flats, 7 x 4 bed houses) proposal including the provision of associated parking and landscaped amenity space be **GRANTED** subject to
- (2) The prior completion of a **legal agreement** to secure the planning obligations listed in the report.
- (3) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be granted delegated power to negotiate the legal agreement indicated in (2) above.
- (4) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be granted delegated power to impose conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the matters listed in the report



- (5) That, if by 15<sup>th</sup> March 2010 the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is granted delegated power to refuse planning permission.

## 8. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

### 8.1 Phoenix School, 49 Bow Road, E3 4AD

Ms Ila Robertson (Applications Manager, Development and Renewal) presented the detailed report regarding proposed works to Phoenix School.

This demolition was required in order to redevelop this area of the site as part of the Government's Building Schools for the Future (BSF) initiative.

A total of 175 neighbouring properties were invited to comment on the application. No comments have been received.

On a unanimous vote the Committee **RESOLVED**

That the application for the removal of existing low boundary wall and railings to allow partial redevelopment of the site, comprising the erection of a new building fronting onto Bow Road be referred to the Government Office for London with the recommendation that the Council would be minded to grant Conservation Consent subject to conditions as set out in the report.

### 8.2 Planning Appeals

Mr Pete Smith (Development Control Manager, Development and Renewal) presented the report. The report provided details of appeals decisions and new appeals lodged against the Authority's Planning decisions.

In response, the Committee discussed the main findings.

Overall the Committee felt that the report was very useful thanked officers for preparing the report.

On a unanimous vote the Committee **RESOLVED**

That the details and outcomes of the appeals be noted.

The meeting ended at 8.50 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Carli Harper-Penman  
Development Committee