

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

21st November 2013

UPDATE REPORT OF HEAD OF PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL

INDEX

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal
6.1	PA/13/02108	Suttons Wharf North, Palmers Road, London	Application under s.73 of the Town and Country Planning Act for a variation of Condition 22 of the Planning Permission PA/11/3348 dated 30/03/12 to seek minor material amendments to the *approved Suttons Wharf North development comprising the conversion of ground, first and second floor levels to create ten additional residential units and associated minor alternations to Block B.
6.2	PA/13/01638 & PA/13/01644	Land bounded by 2-10 Bethnal Green Road, 1-5 Chance Street (Huntingdon Industrial Estate) and 30-32 Redchurch Street	Demolition and redevelopment to provide a mixed use development comprising two basement floors and between 2 - 14 storeys. The proposal provides 78 residential units (Use Class C3), 456 sqm Class A1, 359 sqm Class A1/B1/D2 and 1,131 sqm A1/A3/A4/D2 at basement and ground floor; parking, plant and ancillary accommodation; a central courtyard and accessible amenity roof terraces.
6.3	PA/13/01637	Land at Fleet Street Hill, London, E2	Redevelopment of the site to provide 34 residential dwellings of mixed tenure (7x 1 bed, 12 x 2 bed, 8 x 3 bed, 6 x 4 bed and 1 x 5 bed) in buildings of part one, two, three, four and eight storeys.

Agenda Item number:	6.1
Reference number:	PA/13/02108
Location:	Suttons Wharf North, Palmers Road, London
Proposal:	Application under s.73 of the Town and Country Planning Act for a variation of Condition 22 of the Planning Permission PA/11/3348 dated 30/03/12 to seek minor material amendments to the *approved Suttons Wharf North development comprising the conversion of ground, first and second floor levels to create ten additional residential units and associated minor alternations to Block B.

1.0 ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

- 1.1 Since the publication of the committee report, three additional representations were received from Suttons Wharf Residents Group, a resident and Councillor Whitelock Gibbs, a ward Councillor for Mile End and Globe Town.
- 1.2 The representation received from the Residents Group and the resident raises the same objections as already addressed in the main report.
- 1.3 In relation to the Ward Councillor's representation, she raises the following objections:
- a) Loss of planned A1 and B1 uses within a predominately residential area
[Officer Comment: This has been addressed in the Land Use Section of the report, paragraphs 9.2-9.7]
 - b) Disagree with officer's report in paragraph 2.3 which refers to the A1 and B1 uses in an isolated location. The area is densely populated residential area, adjacent to main roads, and tub stations.
[Officer Comment: The isolated location is referred to in the context of consented A1 and B1 uses in isolation from other commercial units.]
 - c) The proposal contradict SP12 and SP02 of the Core Strategy where it refers to ensuring places have access to a mixed use town centre that offers a variety of shops and services; and distribution and density of housing to the hierarchy and proximity of nearby town centres, respectively.
[Officer Comment: The proposal complies with the mentioned policies as the site, and its density correspond with its location being very close to Roman Road East and West District Centres.]
 - d) Disagrees with Paragraphs 2.5 and 2.6 of the officer's report which refers to the sufficient provision of external space and servicing not being affected as there are issues with fly tipping and there is a lack of any communal space such as a square or play facilities for residents to use.
[Officer Comment: The consented scheme as a whole does have sufficient external amenity space. It should be noted that the site as a whole is still under construction and therefore the delivery of all amenities associated with the wider development is forthcoming. The full potential of the development cannot yet be appreciated due to the construction works currently on site.]

- e) As the residential use will be private, it will do little if any to alleviate the pressure on the housing list.

[Officer Comment: As stated in the main report, the existing blocks on site are the affordable housing delivered for the consented scheme. A total of 136 units ranging in unit size, were delivered as target rented units (additional 70 delivered as Intermediate provision) and now occupied, which is managed by One Housing Group RSL. In terms of percentage, this equates to 48.6% of affordable housing provision on site with the proposal, or 49.6% as consented.]

2.0 CORRECTION

- 2.1 In paragraph 5.8 it refers to 3 additional units in private tenure, and it should have stated 3 additional units in the intermediate tenure.
- 2.2 In paragraph 5.5, Block G should be 12 units, and not 14.
- 2.3 In paragraph 5.8 Block A should be 154 and not 151.
- 2.4 In paragraph 9.17 it should read:

The site originally was consented with 419 residential units separated in 7 residential blocks, with a total of 200 units for affordable housing, equating 52% in habitable room numbers. 'therefore the current consented scheme on site is 424 residential with 206 affordable housing units (49% habitable room).

- 2.5 These errors are typographical errors and therefore do not change the conclusion of the report nor the % of the affordable housing as reported.

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 Officers' recommendation remains as outlined in the main report.

Agenda Item number:	6.2
Reference number:	PA/13/01638 and PA/13/01644
Location:	Land bounded by 2-10 Bethnal Green Road, 1-5 Chance Street (Huntingdon Industrial Estate) and 30-32 Redchurch Street
Proposal:	Demolition and redevelopment to provide a mixed use development comprising two basement floors and between 2 - 14 storeys. The proposal provides 78 residential units (Use Class C3), 456 sqm Class A1, 359 sqm Class A1/B1/D2 and 1,131 sqm A1/A3/A4/D2 at basement and ground floor; parking, plant and ancillary accommodation; a central courtyard and accessible amenity roof terraces.

1.0 CLARIFICATIONS AND CORRECTIONS

1.1 Paragraphs 8.335 and 8.336 of the report consider the s106 in the event the scheme is for outline planning permission, this is an error the scheme is not an outline planning application and as such, these paragraphs do not apply.

1.2 Paragraph 8.168 states

*Overall, officers are satisfied that a wide range of measures have been adopted to ensure that despite the high proportion of **rented** accommodation the proposed development will result in a mixed and balanced community.*

It should read:

1.3 *Overall, officers are satisfied that a wide range of measures have been adopted to ensure that despite the high proportion of **market** accommodation the proposed development will result in a mixed and balanced community.*

2.0 ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS RECIEVED

2.1 Since the publication of the committee report additional representations have been received.

- 123 pro-forma letters in objection to the scheme, of which 12 contained no address
- 6 letters in objection to the scheme.
- 1 letter in opposition have been received from Cllr Jackson
- 12 letters of support have also been raised

2.2 The majority of issues raised in the letters have been addressed within the committee report. The following additional comments have been received.

Daylight/Sunlight

2.3 A letter has been received by Anstey Horne, Chartered Surveyors on behalf of local residents. The letter reports on the findings of the Daylight and Sunlight review carried out as part of the Environmental Statement, however disagrees with the summary of the findings for both Daylight and Sunlight.

[Officer Comment: Officers have considered the daylight and sunlight impacts for the application and the findings are discussed within sections 8.234 and 8.263 of the main report to committee. The assessment made by officers is based on an independent review of the daylight/ sunlight study and has not changed following the publication of the committee report and the letter received by Anstey Horne]

Viability

- 2.4 Several objection letters consider Fleet Street Hill as proposed is not fully maximised and that should it be maximised the development at Huntingdon would be able to be reduced in height, without impacting on the viability of the scheme, and would result in a more mixed and balanced community. A spread sheet has been submitted which suggests an appropriate balance would be for Fleet Street Hill to provide 42 dwellings (instead of 34 units) and Huntingdon Industrial Estate to provide 66 dwellings (instead of 79 units).

[Officer Comment: Given no planning application has been submitted or assessed, officers are unable to attribute much weight to this suggestion. However, it is noted, that a previous application on Fleet Street Hill (PA/11/00459) proposed 43 units, which is one more than what is suggested within the spreadsheet and this was not considered acceptable. In addition, based on the current plans for Fleet Street Hill additional units, could be at the expense of the delivery of family sized units]

Whitby Street

- 2.5 Objections have been received regarding the closure of Whitby Street in the 1980's to facilitate a development that was not implemented. On this basis, objectors consider that the Council should seek to re-instate Whitby Street and that the developer should not benefit from this.
- 2.6 The partial loss of Whitby Street has been fully considered by officers in the assessment of the planning application, and it's loss to facilitate the development has been considered acceptable. The objections received on this ground do not change this position.

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 Officers' recommendation remains as outlined in the main report.

Agenda Item number:	6.3
Reference number:	PA/13/01637
Location:	Land at Fleet Street Hill
Proposal:	Redevelopment of the site to provide 34 residential dwellings of mixed tenure (7x 1 bed, 12 x 2 bed, 8 x 3 bed, 6 x 4 bed and 1 x 5 bed) in buildings of part one, two, three, four and eight storeys.

1.0 CLARIFICATIONS AND CORRECTIONS

1.1 Paragraphs 3.3 and 8.336 of the report incorrectly state the s106 allocations. Whilst the total contribution is correct £863,660.77 this amount is to be allocated in the following heads of terms:

- a) A contribution of between £14,756.30 towards employment, skills, training and enterprise.
- b) A contribution of between **£56,569.95** towards Community Facilities.
- c) A contribution of between **£1,530** towards Sustainable Transport.
- d) A contribution of **£335,519.72** towards Education.
- e) A contribution of **£129,977.28** towards Public Realm.
- f) A contribution of **£58,373.00** towards Health
- g) A contribution of **£250,000.00** towards Network Rail bridge and public realm improvements
- h) 2% Monitoring fee **£16,934.52**

Total: **£863,660.77**

1.2 The proposed s106 contribution is fully SPD compliant and the Network Rail and public realm contribution of £250,000.00 is in excess of the SPD requirements.

1.3 Paragraph 4.1 refers to 7x4bed, however should read be 6x4bed and 1x5bed

1.4 The table within paragraph 8.81 states the 3 bed are at POD Level, it should state they are target rent levels

1.5 Paragraph 8.193 refers to the 4 wheelchair units, however, should read 3 (which match the 3 wheelchair parking spaces)

1.4 As advised in paragraph 8.208 of the Committee Report, public rights of way in the vicinity of the application site were previously removed to facilitate works associated with the London Overground works. Rights of access between the application site and the part of Pedley Street which is adopted highway do not presently exist. Whilst proactive engagement between the applicant, Highways, Network Rail and Transport for London is on-going and is likely to satisfactorily resolve the outstanding issues, it is considered prudent to impose the following condition to deal with the current situation.

No development shall take place until such time as a scheme to confirm access rights to and from the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall not be carried

out unless in accordance with the access rights specified in the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the occupiers of the site have access rights to and from the site, linked to the local highway network.

2.0 ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS RECIEVED

2.1 Since the publication of the committee report additional representations have been received.

- 12 letters of support have also been raised

2.2 The issues raised in the letters have been addressed within the committee report.

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

3.1 Officers' recommendation remains as outlined in the main report.

