

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 11 DECEMBER 2013**

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

**Members Present:**

Councillor Helal Abbas (Chair)  
Councillor Anwar Khan (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Tim Archer  
Councillor Gulam Robbani (Executive Advisor to the Cabinet and Mayor on Adult Social Care)  
Councillor Harun Miah (Deputy Leader of the Respect Group)  
Councillor Rajib Ahmed (Substitute for Councillor Kosru Uddin)

**Other Councillors Present:**

Councillor Peter Golds (Leader of the Conservative Group)  
Councillor Gloria Thienel  
Councillor Rachael Saunders (Deputy Leader of the Labour Group)

**Apologies:**

Councillor Judith Gardiner and Councillor Kosru Uddin

**Officers Present:**

Jerry Bell – (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal)  
Fleur Brunton – (Senior Lawyer - Planning Chief Executive's)  
Kamlesh Harris – (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)  
Mary O'Shaughnessy – (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)  
Nasser Farooq – (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)  
Jane Jin – (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)  
Zoe Folley – (Committee Officer, Directorate of Law, Probity and Governance)

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

The order of business was varied at the meeting so that agenda item 6.3 Calders Wharf, Saunders Ness Road, London, E14 3EA (PA/12/02784 and PA/12/02785) was considered as the first planning application for decision. The remaining items of business followed the agenda order.

**1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made.

Councillors Helal Abbas declared an interest in agenda items 6.2, 6 Boulcott Street, London, E1 0HR (PA/13/00697) and 6.5 St Clement's Hospital Site , 2 Bow Road, London E3, (PA/13/1532, PA/13/1533 and PA/13/1534). This was on the basis that the Councillor had received correspondence from interested parties.

**2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)**

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2013 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**3. 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

**4. PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS AND MEETING GUIDANCE**

The Committee noted the procedure for hearing objections, together with details of persons who had registered to speak at the meeting.

**5. DEFERRED ITEMS**

Nil Items.

**6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION****6.1 213-217 Bow Road, London, E3 2SJ (PA/13/00862 and PA/13/00863)**

Update Report tabled.

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) introduced the item regarding planning permission and conservation area consent at 213-217 Bow Road, London for the demolition of existing warehouse building and erection of three blocks of three, four and six storeys to provide 36 dwellings together with ancillary parking and landscaping.

Kamlesh Harris (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report and the update. Ms Harris explained the location and surrounding area that was of mixed character within the Fairfield Road Conservation Area. Ms Harris also explained the outcome of the local consultation and the issues raised. She explained the justification for the loss of the existing warehouse building due to, amongst other issues, the lack of demand and changing nature of the area. The building was of low architectural quality so the proposed demolition would not cause any harm to the Conservation Area. The change of use to housing was also supported in policy. Therefore, on land use terms, the scheme was acceptable.

Members were also advised of the key features of the scheme including the design, the materials, the layout, the housing plans including 37% affordable housing (that exceeded the minimum target in policy) and a large number of family sized units. The Committee were also advised of the amenity space, the transport issues, the parking and cycle plans, the service and refuse facilities and the measures to enable fire access. It was considered that the impact on residential amenity was acceptable due to the mitigation measures. The s106 agreement had been subject to independent testing. This showed that the scheme delivered the maximum amount that could be supported in view of the affordable housing offer based on viability.

In summary, the application complied with policy and Officers were recommending that it be granted permission. In response to Members, Officers referred to the planning consent for the neighbouring site at 207-211 Bow Road. It was noted this application sought to replicate and complement the features of that scheme to prevent any undue impact on that site.

On a unanimous vote, the Committee **RESOLVED**:

1. That planning permission and conservation area consent (PA/13/00862 and PA/13/00863) at 213-217 Bow Road, London, E3 2SJ be **GRANTED** for the demolition of existing warehouse building and erection of three blocks of three, four and six storeys to provide 36 dwellings together with ancillary parking and landscaping SUBJECT to:
2. The prior completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) within three months of the date of this resolution, to secure the planning obligations set out in the committee report.
3. That the Corporate Director, Development & Renewal and Head of Legal Services is delegated authority to negotiate and approve the legal agreement indicated above.

4. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and conservation area consent and impose conditions plus informative to secure the matters set out in the committee report.
5. That, if within 3 months of the date of this committee the legal agreement referred to in paragraph 3.2 of the committee report has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to refuse planning permission

## **6.2 6 Boulcott Street, London, E1 0HR (PA/13/00697)**

Update Report tabled.

Councillors Anwar Khan and Rajib Ahmed left the meeting at 8pm (after the consideration of items 6.1 and 6.3).

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) introduced the item regarding planning permission at 6 Boulcott Street, London for the demolition of existing building and redevelopment to provide an 8 storey building with a social club on the ground and 1st floor with residential above, comprising 25 units.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Christopher Hicks spoke in objection acting on behalf of 1-9 Ratcliffe Cross Street. Whilst he was supportive of the development of the site, he considered that the plans would unduly effect the redevelopment of the adjacent Ratcliffe Cross site given the scale of the proposal and the site constraints. The development would be built right next to the boundary. The windows would take light from their site. As a result, it would prevent a large part of the site from being developed.

He also expressed concern at the impact on 3 and 5 Boulcott Street in terms of loss of light. The proposal would also create a 'cannoning effect' on Boulcott Street leading to poor outlooks and a sense of enclosure for residents.

Alongside this, there were major issues within the development itself with regard to excessive density, lack of affordable housing, poor outlooks for the future occupants and major sunlight failures within some of the proposed units.

He advised that there had been pre-application discussions with the Council in respect of the redevelopment of 1-9 Radcliffe Cross Street but that the development proposals had been stalled because of the current application. He considered that a joint scheme with the adjacent applicant should be considered that would better address these issues.

Colin Fowler spoke in objection. He expressed concern at the loss of light at 3

and 5 Boulcott Street and loss of privacy to the surrounding residents from the roof garden. The density range was twice the recommended and the proposal would also have an unacceptable impact on highway safety given that it would increase congestion on a very narrow one way street. There were also issues with noise and vibration and, according to the experts, some of the units may be unliveable.

Tony Collins spoke in support acting on behalf of the applicant and the Dockers Club. The applicant had fully taken into account the plans for the adjoining Ratcliffe Cross site and this had informed the plans. There would be no undue impact on such plans. He listed the benefits of the scheme.

Brian Nicholson spoke in support. He highlighted the history of the Dockers Club that had been based in its current location for many years and had always been open to the whole community. The building was in need of replacement. The plans would therefore provide a new purpose built community facility with contributions for health services and the street scene. The plans should be supported as the Dockers Club was an important social asset.

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) presented the detailed report and update describing the location, the outcome of the consultation and the challenges with developing Boulcott Street generally due to the confined nature of the area. Mr Bell also explained the layout and the key features of the proposal.

Mr Bell addressed the concerns about the impact on 3 and 5 Boulcott Street and the adjoining site (especially addressing the daylight and sunlight impacts). Such impacts were due to the site constraints and were almost inevitable with any development that increased the height of the existing building. The Committee also noted the s106 offer including an offer towards off site affordable housing that could not be provided on site because it was difficult for the provider to manage additional units on a mixed tenure floor.

On balance, given the benefits of the scheme (including the new community facilities and affordable housing), Officers considered that the scheme was acceptable and were recommending the proposal for approval.

In response to Members, Officers further explained the amenity impact to 3 and 5 Boulcott Street. It was explained that any redevelopment of the site was likely to have a similar impact unless at a very low level. It was also acknowledged that some of the proposed units within the development itself would experience similar amenity impacts from the adjacent wall and buildings.

It was noted that the plans would maximise the development potential of the site. Given this and the merits of the scheme, Officers considered that the density range was acceptable.

On a vote of 3 in favour and 1 against, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission (PA/13/00697) at 6 Boulcott Street, London, E1 0HR be **GRANTED** for the demolition of existing building and redevelopment to provide an 8 storey building with a social club (Use Class D2) on the ground and 1st floor with residential (Use Class C3) above, comprising 25 units (9 x 1 bed, 13 x 2 bed and 3 x 3 bed) SUBJECT to:
2. The prior completion of a legal agreement, to the satisfaction of the Head of Legal Services (Environment) to secure the planning obligations set out in the committee report.
3. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to impose conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the matters set out in the committee report
4. That, if within 3-months of the date of this committee the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to refuse planning permission.

### **6.3 Calders Wharf, Saunders Ness Road, London, E14 3EA (PA/12/02784 and PA/12/02785)**

Update Report tabled

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) introduced the item regarding planning permission and conservation area consent at Calders Wharf, Saunders Ness Road, London for the redevelopment of Calders Wharf Community Centre to provide a new Community Centre and children's play group facility and 25 new residential units with associated disabled parking and cycle parking, landscaped public open space, private amenity space and other associated works.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Geeta Kasanga spoke in objection. She objected to the impact on the nearby Island Gardens Conservation Area given the height of the proposal. The development would be very high and would harm and encroach on the Island Garden community space. She also questioned the legality of the development, in particularly the right of the developer to build on the land given the landownership disputes. She outlined the various issues relating to this dispute.

Councillor Peter Golds spoke in objection. Councillor Golds commented that he was speaking as the ward Councillor and on behalf of many residents. He objected to the impact of the development, particularly the height, on the neighbouring World Heritage Site buffer zone. The height of the development would be much higher than that of the surrounding buildings. The proposal was contrary to the regional policy that sought to prevent such damage. He also expressed concern about the plans to build over the Docklands Light Railway (DLR) structures and the ability of the proposal to safely support such

works. This would be very dangerous given the risk that the proposed structure could collapse. He questioned whether the plans justified such risks and damage to the setting of the heritage assets especially as there were so few social housing units.

Councillor Gloria Thienel spoke in opposition as a ward Councillor. She commented on the strength of the public opposition to the scheme with 136 letters in objection, a petition against with 490 signatures and an on line petition with 670 objections. Whilst the site was owned partly by the Council and the DLR, it appeared that the proposals would mainly assist the developer in making a profit.

The plans would damage the setting of the heritage assets due the height, the poor design and by removing the boundary wall. A wide range of external bodies including the Friends of Island Gardens had objected to the scheme due to such issues. No noise study had been undertaken.

Councillor Thienel referred to the issues in the surrounding area following the removal of the public toilets in Manchester Road. These problems would spill over to the site when developed. Councillor Thienel also referred to the landownership disputes that were currently being investigated. The proposal should be rejected to preserve this 'jewel in the crown'.

Heather Peters spoke in support as a local resident with children at the existing nursery. She considered that there was a shortage of nursery and education places on the Isle of Dogs so this proposal was welcomed. Whilst the services currently offered by the nursery were invaluable for local parents, the current facility was not fit for purpose. The Council's Children Services department supported the scheme. She also welcomed the new Community Centre as a customer of the existing facility. The plans would provide much needed facilities (such as classes) given the pressures on such facilities in the area.

Steve Inkpen spoke in support of the application. The proposal followed an extensive consultation period with the public. In response to the feedback, the scheme had been amended with a reduction in density, height and scale of the building. The proposal would provide new housing with 19% affordable units and increase the size of the park for public enjoyment. The plans would generate funding to cross subsidise the enhanced community facilities and the play space. In reply to Members, Mr InkPen clarified that the applicant, East End Homes, owned the site. (The DLR owned the subsoil). Any works affecting the DLR would be dealt with through a strict process of approval. The DLR were satisfied with the proposal subject to the conditions.

Mary O'Shaughnessy (Planning Officer) presented the report and update explaining the location and surrounds including the heritage assets. She explained the outcome of the public consultation including an on line petition that at noon of the day of the Committee, had generated 665 signatures in opposition.

The Committee were advised of the amendments to the previous scheme

(including the revised materials, the increased separation distances and the angling of the proposal away from the listed foot tunnel entrance) to ensure the scheme complemented and preserved the surrounding heritage assets. The Committee also noted the affordable housing and the s106 offer, subject to independent viability testing. This showed that the maximum amount of each had been secured in view of viability. The s106 offer included contributions for offsite affordable housing. The proposal would preserve residential amenity.

Officers considered that the case was finely balanced. However, in view of the merits of the scheme, were recommending the scheme for approval.

In response to Members, Officers provided further information on the landownership issues by reference to a plan that showed the interests in the site (clarifying that a small part of the site was registered as being owned by the Council). Officers and the DLR were satisfied with the safety of the scheme given the proximity of the scheme to DLR infrastructure.

Officers also confirmed the main changes since the previous scheme to protect the surrounding area including views from the south of the river. Officers were satisfied with the new plans and considered that the amendments successfully overcame the concerns. It was considered that the level of amenity space on site was acceptable given the proximity of the site to public open space and the contributions towards improving existing open space. The additional park space would be open to the public.

#### Planning Permission.

On a vote of 5 in favour and 1 against, the Committee **RESOLVED**:

1. That planning permission (PA/12/02784) at Calders Wharf, Saunders Ness Road, London, E14 3EA be **GRANTED** for the redevelopment of Calders Wharf community centre comprising the demolition of the existing building (387sq.m GIA) (Use Class D1) and adjacent boundary wall, railings and planters, the construction of a four storey building to provide a new Community Centre and children's play group facility (494 sqm GIA) (Use Class D1) and 25 new residential units (9x1 bedroom; 11x2 bedroom; 5x3 bedroom) with associated disabled parking and cycle parking, landscaped public open space, private amenity space and other associated works SUBJECT to:
2. The prior completion of a legal agreement to the satisfaction of the Head of Legal Services (Environment) to secure the planning obligations set out in the committee report and the update report.
3. That the Head of Legal Services (Environment) is delegated power to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above.
4. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated authority to recommend the conditions and informatives in relation to the matters set out in the committee report and the update report.



Conservation area consent.

On a vote of 5 in favour and 1 against, the Committee **RESOLVED**:

5. That conservation area consent (PA/12/02785) at Calders Wharf, Saunders Ness Road, London, E14 3EA be **GRANTED** for the demolition of an existing modern constructed, single storey community building (387 sq.m. GIA, Use Class D1) (the Calders Wharf Community Centre), a 2.4 metre high brick boundary wall, railings and planters and tree removal.
6. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated authority to recommend the conditions and informatives in relation to the matters set out in the committee report.
7. That if within 3 months of the date of this committee the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development and Renewal is delegated power to refuse planning permission.

#### **6.4 Cutty Sark House, Undine Road, London, E14 9UW (PA/13/01306)**

Update Report tabled

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) introduced the item regarding planning permission at Cutty Sark House, Undine Road, London for the demolition and redevelopment of Cutty Sark House to provide 36 dwellings in two buildings of four and five storeys, together with landscaping, four disabled parking bays and associated works.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Detlev Munster spoke in objection as a resident of the adjacent development, the Clippers Quay Residential Estate (CQMC). He expressed concern at a number of oversights, leaving Council open to challenge. Firstly, he objected to the lack of a recent bat survey of the site as required by law. It was required that such a survey be carried out before consent could be given. He also objected to the lack of consideration given to the nearby gas unit. The health and safety implications of this should be made clear before the application was considered. He also expressed concern about the impact on CQMC land from the servicing on Undine Road.

He also objected to the loss of privacy to the surrounding properties due to overlooking, the loss of open space and the shortfall in affordable housing.

Jack Benson spoke in objection as a resident of the CQMC. He considered that the plans would impinge on the openness and spoil the unique character of the area. He also expressed concern about the noise impact on future occupants from the DLR and the proximity of the development to the street.

He also objected to the lack of family units, the impact on parking from the car free agreement and the servicing and delivery plans. This would lead to trespass on CQMC land. He also objected to the limited separation distances; the lack of play space; the disregard to the loss of habitat and the poor relationship with the setting of the surrounding area. As a result, the proposal would lead to overdevelopment and turn the area into an 'urban jungle'. He referred to a Parliamentary Undertaking, made in the early 1990s that, in his view, designated the site as an open space zone in compensation for the building of the Mudchute DLR station. The plans conflicted with this.

Councillor Peter Golds spoke in objection. He also emphasised the arguments around the impact of bats, the Parliamentary Undertaking and the impact on parking given the ability of future occupants to transfer existing permits. He also objected to the height of the proposal. The plans would tower over the Chapel House Conservation Area. Therefore, would harm the setting of the Conservation Area.

Roger Arkell spoke in support. The proposal would deliver new homes with a policy compliant level of affordable housing. There was an existing planning consent for the site and this proposal was very similar to this. He noted the concerns around servicing from Undine Road. However, it was considered that the servicing routes were acceptable. The applicant had the right to use the road for such purposes.

Mark Connell spoke in support. He considered that there was no evidence of bats on the site as shown by the ecological survey of the site undertaken in 2011. The issues around the Parliamentary Undertaking had been fully taken into account when the previous application was decided. The advice from all parties (the solicitors to the Counsel and the DLR) was that all obligations regarding this matter had been fulfilled. Therefore, it was not a material planning consideration. He also commented on the amenity space and the density range that complied with policy.

Nasser Farooq (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report and update explaining the location and the proximity to the nearby Chapel House Conservation Area and the DLR station. He explained the 2011 planning consent for the site. Due to a reduction in the grant support, the scheme could no longer be delivered.

He explained the similarities with the consented scheme. The main change was the increase in dwellings, achieved by changing the layout of the scheme. He also explained the affordable housing and s106 offer. The scheme had been subject to independent testing that showed that the optimum amount of each had been secured taking into account viability.

Officers had considered the comments of Environmental Health regarding the noise impact to the balconies nearest the DLR. However, Officers considered that the noise impact was no different from many other similar developments and the consented 2011 scheme. Overall given the merits of the scheme, Officers were recommending that the application be granted.

In response to questions, Officers confirmed the views of the LBTH Biodiversity Officer regarding the bat survey. According to the Officer, there was no evidence of bat roosting on site. However should demolition occur after April 2014, it was recommended that precautionary testing be carried out. The issue around the Parliamentary Undertaking had been fully considered at the time of the previous application and it was considered that all obligations had been fulfilled as explained above by the speaker in support.

On a vote of 3 in favour and 1 against, the Committee **RESOLVED**:

1. That planning permission (PA/13/01306) at Cutty Sark House, Undine Road, London, E14 9UW be **GRANTED** for the demolition and redevelopment of Cutty Sark House to provide 36 dwellings in two buildings of four and five storeys, together with landscaping, four disabled parking bays and associated works SUBJECT to:
2. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the committee report.
3. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated authority to recommend the conditions and informatives in relation to the matters set out in the committee report.

#### **6.5 St Clement's Hospital Site , 2 Bow Road, London E3, (PA/13/1532, PA/13/1533 and PA/13/1534)**

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) introduced the item regarding planning permission, conservation area consent and listed building consent at St Clement's Hospital Site 2 Bow Road, London to facilitate the redevelopment of the Grade II listed former St Clement's hospital site comprising the part demolition, part refurbishment and change of use of the existing hospital buildings to accommodate 252 residential units, commercial floorspace, parking spaces, cycle parking, refuse storage, plant equipment, private and communal amenity space and associated works.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Dennis Twomey spoke in objection to the application as a resident of a nearby property. Whilst supportive of the redevelopment of the site, his main concern was the impact on light to his property. He considered that the failings in the report (up to 20% to Brokesley Street properties) were significant and would affect the occupants quality of life. He acknowledged that there was an acute need for housing in the area. However, he considered that a different layout and design could solve the issues and should be explored. Therefore, he requested that the Committee reject this application and a better scheme be brought forward.

Katherine Tyrell spoke in objection to the scheme on behalf of the Mile End Residents Association and residents of Brokesley Street. Whilst supportive of the redevelopment of the site, she objected to the impact on Brokesley Street

in terms of loss of light. She also expressed concern at the impact on 644 Mile End Road. It appeared that no real consideration had been given to this. A further concern was the impact from night time deliveries, especially on the children sleeping in the nearby houses. This could go on for many years. She requested that all deliveries and construction work take place in normal hours. She also requested clarification around the s106 contribution for education (in terms of how and where it would be spent) in view of the additional pressure on education services.

Adrian Bohr spoke in favour of the proposal. He highlighted the merits of the proposal and the extent of the community consultation where most of the respondents had been broadly supportive of the scheme. In response to the feedback, the developers had amended the scheme to include the community floor space. The impact on 644 Mile End Road had been considered and there would be no undue impact. There would be minimal out of hours deliveries and servicing. Brokesley Street would not be used for this purpose. However, the applicant was willing to review the Construction Management Plan to ensure that such activities mostly took place on site. The community floor space would be in place in perpetuity.

Councillor Rachael Saunders spoke in support of the scheme as the local ward Councillor. She reported that, whilst she did initially lodge objections, having now heard about the scheme during the consultation, she now welcomed the proposals especially the plans for the community centre at the John Denham Building. At which the community were to be given two years to achieve a community use. On this basis, they were hopeful that they would be able to come back for planning permission in the near future to request a change of use.

She noted the benefits brought to the area by recent high quality festivals and cultural events and noted that the community use could also host such activities. The plans could help transform the area into an important cultural and community space.

Jane Jin (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report explaining the site location, surrounds and outcome of the local consultation.

The Committee were advised of the plans for the building including the housing mix, the community floor space and the café/restaurant. Members were also advised of the works under the listed building consent to retain and refurbish the listing buildings with minimal external interventions. English Heritage and the Council's Design and Conservation Officer had considered the proposals and had not raised any concerns subject to the conditions. It was considered that plans were in keeping with the surrounding area. It was also noted that the affordable housing offer was policy compliant and that the level of amenity space was acceptable including on site provision for children of all age ranges.

The sunlight and daylight impact had been assessed and it was noted that any development on the site would introduce some issues for the neighbours given that parts of the site were currently without buildings. However, on

balance, the impact on sunlight/daylight was considered acceptable in view of the merits of the scheme and as the impact was generally minor in nature. There was also a full s106 including education contributions and five apprenticeship places.

On a unanimous vote, the Committee **RESOLVED**

1. That planning permission (PA/13/01532), Conservation Area Consent (PA/13/001534) and Listed Building Consent (PA/13/01533) at St Clement's Hospital Site , 2 Bow Road, London E3, be **GRANTED** for:

PA/13/01532: Full planning permission for the redevelopment of the Grade II listed former St Clement's hospital site comprising the part demolition (and infill of associated basements), part refurbishment and change of use of the existing hospital buildings and the construction of eight new buildings between two and nine storeys high to accommodate 252 residential units, 306 sqm (GIA) community floorspace (D1 Use Class), 174 sq m (GIA) commercial floorspace (B1/A2 Use Class), 69sqm (GIA) café/restaurant (A3/A4 Use Class,) 32 parking spaces, cycle parking, refuse storage, plant equipment, private and communal amenity space and associated works.

PA/13/001534: Conservation area consent for the demolition of unlisted buildings (post-dating 1948) and removal of and works to trees in association with the redevelopment of Grade II listed St Clement's site.

PA/13/01533: Listed building consent for the demolition of the Timber Building, Catering Department, Nurses Home and Old Boiler House; the limited partial demolition of the Laundry building, the Bungalow, Administration Block, North Block, South Block, Generator and boundary walls; and the repair and conversion of the retained listed buildings in association with the planning application for the redevelopment of the St Clement's hospital site.

SUBJECT to

2. Any direction by The London Mayor
3. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the committee report.
4. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above acting within normal delegated authority
5. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to impose conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the matters set out in the committee report.

6. That, if within 3 months of the date of this committee the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to refuse planning permission

## 7. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

### 7.1 PLANNING APPEALS REPORT

On a unanimous vote the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That the details and outcomes as set out in the report be noted.

The meeting ended at 9.40 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Helal Abbas  
Development Committee