

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 25 SEPTEMBER 2014

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

Members Present:

Councillor Sirajul Islam (Chair)
Councillor Danny Hassell
Councillor Amina Ali
Councillor John Pierce
Councillor Helal Uddin
Councillor Suluk Ahmed
Councillor Julia Dockerill
Councillor Harun Miah (Substitute for
Councillor Md. Maium Miah)
Councillor Gulam Kibria Choudhury
(Substitute for Councillor Muhammad
Ansar Mustaquim)

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Chris Chapman
Councillor Andrew Wood

Apologies:

Councillor Md. Maium Miah and Councillor Muhammad Ansar Mustaquim

Officers Present:

Paul Buckenham	(Development Control Manager, Development and Renewal)
Jerry Bell	(Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Fleur Francis	(Acting Team Leader - Planning, Directorate, Law Probity and Governance)
Jane Jin	(Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Iyabo Johnson	(Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Robert Lancaster	(Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Amy Thompson	(Pre-Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal)

Zoe Folley

(Committee Officer, Directorate Law,
Probity and Governance)

The order of business was changed at the meeting as follows. However, for ease of reference, the order of these minutes follow the agenda order.

6.3, Peterley Business Centre, 472 Hackney Road London (PA/13/02722)

6.4, 7 Limeharbour, E14 9NQ (PA/14/00293)

6.1, Quay House, 2 Admirals Way, London E14 (PA/14/00990)

6.2, 1 Park Place, Canary Wharf, London PA/13/02344 (Outline Planning Application) and PA/13/02366 (Listed Building Consent)

1. **DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made.

Councillor Sirajul Islam declared an interest in agenda item 6.1, Quay House, 2 Admirals Way, London E14 (PA/14/00990). This was because the Councillor had attended a consultation meeting for the application.

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

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14th August 2014 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

None.

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

6.1 Quay House, 2 Admirals Way, London E14 (PA/14/00990)

Update Report tabled.

Paul Buckenham (Development Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the application and the update and the Chair then invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

John Halnam, Philip Binns (Greenwich Conservation Group) and Councillor Andrew Wood spoke in objection to the scheme. The objectors made the following the points:

- Highlighted the importance of the site as a gateway site to surroundings area. The Council now had a unique opportunity to look at the whole of the Admirals Way site and improve the townscape. But this scheme would not achieve this.
- The impact of the proposal on the setting of the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site. Should the proposal be resubmitted, additional material should be submitted to supplement the applicant's Heritage and Townscape Visual Assessment Analysis.
- Height of the building in relation to the size of the site. If built, it would be the tallest residential building in the country, but on a very small piece of land.
- Overdevelopment of the area in view of the number of recently approved schemes and applications pending nearby. The cumulative impact of these developments needed to be properly explored.
- The density in excess of the Greater London Authority (GLA) guidance.
- The lack of child play space and nearby play space.
- The lack of car parking spaces.

In response to questions, the speakers commented on the expected increase in population from the many new and proposed developments in the area, including developments at Marsh Wall and South Quay. The impact of this

was a concern. They also commented on the need to maintain views of the General Wolfe Statue and that insufficient consideration had been given to this.

Julian Carter and George Kyriacou spoke in support of the scheme. They pointed to the benefits of the scheme as summarised below:

- The redevelopment of a vacant site. The existing building was no longer fit for purpose.
- The level and quality of the housing, including affordable family housing with separate kitchens.
- That English Heritage and the Greater London Authority had raised no objections.
- The quality of the commercial units which would create new jobs and animate the area.
- The quality of the amenity and child play space, the merits of the public realm improvements.
- The Section 106 Agreement and the generation of 'new homes bonus' money for the Borough.
- The developer's experience in delivering high profile developments.
- The positive impact on the Dockside and quality of the southern elevation.
- That the plans would facilitate the comprehensive redevelopment of the area.

In response to questions about the play space, the speakers considered that the plans catered for each age group, including a range of different types of space. Details of the s106 were in the committee report, pursued as per the normal process. The cumulative impact of other developments and plans in the area had been assessed and overall, the impact of this development would be acceptable. The affordable housing would be genuinely affordable at social target rents and at the Council's agreed rent levels. Comprehensive redevelopment of the area by working with other landowners would be difficult because of the number of stakeholders.

Robert Lancaster (Planning Officer) presented the report explaining the key aspects of the scheme. He explained in detail the reasons for refusal as set out in the Committee report. These were that the scheme would be a clear overdevelopment of the site exhibited by the poor quality public realm in relation to the height of the building; the impact on the South Dock southern quayside; the impact of the frontage on the southern façade; the quality of the child play space and the issues around the legal agreement and delivery of affordable housing. The benefits of the proposal did not outweigh the harm caused by the proposal. Therefore the scheme would fail to be sensitive to

the context of its surroundings or bridge the difference in scale between Canary Wharf and surrounding residential areas.

In response to questions, Officers explained the differences between this scheme and other consented schemes in terms of amenity space, the level of noise disturbance from the DLR amongst other matters. There were many key differences. However, this scheme should be considered on the planning merits. Officers also explained that there had been pre-application discussions with the developers over a period of time to set out these concerns and Officers had maintained a consistent approach.

With the permission of the Chair, the applicant's representative explained the nature of the private gardens that may be used as balconies. Officers expressed concern about the noise impact from the plans.

In relation to the effect on views from the General Woolfe Statue in Greenwich, it was noted that English Heritage had not made objections. Therefore, it would be very difficult to sustain a reason for refusal on this basis.

Attention was also drawn to the GLA letter in the update report.

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

1. That planning permission PA/14/00990 at Quay House, 2 Admirals Way, London E14 for the demolition of the existing building and redevelopment to provide a residential led, mixed use scheme to include a tower of 68 storeys (233 metres AOD) comprising 496 residential units, 315.3 sq.m. (GEA) of flexible commercial uses including retail/financial and professional services/café/restaurant uses (Use Classes A1 to A3), a residents' gymnasium and associated residential amenity space, car and cycle parking and landscaping be **DEFERRED** to enable a site visit to be held so that Members can better acquaint themselves with the site and surrounds.

(Members present: Councillors Sirajul Islam, Danny Hassell, Amina Ali, John Pierce, Helal Uddin, Suluk Ahmed, Julia Dockerill, Harun Miah, Gulam Kibria Choudhury)

6.2 1 Park Place, Canary Wharf, London PA/13/02344 (Outline Planning Application) and PA/13/02366 (Listed Building Consent)

Update Report tabled.

Paul Buckenham (Development Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the application and the update.

Jane Jin (Planning Officer) gave a presentation on the application describing the site and surrounds, the site designation, the floor plans and the height of

the building. It was considered that the loss of the water space and the dock wall was acceptable in view of the overall benefits of the scheme (the new pedestrian link across the dock, the enhancements to the public realm, the biodiversity enhancements). Furthermore, the plans for the dock wall would cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed wall and the Conservation Area. Contributions had been secured in line with policy.

Given the merits of the scheme, it was recommended that the planning permission and listed building consent be granted.

In response to questions, Officers clarified the plans for the dock wall. A condition would be imposed to the satisfaction of English Heritage and the Council's Conservation Officer to ensure the repair works were of a high standard. Officers also clarified the size of the extension in relation to the water space required to make best use of the office space. The impact on traffic and the highway should be minimal given the travel assessment, the number of parking spaces and the implementation of a servicing plan.

The additional ecological benefits were also explained.

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

1. That planning permission PA/13/02344 be **GRANTED** for the outline application for the demolition of any existing structures, and construction of a building of up to 102,102 sq.m (GIA) comprising office use (use class B1) along with a decked terrace to the Middle Dock, access and highways works, provision for flood storage, landscaping, pedestrian link and other works incidental to the application (all matters reserved) subject to:
 2. Any direction by The Mayor of London.
 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 authority to recommend the conditions and informatives in relation to the matters set out in the Committee report and as amended in the update report.
 6. Any other informative(s) considered necessary by the Corporate Director Development & Renewal
 7. 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.

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

1. That Listed Building Consent PA/13/02366 at 1 Park Place, Canary Wharf, London be **GRANTED** for the alterations to grade I listed Quay Wall in connection with the redevelopment of the site under associated outline planning application PA/13/02344 subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Committee report.
2. Any other informative(s) considered necessary by the Corporate Director Development & Renewal
3. 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 Peterley Business Centre, 472 Hackney Road London (PA/13/02722)

Update Report tabled.

Paul Buckenham (Development Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the application and the update. The Chair then invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Raj Gupta spoke in opposition representing one of the existing businesses at the centre. She objected to the loss of their business unit given the proximity to their customer base, the good transport links and facilities. The business had been there for many years, had a long lease and employed many staff. All this would be lost. The Council should support small businesses and review the application with this in mind. In response to questions, she considered that, should a similar unit in the area be found, the applicant would consider this.

Tim Gaskell (Applicant's Agent) spoke in support of the application. He drew attention to the Business Relocation Strategy to assist displaced businesses. This research showed that there was sufficient business units in the area to accommodate the businesses and there was also the option of businesses coming back into the completed development. He advised that the businesses were protected by their leases and that they could not be forced to go. He highlighted the other benefits of the scheme.

In reply to questions, he explained the different phases of the scheme and the specific steps that would be taken to help businesses relocate.

He explained the mix and location of the proposed commercial units. It was considered that these were appropriate locations for these units. The Greater

London Authority (GLA) were satisfied with the rent data provided to ensure marketability for small and medium sized businesses.

In terms of the consultation, the developer had held an exhibition, leafleted neighbours and had consulted the existing business. As a result, steps had been taken to reduce the height of the scheme, improve the parking and access plans and clarify the business support strategy. The appearance of the extension to the former public house had been amended to better fit in with the area.

Iyabo Johnson (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report and the update. She explained the site and surrounds, the outcome of the local consultation and the impact of the existing building on the area.

She described the key features of the proposal including: the nature of the residential units, the plans for the public house, the public realm improvements and the commercial units. It was considered that the loss of the existing employment floor space was acceptable given that the proposal could accommodate a greater employment density with more modern facilities. The proposed mix also complied with the policy for the area.

Officers had requested that a Business Relocation Strategy be submitted. The scheme would be in keeping with the area.

Attention was also drawn to the position regarding the nearby gasholder site. It was considered that the mitigation condition preventing the commencement of part of the scheme until the hazardous substances consent was revoked was sufficient to prevent any harm from this and would deal with concerns raised by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE).

Given the overall benefits of the scheme, it was considered that the scheme was acceptable and should be granted planning permission.

In response to questions, it was reported that the application had been subject to independent viability testing that showed that the scheme provided the maximum amount of affordable housing that could be afforded. There would be a review mechanism in the s106 to increase the affordable housing offer should profit margins increase. There were conditions to ensure that the child play space was of good quality.

It was noted that the scheme would result in a loss of light industrial space, however, the site was not in an area designated by local plan policy to protect such uses. Furthermore, given the benefits (highlighted above) and the number of sites allocated in planning policy for light industrial uses (based on the most recent employment evidence), it was considered that on balance, that redevelopment for a mix of uses was acceptable.

The Committee requested a condition securing the submission of a Business Relocation and Marketing Strategy for the existing commercial units. The

Chair also requested that greater information on the tenure types of the affordable housing be provided in reports.

A Member also sought clarity on the percentage of wheelchair housing. It was requested that, in future, more information on this be provided in the report.

In response to further questions, Officers clarified the daylight and sunlight assessment, the measures to minimise noise, separation distances and the environmental benefits and the quality of the residential units.

On a vote of 6 in favour, 1 against and 2 abstentions, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission PA/13/02722 at Peterley Business Centre, 472 Hackney Road London be **GRANTED** for the demolition of existing building and phased redevelopment of the site to provide a residential led mixed use development, comprising the facade retention and extension to the former Duke of Cambridge public house, erection of part 7 to 10 storey building on Clare Street and erection of part 4 to 12 storey building on Hackney Road/ Clare Street, all to provide 217 dwellings and 1521 sqm of commercial space falling within use classes A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, D1 and/or D2, plus disabled car parking spaces, cycles parking, refuse/recycling facilities and access together with landscaping including public realm, communal and private amenity space subject to:
 2. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the Committee report and the further condition in the update report regarding the child play space.
 3. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal and the Service Head (Legal Services) are delegated power to negotiate and complete the legal agreement indicated above acting within normal delegated authority.
 4. 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 AND following matters:
 - the submission of a Business Relocation Strategy and Marketing Strategy for the rent levels for the commercial units.
 - the additional condition in the update report regarding the child play space.
 5. That, if within 3 months of the date of this committee the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director of Development & Renewal is delegated power to refuse planning permission.

6.4 7 Limeharbour, E14 9NQ (PA/14/00293)

Update Report Tabled.

Paul Buckenham (Development Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the application and the update and the Chair then invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Councillor Chris Chapman spoke in opposition to the scheme. He objected on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site given the volume of new development in the area. In particular, he objected to the impact on parking stress and highway safety given the existing problems in the area. He also objected to the impact on local schools, health facilities and public transport, already at a capacity. The scheme should be refused planning permission. In response to questions, he commented on the likelihood that future occupants would bring vehicles to the development, despite the car free agreement, worsening existing parking and highway safety issues.

Philip Dunphy (Applicant's Agent) spoke in support. He detailed the scope of the consultation. As a result, the scheme had been amended to reduce the number of storeys. He also explained the benefits of the scheme including the level of affordable housing and the design that would be in keeping with the area. The three parking spaces would be re - provided under the legal agreement. The proposal should actually reduce use of the Crossharbour DLR station compared to activity from the consented use.

Amy Thompson (Planning Officer) gave a detailed presentation on the scheme explaining the surrounding area that was mainly residential, the lack of need for the existing use and that the site designation sought to maximise residential development in the area. She set out information regarding the objections received and also explained the design, massing, density, height of the scheme, the housing offer, the measures to protect amenity, the amenity space, the public realm improvements, the s106 agreements and addressed the issues in the update report regarding the sunlight and daylight impact. In view of the merits of the scheme, it was recommended the scheme be granted planning permission.

In response to questions, Officers welcomed the level of open space surrounding the proposal. The scheme had been designed to reflect the lower scale of surrounding buildings with the 'stepped' design. The height of the building had been reduced through pre-application discussions and the proportion of affordable housing had been increased.

Officers also clarified the rent levels for the social housing and the distribution of funding between highway works and the DLR as agreed by the Council's Planning Contribution Overview Panel taking into account need.

On a vote of 7 in favour, 2 against and no abstentions, the Committee
RESOLVED:

1. That planning permission (PA/14/00293) at 7 Limeharbour, E14 9NQ be **GRANTED** for the demolition of the existing building and the construction of a new residential building ranging from 6 to 23 storeys (with additional lower ground level) and comprising 134 residential units, private leisure facilities, a new urban square (including new pedestrian links and hard and soft landscaping), revised vehicle access arrangements, and basement car parking and servicing 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 and complete 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 and the additional condition in the update report regarding the architectural treatment.
6. Any other conditions(s) considered necessary by the Corporate Director Development & Renewal
7. 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.

The meeting ended at 10.30 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Sirajul Islam
Strategic Development Committee