LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

19th November 2014

UPDATE REPORT OF HEAD OF PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL

INDEX

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.1	PA/14/01807	11 Havannah Street	Conservatory extension at ground floor level and first floor extension
6.1	PA/14/00623	Land at rear of 81-147 Candy Street And Wendon Street, London, E3	Demolition of existing garages and 2 bungalows and the construction of 45 residential dwellings (15 x 1 bed, 15 x 2 bed, 9 x 3 bed and 6 x 4 bed) with associated infrastructure provision

Agenda Item number:	5.1
Reference	PA/14/01807
Location	11 Havannah Street, London E14 8NA
Proposal	Conservatory extension at ground floor level and first floor extension

1.0 Correction

1.1 Paragraph 3.10 of the committee report relates to a proposed planning condition and proposed Condition 3) should read as follows.

> Full details of the proposed facing materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA in writing ***prior to the commencement of works.***
>
> Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory in accordance with the requirements of policy SP10 (4) of the Tower Hamlets Core Strategy.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 Officers' original recommendation to refuse planning permission for the proposal as set out in the report to the Development Committee dated 15th October 2014 (see Appendix 1) remains unchanged.

Agenda Item number:	6.1
Reference	PA/14/00623
Location	Land at rear of 81-147 Candy Street And Wendon Street, London, E3
Proposal	Demolition of existing garages and 2 bungalows and the construction of 45 residential dwellings (15 x 1 bed, 15 x 2 bed, 9 x 3 bed and 6 x 4 bed) with associated infrastructure provision

1.0 **UPDATES**

1.1 **Please note the following amendments to this report**

1.2 Under Paragraph 2.4 of the executive summer, it states, the residential quality of the scheme would be very high. Out of the 45 affordable rented units 33% would be of a size suitable for families. **This should read '48%.'**

1.3 Under Paragraph 4.8 of the proposal, it states, Out of the 45 affordable rented units 33% would be of a size suitable for families. **This should read '48%.'**

1.4 Under Paragraph 8.31 of the Housing section, it states, The benefits of the scheme are that 31 units of the total housing provided would be affordable rented, with 33% provide as family housing at lower density environment which is more suitable for family accommodation. **This should read '48%.'**

1.5 Paragraph 3.2 which states 'Any direction by the London Mayor', should be omitted as this application does not need to be referred to the London Mayor.

2.0 Representations

2.1 For avoidance of doubt Dockland Light Railway (DLR) were consulted as they own a strip of land to the east of Site J. Further to the consultation no comments have been received.

2.2 Two additional letters of objection has been submitted, the first from the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) and the second from a resident.

2.3 The LLDC objection raises the following issues:

- Concerned raised about the alignment of the proposed development in particular Site K and its relation to the existing pedestrian/cycle bridge.
- Late consultation and no discussion was undertaken given the aspirations within the Fish Island AAP and Draft Local Plan to promote future connectivity improvements between Crown Close and Old Ford Road across the A12 and which the Legacy Corporation are in the process of taking forward.
- The proposed Block K would likely prejudice delivery of future bridge improvements given proximity to boundary lines, with access to residential units and winter gardens coming to the edge of boundary lines.
- The proposal creates inappropriate future street frontage and access if this were to change to a vehicular or larger pedestrian and cycle bridge.
- The ground floor units or single aspect units close proximity to the A12 are also of concern.

- The Legacy Corporation request that the item be deferred for further discussion to take place.

(Officer response: Officers have considered the concerns raised and have considered this in the context of the policies within the Council's adopted Fish Island Area Action Plan (FIAAP) and the London Legacy Development Corporation Local Plan (publication version) (LLDC LP). In context of the Council's FIAAP, AAP policy FI 3.2 is relevant and it refers to Achieving Connectivity and states that *'Upgrade of the existing pedestrian and cycle bridge over the A12 linking Old Ford Road to Crown Close with improved signage and public realm improvements on the landing site on Crown Close'* as a priority actions to improve the access across the A12. Therefore Officers considered that the proposed development would not prejudice the delivery of any future improvements to the bridge. In addition, the proposal Site K is all within its site boundary and therefore officers do not considered that the proposal would have any adverse implications to any future improvements.

In the context of the publication version of the LLDC LP, policy 1.3 is relevant and refers to Connecting Hackney Wick and Fish Island. Within the subtext to this policy, it refers to *'the overall aim is to achieve new and enhanced walking, cycling and vehicular routes that intersects with open spaces and node of public activity'*. It is the view of the officers that the proposal would not disrupt this aim and improvements can be achieved which is also within the Borough's interest.

Nevertheless, to improve the relationship between the proposed building footprint of Site K and the bridge, officers consider that there can be design amendments which can be secured by planning condition.)

2.4 The resident's objection letter raises the following issues:

- Loss of light to garden
- Sense of enclosure

(Officer response: Issues in relation to loss of light and sense of enclosure has been fully addressed within the amenity section of the committee report)

- Consultation letter was not sent to the applicant

(Officer response: Council's records show that a letter was sent to the resident. Furthermore, a site notice was displayed and an advert was placed in the local news)

- Noise/dust from the building works
- Removal of party wall

(Officer response: A condition will be imposed to restrict hours of construction. It should be noted that the any disruption/inconvenience arising from the proposal would be for a temporary period only and will be limited to the duration of the proposed works. A condition will also be imposed to submit a construction management plan to address health and safety issues. Removal of a party wall is not a planning material consideration.)

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

3.1 Officer recommendation as set out in the committee report remains unchanged.