

Committee: Development Committee	Date: 17 th December 2014	Classification: Unrestricted
---	--	--

Report of: Director of Development and Renewal	Title: Applications for Planning Permission
Case Officer: Shahara Ali-Hempstead	Ref No: PA/14/00623
	Ward: Bow East

1.0 APPLICATION DETAILS

Location: Land at rear of 81-147 Candy Street And Wendon Street, London, E3

Existing Use: Brown field and residential land

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.

Drawings: AA3313 /IJK/2.3/001, AA3313 /IJK/2.3/002, AA3313 /IJK/2.3/003, AA3313 /IJK/2.3/004, AA3313 /IJK/2.3/005, AA3313 IJK/2.0/001, AA3313/IJK/2.1/001, AA3313/IJK/2.1/001, AA3313/IJK/2.1/002, AA3313/IJK/2.1/003, AA3313/IJK/2.1/004 Rev B, AA3313/IJK/2.1/005 Rev A, AA3313/IJK/2.1/006 Rev A, AA3313/IJK/2.1/007, AA3313/IJK/2.1/008 and AL3386_2.1_101

Document:

- Planning Statement by PRP Planning Dated March 2014
- Design and Access Statement by PRP Architects
- Air Quality Assessment by Resource & Environmental Consultants Ltd, Dated 24 July 2013
- Transport Statement by Transport Planning Consultants, Dated November 2013
- Energy Statement by PRP Environmental, Dated 6 March 2014
- Daylight levels document
- Daylight and Sunlight Assessment by Calfordseaden, Dated March 2014
- Code for Sustainable Homes Pre-Assessment by PRP Environmental, Dated 4 March 2014
- Code for Sustainable Homes Ecology Report by Landscape Planning Ltd, Dated

- September 2013
- Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment by Hayden's Arboricultural Consultants Limited, Dated 19 August 2013
 - Noise Vibration Statement by Airo, Dated 3 October 2013
 - Ecological Appraisal by Landscape Planning Ltd, Dated September 2013

Applicant: Old Ford Housing Association
Ownership: Old Ford Housing Association
Historic Building: None
Conservation Area: No

2.0 Background

- 2.1 This application was reported to the Development Committee on the 19th of November 2014 with an Officers recommendation for **APPROVAL**. The Committee resolved to defer the application for further discussions to take place with London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) to resolve the issues raised within their objection.
- 2.2 Discussions are currently taking place with LLDC; Member will be notified of the outcome of the discussions within an update report.
- 2.3 Officers recommendation for **APPROVAL** remains unchanged, subject to the outcome of the discussions and for the following reasons:
- a) The development would result not only in re-provision of the existing affordable units on site but also additional affordable housing, providing a 100% affordable scheme.
 - b) The residential quality of the scheme would be very high. Out of the 45 affordable rented units 48% would be of a size suitable for families. The family-sized units would be provided as a mix of three and four units. A large proportion of these units would be provided as townhouses with sizeable private amenity space and individual front doors. All of the proposed units would meet or exceed the floorspace and layout standards with family sized units being more spacious. All affordable rented units would be provided with separate kitchens and living/dining rooms. All of the dwellings would meet Code of Sustainable Homes and Lifetime Homes standards and 10% would be provided as wheelchair accessible. All but 2 of the proposed 45 units would be dual aspect.
 - c) The proposal would be acceptable with regard to highway and transportation matters including parking, access and servicing.
 - d) The amenity impact of the development would be acceptable. Officers consider that the design of the development, massing of the site minimise any adverse amenity impacts.
 - e) The design of the scheme as a whole, including the proposed massing, siting, architectural design and response to the site's setting, is of a high quality. The

proposed heights do not cause concern. High quality materials and detailing would be used throughout.

- f) The scheme would provide a financial contribution towards education facilities in the Borough. Nevertheless, the financial obligations proposed would not fully mitigate the impact of the development proposal, in particular with regard to provision of education, healthcare and open space. Having taken into account the provision of 100% affordable scheme and the results of the independently reviewed viability assessment, officers consider that, on balance, the substantial public benefits and the regenerative potential of the proposal outweigh the proposal's inadequacies with regard to the mitigation of all of the infrastructure impacts of the development.

3.0 UPDATES AND CLARIFICATIONS

- 3.1 Under Paragraph 2.4 of the 19th November Committee Report it was stated within the executive summary, 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%.'**
- 3.2 Under Paragraph 4.8 of the proposal, it stated, Out of the 45 affordable rented units 33% would be of a size suitable for families. **This should read '48%.'**
- 3.3 Under Paragraph 8.31 of the Housing section, it stated, 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%.'**
- 3.4 Paragraph 3.2 which stated 'Any direction by the London Mayor', should be omitted as this application does not need to be referred to the London Mayor.

Representations

- 3.5 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.
- 3.6 Two additional letters of objection were submitted, the first from the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) and the second from a resident.
- 3.7 The LLDC objection raised 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.)

3.8 The resident's objection letter raised 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.)

4.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 4.1 All relevant policies and considerations have been taken into account and Officers' original recommendation as set out in the officers' report for Development Committee on 19th November 2014 to GRANT planning permission for the proposal remains unchanged.