

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2015

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

Members Present:

Councillor Sirajul Islam (Chair)
Councillor Marc Francis
Councillor Shiria Khatun
Councillor Suluk Ahmed
Councillor Gulam Kibria Choudhury
Councillor Shah Alam
Councillor Chris Chapman

Other Councillors Present:

None.

Apologies:

None.

Officers Present:

Jerry Bell	– (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Robert Lancaster	– (Principal Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Adam Williams	– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Andrew Hargreaves	– (Borough Conservation Officer, Development and Renewal)
Kate Harrison	– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Richard Murrell	– (Deputy Team Leader, Planning, Development and Renewal)
Christopher Hunt	– (Senior Planning Lawyer, Directorate Law, Probity and Governance)
Zoe Folley	– (Committee Officer, Directorate Law, Probity and Governance)

1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14th January 2015 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 1-9 Ratcliffe Cross Street and land to the south of 8-12 Ratcliffe Cross Street (PA/14/001671)

Update Report Tabled.

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader), introduced the report.

Robert Lancaster (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal) presented the application for the development of site to provide a residential development with associated works across two buildings.

Members were advised of the existing use of the site and the character of the area. Consultation had been carried out and six letters of objection had been received as addressed in the committee report and update.

Members were advised of the proposed layout of the two blocks, as well as the height, design, the materials, the amenity space and play space. In relation to transport matters, the scheme met the policy requirements in terms

of vehicle, cycle spaces and disabled parking spaces amongst other matters and had good public transport links. There would be a car free agreement. Overall, the impact on transport and highways was acceptable. Officers were satisfied with the housing mix including good quality private and affordable units, a high number of family units in this tenure and payments for affordable housing.

Contributions had been secured in line with policy. In view of the merits of the scheme, Officers were recommending that the application should be granted planning permission.

In response to Members, it was reported that the scheme had been amended to improve security in view of the Crime and Prevention Officer's comments. Specific measures included the introduction of an additional secure entrance system and a more secure cycle parking system. The comments of the Crime and Prevention Officer in the report predated such amendments.

It was also confirmed that following further negotiations about the viability of the scheme, the level of affordable housing had been increased. The final legal agreement and impact on the contributions were set out in the update report that Members were asked to consider. There were measures to prevent any undue impact on the approved scheme at Boulcott Street. These were explained.

Officers had recently assessed the impact on sunlight and daylight and assured Members that the assessment in the Committee report was up to date.

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

1. That planning permission at 1-9 Ratcliffe Cross Street and land to the south of 8-12 Ratcliffe Cross Street (PA/14/001671) be **GRANTED** for the demolition of the existing building at Site A and redevelopment to provide part 6 part 7 and part 8 storey residential building/block comprising of 56 flats (30 x 1 bed, 13 x 2 bed, 13 x 3 bed) with associated ground floor car park and cycle parking and the development of Site B to provide an 8 storey residential building/block comprising of 22 flats (8 x1 bed, 7 x 2 bed, 7 x 3 bed) with associated undercroft car and cycle parking and protected roof top child play space.

SUBJECT to

2. The prior completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), to secure the planning obligations set out in the update report.
3. That the Corporate Director, Development & Renewal 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 impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out in the Committee report.
5. Any other conditions/informatives considered necessary by the Corporate Director Development & Renewal.

6.2 Silwex House, Quaker Street, London, E1 6NS (PA/14/01897)

Update Report Tabled

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) introduced the item.

Adam Williams (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal) gave a presentation of the scheme, explaining the history of the site and the character of the existing building. The site fell within the Brick Lane Fournier Street Conservation Area, the Central Activity Zone and the City Fringe Opportunity Area in the London Plan and had good public transport links. The surrounding area comprised a mixture of uses and there were listed buildings nearby.

Consultation had been carried out and the issues raised were addressed in the Committee report.

He explained the details of the application. The scheme was acceptable in land use terms in view of the extant hotel use consent and the site designation in policy. It was proposed to preserve the majority of the key features of the building recognising that the building made a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area. This included the retention of the rear (north) elevation of the building following negotiations with Officers and other consultees. The main changes were explained. The Council's Design and Conservation Team were satisfied with the design of the scheme and the impact on the Conservation Area subject to the conditions.

The impact on sunlight and daylight was generally acceptable as shown by the independent assessment. Environmental Health had no concerns about increased noise subject to the conditions.

Officers also explained the car and cycle parking, the deliveries and servicing, the waste and recycling plans and the clause in the s106 to restrict coach party bookings following discussion with LBTH Highways and Transport for London.

Whilst there would be an increase in the number of non-vehicle born trips to the consented scheme, importantly there would be a decrease in vehicle born trips. Given this and the high public transport accessibility rating for the site and level of public access, this was considered acceptable.

The section 106 contributions complied with policy. In view of the merits of the scheme, Officers were recommending that the scheme was granted planning permission.

In response, Members noted the need to modernise the building and to bring it back into use. However, it was questioned whether the proposals could be reduced to fit into the existing building envelop in view of the objections from the historic societies.

Concern was also expressed about the modern design in relation to the traditional building. Particularly, it was felt that the new windows and the upper part of the buildings due to the design and the scale and massing would be out of keeping with the building and the surrounding area. Due to these issues, it was feared that the proposal could over dominate the building and have an adverse impact on the area.

Members also requested more details on the commitments regarding local employment in the legal agreement, the Crossrail contributions and also asked whether the number of apprenticeship places could be increased. It was also suggested that Officers should work more with the historic societies to address their concerns.

In response, Officers noted that the scheme was a bold addition to the building. But it was felt that, given the detailed design and subject to the conditions, that the scheme was acceptable and was an appropriate response to the design challenges. The building would be a substantial improvement on the consented apart-hotel scheme. Officers drew attention to specific features of the scheme to fit in with the building and the area. Officers also referred to similar conversions approved by Committee involving a 'saw tooth' building.

The height of the scheme was broadly in line with adjacent buildings. Furthermore, due to the design of the building and the nature of the area, it would not be possible to view the front elevation head on from street level and the massing of the building would be minimised when viewed from street level.

Officers also noted that the Committee were comfortable with the proposed use.

In view of the concerns, Councillor Sirajul Islam moved and Councillor Marc Francis seconded that the application be deferred to address Members concerns over the design of the scheme.

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

That planning permission Silwex House, Quaker Street, London, E1 6NS (PA/14/01897) be **DEFERRED** for the demolition of the roof and part side elevations, the retention and restoration of the southern and northern elevations and the construction of a 3 storey roof extension to provide a new hotel (Class C1) development comprising approx. 250 bedrooms over basement, ground and 5 upper floors with ancillary cafe space and servicing

on the ground floor, associated plant in the basement and roof, improvements to the front pavement and associated works.

The Committee were minded to defer the application to address Members concerns about the design of the scheme particularly the roof extension, in relation to the building and the surrounding area.

Members also requested further information on the operation of the contributions towards Cross Rail, the commitment to provide 20% local employment and the possibility of increasing the number of apprentice places during the first 5 years of occupation in the legal agreement. Further consultation should also be carried out with the historic groups.

In accordance with Development Procedural Rules, the application was **DEFERRED** to enable Officers to prepare a supplementary report to a future meeting of the Committee.

6.3 13-15 Folgate Street and 1-4 Blossom Street London, E1 6BX (PA/14/00760)

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) introduced the item and the Chair invited registered speakers to address the meeting.

Martin Hughes, local resident, spoke in objection to the application about the impact of the hotel on residential amenity. Specifically in terms of late night disturbance from the coming and goings, guests smoking and socialising outside and also litter on the pavement. The proposal would worsen these problems and would obstruct light to properties in Folgate Street. The concerns about this had not been properly addressed in the committee report. In response to Members questions, he reported that he had spoken to staff of the hotel and Environmental Health about the issues and the premises had now put up a sign about smoking that had had some success. The Committee report failed to properly take into account the impact on neighbouring amenity

Joe Stenson (Applicant's representative) spoke in support of the application as the Director of the hotel company. The applicant had continuously liaised with residents and LBTH Officers. As a result, the applicant had reduced the proposed number of new bedrooms and had moved the smoking area away from residents and ensured that there was regular cleaning of the external area. There had been very few complaints about the premises since it had opened and these had all been dealt with including the one issue from LBTH Environmental Health. The studies showed that the vast majority of trips to the hotel would be by public transport or walking during the day time and it would be reasonable to expect some level of noise from guests in this location. Furthermore, this minor addition would have little impact on servicing or deliveries. The external garden would be closed at 9:30pm.

The Chair considered it important that the management continually engaged with residents to address issues. Members also considered that the management should take a proactive approach to this. Mr Stenson drew

attention to the management's track record in engaging with the community and that his contact details were known to the community.

Kate Harrison (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal) presented the application explaining the site location, the character of the area, the existing premises and the outdoor terrace area. Several of the residents near this area had made objections. The outcome of the consultation and issues raised were addressed in the committee report.

Members were advised of the details of the proposal. The material planning considerations included design and heritage matters, the impact on amenity and the transport matters. It was considered that the height following amendment, design and material was acceptable and would preserve the setting of the Conservation Area. The reasons for this were explained. The impact on amenity would be acceptable due to the separation distances and the privacy measures amongst other matters. The sunlight and daylight assessment, that had been independently assessed, showed that all windows tested complied with policy save for the properties at 17 and 19 Folgate Street. However, due to the mitigating circumstances, on balance it was felt that this was acceptable for an urban setting.

LBTH Highways and Transport for London were satisfied with the scheme in view of the transport impact. Therefore, Officers were recommending that the scheme was granted planning permission.

In response, Members noted the concerns about the noise impact from the hotel. Accordingly, Councillor Chris Chapman requested that an additional condition be added to the permission to minimise the noise impact. This could include erecting signs outside the premises at appropriate points to ask customers to carry luggage over the cobbled pavement or putting messages in their literature on the subject. Whilst explaining the potential difficulties with putting signs on public roads, Officers stated that such measures could be explored. Accordingly, Councillor Chris Chapman moved an amendment that was agreed by the Committee that an additional condition be added regarding noise mitigation.

It was also reported that the transport assessment complied with policy predicting only a small number of vehicle born trips to and from the hotel per day. The mythology used for the survey (a questionnaire of hotel guests) and the findings had been considered and approved by LBTH Highways.

In response to further questions, Officers explained in further detail the impact on sunlight and daylight to the properties at Folgate Street. It was confirmed that the policy allowed for the impact from the existing balcony to be taken into account. Overall, it was considered that the impact was acceptable following the further review of the objections.

Officers also referred to the policy for s106 contributions with respect to this application.

On a vote of 6 in favour 0 against and 1 abstention, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission at 13-15 Folgate Street and 1-4 Blossom Street London, E1 6BX (PA/14/00760) be **GRANTED** for the demolition of existing external staircase and erection of a 5 storey side extension and a rear extension ranging from 1-5 storeys in height. The extension would provide 31 additional hotel rooms (Use Class C1)

SUBJECT TO:

2. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated authority to issue the planning permission, impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out in the Committee report and the following condition:
 - That further consideration be given to additional measures to minimise the noise impact from the hotel, particularly in relation to arrivals and exits.
3. Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Corporate Director Development & Renewal

8. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

None

The meeting ended at 8.30 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Sirajul Islam
Development Committee