

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 29 JANUARY 2015**

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

**Members Present:**

Councillor Sirajul Islam (Chair)  
Councillor Md. Maium Miah (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Danny Hassell  
Councillor Helal Uddin  
Councillor Suluk Ahmed  
Councillor Muhammad Ansar Mustaqim  
Councillor Julia Dockerill  
Councillor Khaled Uddin Ahmed (Substitute for Councillor John Pierce)

**Other Councillors Present:**

Councillor Candida Ronald  
Councillor Andrew Wood  
Councillor Shahed Ali

**Apologies:**

Councillor Amina Ali  
Councillor John Pierce

**Officers Present:**

Paul Buckenham	– (Development Control Manager, Development and Renewal)
Fleur Francis	– (Acting Team Leader - Planning, Directorate, Law Probity and Governance)
Shay Bugler	– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Beth Eite	– (Principal Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Tim Ross	– (Deputy Team Leader - Pre-application Team, Development and Renewal)
Jermaine Thomas	– (Planning Officer, Development & Renewal)
Alison Thomas	– (Private Sector and Affordable Housing Manager, Development and Renewal)

Jerry Bell	– (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Zoe Folley	– (Committee Officer, Directorate Law, Probity and Governance)

## 1. **DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made.

Councillors Sirajul Islam, Md Maium Miah, Khales Uddin Ahmed, Helal Uddin, Suluk Ahmed and Muhammad Ansar Mustaquim declared an interest in agenda item 6.1, 100 Whitechapel Road and land rear at Fieldgate Street (PA/13/3049). This was on the basis that the Councillors worshiped at the East London Mosque.

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

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 6<sup>th</sup> November 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**

No Items.

## **6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION**

### **6.1 100 Whitechapel Road and land rear at Fieldgate Street (PA/13/3049)**

Update Report tabled.

Officers reported that the application had been moved from the deferred items part of the agenda (Part 5) to the Planning Applications for Decision section (Part 6) due to the substantial changes made to the application since last considered by the Committee in July 2014. The application would be considered in its entirety afresh. The application had been subject to consultation (as per the standard process) and the public and applicant had been notified of their right to speak at this meeting.

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

Mohamed Zabadne and Councillor Shahed Ali spoke in support of the scheme highlighting the following points:

- The strength of local support for the scheme including a petition with thousands of signatures.
- The merits of the scheme including: new affordable units with family sized housing, a new access route, wheelchair accessible housing and disabled parking spaces in accordance with requirements, local investment, many new jobs, the creation of an active frontage at ground floor from the new commercial units and the extension of the Mosque that could only be provided at that point due to the site constraints.
- That the Greater London Authority (GLA) were satisfied with the changes to the scheme to reduce the impacts which included: the creation of the access link, setting back the buildings to improve permeability, the introduction of commercial units at ground floor level, increasing the number of family sized accommodation, a reduction in single aspect units and improving the internal layout of the buildings.
- Only three reasons for refusal remained as set out in the Officers report. Turning to these, it was commented that the height and design of the scheme would be sympathetic to the area. The height had previously been reduced. The GLA were satisfied with the height. Comments about this were subjective. The density of this scheme was within the accepted parameters in policy unlike many other consented schemes.
- Other developments, notable the City Pride development approved by this Committee, were taller than this scheme, had a higher density, included off site affordable housing and had a greater impact on sunlight and daylight. So the scheme compared favourably with this and it was surprising that Officers were still recommending refusal.

- Welcomed the s106 agreement and the level of affordable housing which despite the changes, the developer had worked hard to maintain to their credit.

In response to Members questions about the GLA's response, it was considered that the applicant had complied with their requests. The scheme had been substantially amended to mitigate the concerns. Councillor Shahed Ali reported that he had discussed the application with local residents and they welcomed the scheme. He had not received any objections personally about the scheme from the local community and in total, very few people had objected. None of the immediate neighbours had objected.

Officers clarified that they had no objection to the density of the scheme in principle rather the impact of the scheme on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, design and amenity as set out in the Committee report. Officers also explained the reasons why the Application had been submitted to the Committee on three occasions.

Shay Bugler (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal) presented the detailed report and the update. He explained the site location, the good public transport rating for the site and the outcome of the local consultation. He also explained the key elements of the scheme and the changes relating to the design and heritage matters, the housing mix, the impact on residential amenity and the quality of the accommodation that appeared to address the GLA's concerns

Nevertheless, whilst recognising the improvements, Officers felt that the changes failed to address the key concerns about the scheme in terms of poor quality design and harm to the surrounding area, impact on neighbouring amenity and poor quality accommodation. Therefore, the Officers recommendation remained to refuse the application.

In response to the presentation, Members queried the concerns around the height, the impacts on Myrdle Street Conservation Area and the density of the scheme. Officers clarified that part of the proposed development to west of the site fronting Vive Courts falls within a Conservation Area.

Members also queried the concerns about the quality of accommodation and the impact on amenity given the site constraints and that the scheme would deliver new homes in the Borough. It was also noted that the GLA were supportive of the changes and there was widespread support for the scheme.

Given the supportive comments and perceived merits of the scheme, Members of the Committee were minded to look favourable on the scheme.

Officers responded to Members as summarised below:

- It was considered that the scheme was unacceptable due to a combination of factors - the height, given that the site was not within a tall building location identified in the local plan, together

with the design, quality of accommodation, the materials and the impact on the Conservation Area that was mainly made up of high quality lower rise buildings. In assessing the acceptability of the height, it was necessary to bear in mind such wider factors.

- The scheme would deliver an inferior quality of accommodation given the sunlight daylight failings, poor outlook and loss of privacy given the substandard separation distances and high number of single aspect units. Some units would have to rely on artificial light. Examples of this were given.
- The scheme would harm surrounding amenity.
- The daylight and sunlight assessments (for this and previous committee reports) were carried out by the same independent consultant that concluded that there would be a substantial loss of sunlight and daylight to neighbouring properties.
- Part of the site fell in the Conservation Area.
- Given the site constraints and other issues, this application was very different from the City Pride development. Each application should be considered on its merits.
- Should Members be minded to approve the scheme, it would need to be referred back to the GLA for consideration.
- That the s106 and conditions suggested in the update report had been agreed with the applicant.

On a vote of 2 in favour and 6 against the Committee resolved not to accept the Officer recommendation to refuse planning permission.

Given the supportive comments, Councillors Khales Uddin Ahmed then moved a motion seconded by Councillor Muhammad Ansar Mustaqim that the application be granted subject to the legal agreement and conditions set out in the update report.

On a vote of 6 in favour 0 against and 2 abstentions the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission PA/13/3049 at 100 Whitechapel road and land rear at Fieldgate Street & Vine Court be **GRANTED** for the Demolition of existing vehicle workshop and car showroom; erection of a residential development comprising a total of 185 dwellings (comprising 10 studios; 65 x 1 bed; 71 x 2 bed; 27 x 3 bed; 12 x 4 bed) in an 18 storey building facing Fieldgate Street; and 2 buildings ranging in height from 8-12 storey building facing Whitechapel Road and Vine Court, provision of ground floor retail, office and restaurant spaces (Class A1, A2 and A3), café (A3); 274.9 sqm extension to the prayer hall at the East London Mosque and provision of pedestrian link between Fieldgate Street and Whitechapel Road, extension to existing basement to provide 20 disabled car parking spaces, motorcycle spaces, 360 bicycle parking spaces and bin storage in basement, associated landscape and public realm works SUBJECT to the Section 106 Agreement and conditions set out in the update report.

## **6.2 Meridian Gate, 199-207 Marsh Wall, London, E14 (PA/14/01428)**

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.

Councillors Andrew Wood and Candida Ronald spoke in opposition to the application. They objected to the impact of the scheme in terms of design height, density, lack of public space, the impact on amenity, the level of affordable housing and loss of employment. On such grounds the scheme was even worse than the Skylines Village scheme refused by this Committee in 2012. They also objected to the impact of the scheme on the water infrastructure. Thames Water had requested a further assessment of this to ensure the water infrastructure could cope. The speakers also objected to the cumulative impact on the Docklands Light Railway from the density of new schemes in the area that was already at a capacity. The infrastructure should be in place first. The LUC report to the South Quay Masterplan showed adverse effects for developments at this density.

It was also considered that the design was unsympathetic to the iconic Canary Wharf skyline contrary to the emerging master plan. Schemes should be master plan lead

Hugh Sowerby, Applicant's Agent, spoke in support of the scheme explaining that the plans would create new jobs and the differences with the Skylines scheme. Thames Water had raised no objections subject to the completion of a water impact study to be secured by condition. UKPN had been engaged and were aware that a substation was required. He highlighted the policy support for the scheme on the site, the lack of demand for the existing use, the proposed new housing, (including a large proportion of family housing) open space and that the feedback from the consultation had been mostly positive. English Heritage and the Council's Conservation Team had raised no objections about the impact on views and heritage assets. The scheme was supported by the GLA.

In response to questions, Mr Sowerby confirmed that there would be contributions for open space in view of the short fall on site. He outlined the nature of the commercial units primarily for small and medium sized units. The private and affordable housing would be of a similar standard. The only difference related to ceiling heights, which were higher in the affordable housing. In response to further questions, Alison Thomas, (Private Sector and Affordable Housing Manager, Development and Renewal) confirmed the need for the separate entrances for these units to ensure the services charges were reasonable for the occupants. However, the entrances for the affordable units would be in a prominent location.

Mr Sowerby stated that the developers were willing to give consideration to reviewing the landscaping around the entrance of the affordable housing to ensure it was suitable. Mr Sowerby also answered questions about the proposed local employment opportunities as set out in the legal agreement and the discussions with the GLA. He confirmed that the development complied with the principles of the South Quay Master Plan.

Tim Ross (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal) presented the report and the update explaining the site and surrounds and the existing use. He described the details of the application including the proposed layout, the height and appearance of the scheme, the housing mix (including affordable housing at Borough Framework rent levels), the need for the separate entrances for the private and affordable housing, the commercial space and the impact on the highway.

Consultation had been carried out and the outcome and the issues raised were addressed in the Committee report. The proposal was in line with the site allocations in policy and would make a positive contribution to the area. The scheme would also help meet the need for housing in the Borough and provide good quality office space.

Officers had no objections to the impact on views as explained by the speaker. The impact on neighbouring amenity was acceptable given the urban setting. The scheme would be secure by design and would provide a satisfactory level of play space and amenity space with contributions to mitigate the lack of public open space. The contributions complied with the policy.

Officers showed images of planned and consent schemes in the area to show the cumulative affect.

Given the merits of the scheme, Officers were recommending that the application was granted planning permission.

In response to Members questions, Officers confirmed the car parking arrangements and the rent levels for the affordable units. It was considered that the maximum number of affordable units had been secured based on the viability of the scheme. If permission was granted, a condition would be attached that required that no work could commence until Thames Water were satisfied with the scheme in this regard and had approved the strategy for dealing with the impact on water structure. Officers would be meeting with Thames Water to further discuss the impact of the various high density developments in the South Quay area on the water supply in the Isle of Dogs. Officers agreed to bring an update back to the Committee on the outcome of these discussions for information.

Officers would engage with relevant colleagues to ensure that appropriate play equipment was provided and have regard to guidance in the London Plan SPG for children's play. It was also explained that there would be additional schools places to accommodate the child yield from developments in the area

with new school places at Millharbour and Wood Wharf and a proposed new school at Westferry Printworks site.

It was necessary to consider the application in view of current planning policy. The South Quay Master Plan was a draft document at this stage so should be given limited weight. However, the scheme complied with the plan.

The South Quay Master Plan identified areas where new open space could be delivered. It was possible that the contributions for open space could be spent in the ward under current arrangements.

Officers also answered questions about the new pedestrian and cycle bridge across South Dock.

On a vote of 4 in favour 4 against with the Chair casting a second vote in favour the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission PA/14/01428 at Meridian Gate, 199-207 Marsh Wall, London, E14 be **GRANTED** for the demolition of all existing structures and the redevelopment of the site to provide a building of ground floor plus 53 storeys comprising of 423 residential apartments (use class C3) and circa 415sqm office (use class B1), 30 basement car parking spaces; the ground floor uses comprises an electricity sub-station, entrances for the office, affordable and private housing, basement access via car lift and cycle lifts, and circa 43sqm retail/cafe (use class A1/A3); public open space; and a single storey enclosure providing a secondary basement access **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. Any other conditions(s)/informatives 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.

### 6.3 South East block Of Goodmans Fields, 74 Alie Street, London (PA/14/2817)

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

Beth Eite (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal) presented the application regarding the SE Block of Goodmans Feilds to increase the level of commercial floor space and residential units approved under the outline consent. This included the addition of an additional residential tower. She explained the height, scale, proposed density, layout, the design and the impact of the scheme on amenity. Consultation had been carried out and the results were addressed in the report

The development would provide a suitable mix of housing. The impact on the local and strategic views would be acceptable with no objections from the statutory consultees.

The amenity of the units, level of child play space, amenity space and public open was also explained. Planning contributions had been secured in line with policy, which reflected the increased unit numbers and floor space in the scheme.

Overall, given the merits of the scheme, Officers were recommending that the application was granted planning permission.

In response to Members questions, Officers confirmed the policy on separation distances between buildings mostly for residential buildings. For uses where the occupancy was more temporary in nature, (student accommodation) a more flexible approach could be taken to this.

Whilst there would be some loss of light to properties at Gowers Walk, it was considered that given the layout of the houses on Gowers Walk with the main outlook to the rear and increased separation distances from the extant permission, that mitigated against this and the small number of failings overall, that this could be accommodated.

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

1. That planning permission PA/14/2817 at South East block Of Goodmans Fields, 74 Alie Street, London be **GRANTED** for the Development of the South East block comprising a podium block between 6-12 storeys and three towers of 21 storeys, 22 storeys and 23storeys to provide 415 residential units (use class C3), 3,398sqm (GEA) of flexible commercial space including a health centre ( use class A1, A2, A3, B1A and D1), public open space and associated landscaping, surface car parking, cycle parking and related infrastructure and associated works 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 matters set out in the Committee report.
6. Any other conditions(s)/informatives 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.

**Time Extension:**

The Committee agreed a time extension to extend the meeting for another hour or until the conclusion of the remaining item of business whichever was earlier.

**6.4 1 Bank Street (Heron Quays West 2) Heron Quay, London, E14 (PA/14/02617)**

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

Jermaine Thomas (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal) gave a presentation on the scheme explaining the site, the outline scheme that established the principle of the scheme and the main changes from the outline scheme proposed under the current application as detailed below:

- Extension further into the dock by 3.5 (further than previously approved).
- Positioning of part of the building being positioned closer to West Ferry Road.

He explained the height, shape and layout of the proposal and the outcome of the local consultation as set out in the Committee report. There would be no significant harm to the setting of the surrounding heritage assets or to neighbouring amenity given the generous separation distances. Planning contribution had been secured in line with policy.

Given the merits of the scheme, Officers were recommending that the

application was granted planning permission.

In response to questions, Officers explained in further detail the economic benefits of the scheme (including the café/restaurant space) and the biodiversity measures. On balance, it was felt that such benefits outweighed the impact on the dock, (which would be less than the previous consent in area) and justified the changes. Officers also advised that there was a condition requiring impact studies of the existing water supply infrastructure.

Officers also answered questions about the provision of electric charge points off site and the reasons why this should not be requested as a condition at this stage in view of policy.

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

1. That planning permission PA/14/02617 at 1 Bank Street (Heron Quays West 2) Heron Quay, London, E14 be **GRANTED** for the erection of a 27 storey building comprising offices (Use Class B1) and retail (Use Class A1-A5) including three basement levels, partial infilling of South Dock, ancillary parking and servicing, access and highways works, landscaping and other works incidental to the application 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 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. That in the event that the section 106 is not signed prior to 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015 the Local Planning Authority reserves the right to determine the application under delegated authority.

The meeting ended at 10.15 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Sirajul Islam  
Strategic Development Committee