

Committee: Strategic	Date: 21 st July 2015	Classification: Unrestricted	Agenda Item Number:
--------------------------------	--	--	----------------------------

Report of: Director of Development and Renewal	Title: Applications for Planning Permission
Case Officer: Nasser Farooq	Ref No: PA/14/03195- Full Planning Permission
	Ward: Canary Wharf

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Location: Two Sites:
Site 1 Land at 3 Millharbour and
Site 2 Land at 6, 7 and 8 South Quay Square, South
Quay Square, London

Existing Uses: A number of low-rise buildings, including a print works, an engineering company and a vacant Audi sales yard on Millharbour and the Great Eastern Enterprise Commercial Centre (totalling approximately 4,692 sqm of floorspace) and a cleared site to the north on Millharbour East.

Proposal: The demolition and redevelopment with four buildings:
Building G1, a podium with two towers of 10 - 38 storeys and of 12 - 44 storeys;
Building G2, a four floor podium with two towers of 34 and 38 storeys inclusive of podium;
Building G3, a tower rising to 44 storeys; and
Building G4, a four floor podium with a tower of 31 storeys inclusive of podium.

The development proposes:
1,500 new homes in a mix of units and tenures (private, social-rented and intermediate);
a new primary school with nursery facilities;
further education uses (total D1 floorspace 13,525 sqm with a fall back that 4,349 sqm of this floorspace could also be used in full or part as D1 or D2 leisure floorspace, if necessary);
5,820 sqm of flexible commercial floorspace (B1/D1/D2/A1/A2/A3 and/or A4);
two new public parks including play facilities, a new north-south pedestrian link and landscaping including works to conjoin the plots into the existing surrounding urban fabric;
387 car parking spaces (for residential occupiers, blue

badge holders and for a car club); cycle parking; management offices; service road and associated highway works; and other associated infrastructure including the diversion of the Marsh Wall sewer.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 This application for planning permission was considered by the Strategic Development Committee on 4th June 2015. A copy of the original report is appended.
- 2.2 The Committee deferred the applications in order to visit the site, to better understand the proposal.
- 2.3 At the time of writing, a site visit is in the process of being arranged w/c 13th July 2015. Members will have the opportunity to report back on their findings at the next meeting of the Strategic Development Committee on 21st July 2015.
- 2.4 At the Strategic Development Committee of 4th June 2015, the following four matters were deliberated in greater detail and this report provides further discussions on these matters.
 1. Child Play Space
 2. Affordability of the Intermediate family sized homes
 3. Re-provision of the existing uses (in particular Lanterns)
 4. Servicing Route on Millharbour East

3. FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1. Following the deferral of the application by the Committee, the Council has received the following additional representations.

Consultation Response

- 3.2. Secure by Design Officer, no objections for the development to proceed as long as it shall incorporate measures to minimise the risk of crime according to the requirements of Secured by Design.
- 3.3. One letter of objection has been received since the June committee. The objection has suggested a communal garden should be built instead of a residential tower on Millharbour East.
- 3.4. The Council has received various correspondents from Lanterns Nursery, Studio Theatre and School of Performing Arts (Lanterns) explaining the nature of the business, upcoming events and endorsements of outside bodies. In addition, the applicant has copied the Council into a letter sent to Lanterns.

3.5. This matter is discussed further within the following section of the report.

4. UPDATE ON RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1. Following adverse recommendations from the Councils Planning Department, two planning applications at “50 Marsh Wall” and “54 Marsh Wall” listed within paragraphs 4.58 and 4.59 of the original committee report, under the heading of applications ‘under consideration’ have been withdrawn by their applicants. Consequently, they no longer form part of the applications under consideration within the relevant planning history.

4.2. For ease of reference these applications originally proposed the following:

50 Marsh Wall, 63-69 and 68-70 Manilla Street (PA/14/03281)

Application received for demolition of all buildings on site to enable redevelopment to provide three buildings of 63, 20 and 32 storeys above ground comprising 685 residential units (Class C3), 273 hotel rooms (Class C1), provision of ancillary amenity space, a new health centre (Class D1), a new school (Class D1), ground floor retail uses (Class A3 and A4), re-provision of open space, provision of a new landscaped piazza and vehicular access, car parking, cycle storage and plant (as amended).

54 Marsh Wall (PA/14/002418)

Application received for the demolition of the existing building and the construction of a new residential-led mixed use development consisting of two linked buildings of 29 and 39 storeys (with two additional basement levels) comprising 240 residential units (including on-site affordable housing), a new café (Use Class A3) and community facility (Use Class D1) at the ground level, basement car parking and servicing, landscaped open space and a new public pedestrian route linking Marsh Wall and Byng Street.

5. ISSUES RAISED BY THE COMMITTEE

Child Play Space

5.1. At the last committee, officers understood there to be two issues in relation to child play space, firstly whether the development mitigates against the collective impact of this development and the adjoining development (2 Millharbour) and secondly whether the quality of the child play space, in particular reference to its various locations was an acceptable approach.

5.2. In relation to the first issue, it is advised that each planning application is considered on its own planning merits. The planning application at 2 Millharbour which has a resolution to grant following the Strategic Development Committee of 23rd April 2015, originally had a deficit of 444sqm of Child Play. Following amendments undertaken by the applicant, that deficit was reduced to 191.5sqm and on balance, when taking into account the

merits of the scheme, the provision of on-site children’s play space was considered acceptable in its own right.

- 5.3. Within this application the proposed child play space exceeds the minimum policy requirements by 564 sqm. As such, whilst both applications are considered on their own merit. Collectively the child play space provided across the sites as considered within the UDF exceeds policy by 372.5sqm. Furthermore, the majority of playspace across all the sites is at ground floor level and enables children from both development to access spaces across both sites.
- 5.4. In relation to the location of the child play space, the table below outlines the distribution of child play space within the development, across the proposed buildings.
- 5.5. For the avoidance of doubt, the proposed communal amenity space also exceeds policy requirements by 394sqm (there is no double counting of either type of open space) and as such, the Child Play Space would not be provided at the expense of Communal Amenity Space.

	Child Play Space			
	0-5 m ²	6-11m ²	12+ m ²	Total m ²
West Park	549	654	147	1350
East Park	0	971	1030	2001
Block G1				
G1 Level 1 Podium	288			288
G1 Level 7	229			229
G1 Level 9	136			136
Block G2				
G2 Level 4	271	134		405
Block G3				
Level 00	159	72		231
Block G4				
Level 1	62			62
Level 2	135			135
Level 3	135			135
Level 27	96			96
Total	2060	1831	1177	5068

Table 1: Showing the distribution of playspace

- 5.6. From the above table, and the applicant’s Design and Access Statement, it is clear that a specific strategic approach has been taken towards planning child play space within the scheme.
- 5.7. Firstly, in relation to the two parks, the West Park has been designed to accommodate a variety of playspaces for different age groups. This is reflected in its designed with various types of play equipment’s to encourage its use as a ‘destination play’. The eastern park has been designed as more open grassland to encourage the elder play groups.

- 5.8. The majority of child play space proposed at podium level and above, is focussed on the 0-5m² age group, which would be a more private, confined environment. Whilst not shown above, in many instances the child playspace is complemented by communal amenity space located adjacent to it to ensure supervisory space is provided.
- 5.9. In addition, the playspace has been equally divided between the two sites and also within each individual block to ensure equal access towards child play space for all tenures within the development. The approach also ensures as each part of the development is built, the requisite amount of child play space is also provided.
- 5.10. Member's raised concerns over the amount of playspace above ground floor level. The table below outlines the percentage of child play space within different levels of the building.

	Total M ²	%
Ground Floor	3582	70.6
Level 1	350	7
Levels 2-10	1040	20.5
Levels 10+	96	1.9

Table 2 Showing % of playspace at various levels

- 5.11. As members will note, the vast majority of playspace is within the lower levels of the development, with just 96m² or 1.9% above level 10 (at level 27 of Block G4)
- 5.12. Officers consider the overall quantum and quality of the child play space to be of a high standard and thus acceptable within the proposed development. This is a view shared by the GLA (on behalf of the Mayor of London), within their stage 1 response, which says::

“44. The applicant has submitted a comprehensive and innovative play strategy, for which it should be commended....45. The overall approach to play and recreation will ensure high-quality facilities will be provided that exceeds the needs of the children of this development. Critically, the development will also provide publically accessible external play opportunities set within areas of public open space, which is strongly supported.”

Affordability of the Intermediate family sized homes

- 5.13. This issue first arose during the course of the determination of 2 Millharbour (PA/14/01246), when the applicant chose to omit the 3 bedroom intermediate units on the basis that they were not affordable to residents.
- 5.14. Since 4th June's Strategic Development Committee, the applicant and housing colleagues have further considered whether the intermediate family are

affordable within this location. Based on the information provided on Indecon Court which is the nearest comparable site having recently been completed, it is considered that the 3 bedroom intermediate units, are currently affordable and meet the upper ends of the GLA affordability criteria.

- 5.15. It is also noted that the requirement to provide a mix of units within the Intermediate tenure is found within policy DM3 of the Managing Development Document, which requires 25% of the intermediate accommodation to be family sized accommodation. In this instance, the applicant by providing just 20% falls below this policy aim. As such, officers do not feel there would be adequate grounds in planning policy terms to insist on the removal of the 19, three-bedroom intermediate units from the scheme, which are already below the level advocated by policy.

Re-provision of the existing uses (in particular Lanterns)

- 5.16. Whilst, the application was deferred from committee to enable members to carry out a site visit, the opportunity was given for Lanterns School(s) and the applicant Galliards to continue discussions over a possible lease to enable Lanterns to move across within the new development.
- 5.17. From various correspondents which officers have been copied into, both parties have indicated a willingness to continue discussions. It is not clear whether these discussions have taken place.
- 5.18. In terms of planning policy, officers have worked closely with the applicant to ensure the application would re-provide the existing D1 floorspace within the development, it is outside the control of the planning system and the Council to target a specific end user for the D1 space, however in recognition of the desire for Lanterns to remain in this location, the space has been designed to accommodate their specific needs including the provision of a bespoke theatre space at basement level. This floorspace and its letting is a private commercial arrangement outside the scope of planning and it is a matter for the applicant and prospective tenants to reach a solution.
- 5.19. In the event any of the existing commercial providers (Lanterns or Montessori) are unable to take the premises provided within the scheme, the Section 106 agreement is to include a planning obligation to ensure the space will be marketed for an alternative education use, thereby ensuring that the education focus of the development is promoted in the first instance.

Servicing Route on Millharbour East

- 5.20. The final issue raised was servicing. Members were concerned whether there was adequate space for two large vehicles to pass along the new access route from Millharbour East.
- 5.21. This was a matter considered by the applicant who advised that the width of the road had been designed to be wide enough based on the dimensions found within the DCLG's Manual for Streets. This was received by the

Councils Transportation and Highways officer who considered the information satisfactory and that this matter can be dealt with via a delivery and servicing management plan condition.

- 5.22. Should members not be satisfied with this, a condition requiring a layby to be provided can also be secured.

6. RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 Officers do not wish to change their original recommendation to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION**, subject to conditions and the completion of a s106 legal agreement.