

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 19 JANUARY 2017**

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

**Members Present:**

Councillor Marc Francis (Chair)  
Councillor Danny Hassell (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Asma Begum  
Councillor Denise Jones  
Councillor Helal Uddin  
Councillor Julia Dockerill  
Councillor Shafi Ahmed (item 5.1)  
Councillor Gulam Robbani  
Councillor Md. Maium Miah (item 4.1)

**Other Councillors Present:**

Councillor Andrew Wood

**Apologies:**

None

**Officers Present:**

Paul Buckenham	(Development Control Manager, Place)
Jerry Bell	(East Area Manager, Planning Services, Place)
Kirsty Gilmer	(Planning Officer, Place)
Nasser Farooq	(Team Leader, Planning Services, Place)
Marcus Woody	(Legal Advisor, Legal Services, Governance)
Zoe Folley	(Committee Officer, Governance)

**1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

No declarations of interests were made.

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

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 29 November 2016 and 21 December 2016 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## 3. RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS AND MEETING GUIDANCE

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
- 3) To note the procedure for hearing objections at meetings of the Development Committee and the meeting guidance.

## 4. DEFERRED ITEMS

### 4.1 The Quay Club, Marine Slab Pontoon to the North of Bank Street, Canary Wharf, London, E14 (PA/16/00899 + PA/16/00900)

Update report tabled.

Paul Buckenham (Development Control Manager) introduced the application for the demolition of the existing concrete slab and associated infrastructure; alterations to Bank Street including the removal of existing coping stones above the existing Banana Wall and the erection of a five storey building on the existing marine piles for use as a members club and other associated works incidental to the development.

Jerry Bell (East Area Manager, Planning Services) presented the application. He reported that the application was originally considered by the Committee on 20 October 2016 where Members were minded not to accept the application due to concerns over:

- The loss of open water space and the lack of exceptional circumstances justifying this;
- The adverse impact on the biodiversity of the dock;
- The adverse impact on heritage assets, notably the Grade I listed banana dock wall;
- Inadequate mitigation to address the harm caused by the application.

Since that the meeting, the application had been amended to address the Concerns. Details of the changes made to the application were as follows:

- Alterations to the building at ground floor level which include setting back the central portion of the building to reveal 110sqm of water space along with views of the Grade I listed banana dock wall.
- A reduction in the number of alterations to isolated areas of the coping of the Grade I listed banana dock wall.
- Replacement of the previously proposed £600,000 financial contribution for improvements and enhancements to the natural environment in the borough with an enhanced £800,000 financial contribution towards water space and heritage features improvements and enhancements in the borough
- An additional non-financial obligation to secure public access to the building for local residents on a bi-annual basis, to view art and cultural exhibitions curated by Canary Wharf Group through its Arts and Events programme.

The Committee were reminded of the site location and the surrounds. They also noted that Officers remained of the view that the application should be granted permission. However, should the Committee be minded to refuse the application, they were directed to consider the suggested reasons for refusal set out in the report.

In response to questions from Members about the proposal to hold bi-annual arts events, it was reported that they would be held on a weekend, free of charge, for the lifetime of the development and this requirement would be written in to the S106 agreement. Save for these events, access to the proposed facilities would generally be restricted as reported at the previous meeting. In response to questions about the biodiversity measures, it was noted that the application included a number of biodiversity enhancements. In addition, the alterations to the application should deliver further benefits in this regard by revealing additional water space. The Council's Biodiversity Officer had considered the plans and did not consider that the plans, including the proposed lighting of the underside of the building would have a significant impact. Their comments were set out in the update report.

In response to questions about the interventions to the dock wall, Officers confirmed that the number of which had been reduced to minimise the impact on the wall. The works would enable the installation of the utility services and

other essential works. In discussing these points, the Committee noted images of the plans.

In response to further questions, Officers reported that the plans would allow for the free flow of water under the proposed development. Officers also outlined the contributions for local employment (as set out in the legal agreement) and the contributions towards water space and heritage enhancements in the local area.

Overall Members welcomed the changes and felt they would help minimise the applications impact.

On a vote of 7 in favour, 1 against and 0 abstentions, the Committee

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the planning permission and listed building consent be **GRANTED** at The Quay Club, Marine Slab Pontoon to the North of Bank Street, Canary Wharf, London, E14 for the Demolition of the existing concrete slab and associated infrastructure; alterations to Bank Street including the removal of existing coping stones above the existing Banana Wall to enable the installation of proposed utilities services and future deck; the installation of new piles in the Bank Street; and the erection of a five storey building on the existing marine piles for use as a members club (Use Class Sui Generis) and other associated works incidental to the development. (PA/16/00899 + PA/16/00900) subject to:
2. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the 19 January 2017 Committee update report.
3. That the Corporate Director of Development & Renewal is delegated authority to recommend the conditions and informatives in relation to the matters set out in the 19 January 2017 update report.

## **5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION**

### **5.1 54 Marsh Wall, London, E14 9TP (PA/16/01637)**

Paul Buckenham introduced the application for the demolition of the existing building and construction of two new linked buildings of 41 and 16 storeys (over double basement) comprising a residential led development.

The Chair then invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Councillor Andrew Wood addressed the Committee. Whilst noting the merits of the application, he considered that the density of the scheme was too excessive for this site given the public transport rating for the site. He also expressed concern about the cumulative impact of the developments in the area on social infrastructure. He also stated that the proposed land use conflicted with policy given that the site now formed part of the Central

Activities Zone due to recent policy changes. The policy stated that developments in this area should primarily provide commercial units. He also considered that the height of the application conflicted with the provisions in the South Quay Master Plan in respect of building heights. In response to questions, he expressed concern about the lack of green space in the area to cater for new developments, the cumulative impacts of plans on the infrastructure (already at capacity) and the lack of plans to deal with this. He stressed that it was the cumulative impact of schemes as a whole on the area that was the problem rather than this application in isolation. The plans would also result in the loss of affordable business space in the area

Philip Dunphy (Applicant's representative) spoke in support of the application. He drew attention to the merits of the application. The application would deliver good quality new residential units that included a generous amount of affordable units. It would also provide good quality communal and child play space and public realm improvements. The height of the proposal generally followed existing building heights, proving an appropriate transition from Canary Wharf to lower rise developments in the area. Furthermore, given the lack of adverse impacts, it was considered that the density of the application could be accommodated. In response to questions, he reported that the application had been designed to fit in with the nearby Alpha Square development and to ensure that each worked successfully with each other and protect the internal amenity of both. In relation to the child play space, the speaker reported that over a third of the play space would be outdoor play space and the plans had been carefully designed to link the various types of play space and community space and ensure the children were safe and secure. There would be measures to prevent vehicles queuing outside the development. In response to further questions, he also clarified the wheelchair accessible car parking plans.

Kirsty Gilmer (Planning Services) gave a detailed presentation describing the site and its context. She described the key features of the application and the changes to overcome the concerns with the previously withdrawn application in terms of the height of the development amongst other matters. The application would deliver a public walkway connecting Marsh Wall and Byng Street which was welcomed. Furthermore, the application would deliver a generous amount of good quality affordable housing. The housing offer comprised 36% affordable units by habitable room. The child play space and communal amenity space exceeded the policy requirements.

It was also explained that the proposed development had been carefully designed to respond positively to the area including the Alpha Square development. The application would impact on a number of neighbouring properties. However, when taking into account the cumulative impacts of the other nearby schemes, the impact would be less significant. Consequently, it was considered that the impact on neighbouring buildings would be acceptable. The proposal would also preserve strategic views. Consultation had been carried out and no representations had been received.

The Committee were also advised of the highway issues including the wheelchair assessable car parking plans.

In summary, Officers considered that the plans would deliver a range of benefits and on balance complied with policy so were recommending that the application was granted planning permission

Members asked questions about the sunlight and daylight impacts. In response, Officers drew attention to the cumulative impacts from this and neighbouring consents. It was confirmed that when considered in the round, the impacts from this application would be relatively moderate as it would duplicate the impacts from other nearby developments coming forward. In response to further questions, Officers explained in greater detail the findings of the assessment of the properties at Alpha Square, Arrowhead Quay and Phoenix Heights.

Members also asked about the impact on social infrastructure. It was reported that this site did not itself lend itself to the provision of social infrastructure. Nonetheless, it was planned that other application sites nearby, that were more suited to providing such facilities, would deliver such facilities in accordance with their site allocation. There would also be a CIL payment that could be used for social infrastructure. In responses to further questions about this issue, Officers briefly outlined the wider process for securing social infrastructure in the planning system.

Member also enquired about the child play space and sought assurances about the operation of the roof top play area. It was confirmed that the plans had been designed to link together various areas of child play space to facilitate access. This approach was welcomed. A portion of the play space would be roof top play space. The operation of which would be controlled by condition.

Officers also responded to questions about the wheelchair accessible units, the proximity of the site to a nearby school and the entrances to the affordable and private units.

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

1. That the planning permission be **GRANTED** at 54 Marsh Wall, London, E14 9TP for the demolition of the existing building and construction of two new linked buildings of 41 and 16 storeys (over double basement) comprising 216 residential units; two ground floor commercial units (Use Classes A1-A3, B1) totalling 174 sq. m GIA fronting on to Marsh Wall; basement car parking and servicing; and landscaped open space including a new pedestrian route linking Marsh Wall and Byng Street. (PA/16/01637) subject to:
2. Any direction by the London Mayor.

3. The prior completion of a Section 106 legal agreement to secure 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 informatics in relation to the matters set out in the Committee report

The meeting ended at 8.30 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Marc Francis  
Strategic Development Committee