

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

UPDATE REPORT, DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE. 14th NOVEMBER 2019

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.2	PA/16/02789	William Brinson Centre, 3-5 Arnold Road, London	Demolition of existing building, construction of an 8 storey building and a 6 storey building to provide 62 dwellings (affordable housing tenure) and 398 sqm B1 floorspace with amenity space, access, cycle parking, landscaping and associated works.

1.0 CLARIFICATIONS

- 1.1 Paragraph 1.176 on page 201 of the committee report, should read: *Properties 1 – 25 Tomlins Grove were tested for sunlight. The effect on sunlight to numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 25 Tomlins Grove is considered negligible. – 5 and 6 Tomlins Grove should not have been included in this paragraph.*
- 1.2 At paragraph 7.180, the paragraph should read “The 11 properties which do not satisfy the guidelines are addressed in Table 4 of Appendix 3.
- 1.3 The two properties below should have been included in the Summary of Sunlight results – Table 4 at page 246-247 of the committee report.

Property	Daylight Impact	Further detail
5 Tomlins Grove	Negligible to Minor Adverse	<i>In the DPR report, this property is classified as meeting the BRE guidelines, based on the living rooms meeting the BRE guidelines for sunlight.</i> <i>There is a Major Adverse winter sunlight reduction of 63% to the first floor bedroom, (moving from 8% WPSH to 3% WPSH). However, the annual sunlight target meets the BRE guidelines and as this is a bedroom where sunlight is less important, the local authority has classed this property as Negligible to Minor Adverse (as the reduction is large – Appendix I, paragraph I5).</i>
6 Tomlins Grove	Negligible to Minor Adverse	<i>In the DPR report, this property is classified as meeting the BRE guidelines, based on the living rooms meeting the BRE guidelines for sunlight.</i> <i>There is a Major Adverse winter sunlight reduction of 60% to the second floor bedroom, (moving from 10% WPSH to 4% WPSH). However, the annual sunlight</i>

		<p><i>target meets the BRE guidelines and as this is a bedroom where sunlight is less important, the local authority has classed this property as Negligible to Minor Adverse (as the reduction is large – Appendix I, paragraph I5).</i></p>
--	--	---

2.0 FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 Officers received an email from Paul Velluet on 11th November stating that the officer's report was incorrectly implying that that his report is a standalone objection unrelated to the representations submitted by residents of Tomlins Grove.

2.2 Paragraph 4.13 of the officer's report states the following:

*"In addition to the above, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) also received the following two documents which were submitted by consultants **on behalf of local residents (officer underlining)**:*

- *Heritage Report, produced by Paul Velluet; and*
- *Review of the Daylight and Sunlight Report by BRE"*

2.3 Officers acknowledged that Paul Velluet submitted a representation on behalf of residents in this point of the report and therefore all subsequent reference to Paul Velluet's representations should be read as being on behalf of residents of Tomlins Grove.

2.4 In addition to the above, on 13th November, the LPA received 3 emails from an objector from Tomlins Grove addressed to Committee Members. One of the emails included a further representation made by Paul Velluet on behalf of Tomlins Grove residents. The representation included the following issues:

- Lack of specific reference to highly relevant policies 7.4.B, 7.6.B., 7.7.C. and 7.8.D of the London Plan, 2016 and to paragraphs 127.c) and 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework,

(Officer Comment: Paragraph 6.3 of the Officer's Report, within the Design section, refers to policies 7.1-7.8 of the London Plan and the NPPF was also listed as a document which was considered.

In terms of referencing specific policies within the report, the report includes the relevant policies/documents in the Section 6 of the report, and only draws reference to some of them as and where necessary in the report.

Officers are satisfied that the proposals comply with policies 7.4B, 7.6B, 7.7C and 7.8D of the London Plan 2016 and paragraphs 127 c and 131 of the NPPF 2019 and does not change officer recommendation to grant planning permission.)

- In relation to paragraph 7.105 of the committee report which refers to cross-sectional drawings.

(Officer Comment: With respect to a request for a section through the site, this was not thought to be necessary. The site lies to the west of a substantial

railway viaduct which divides the townscape at this point and creates a natural divide between Tomlins Grove, and Arnold Road. The setting of the Tomlins Grove properties is largely appreciated from the street, or from the railway line itself, the intervisibility is not critical to the appreciation of the setting of the houses.

The site itself is set at a distance of greater than 18 metres away from the properties on Tomlins Grove. This is significantly more than the council's standard overlooking distance. The difference in scale between the houses on Tomlins Grove and the proposed development can be appreciated without the need for a section.)

- That paragraph 7.104 of the report is 'unjustified' and that 'officers have not read the report with due care (...)

(Officer Comment: The position of officers remain unchanged to that set out in the committee report.)

- From paragraphs 7.107, 108, 109 and 125 of the committee report, it appears that officers rely heavily upon the review and rebuttal of Paul Velluet's *Report* by the applicants' Heritage Consultant and concur unreservedly with the consultant's comments rather than addressing the highly relevant and specific concerns raised in Paul Velluet's *Report* themselves.

(Officer Comment: The review and rebuttal was carried out by the applicant's heritage consultant and subsequently reviewed by the Design and Heritage Officer who agreed with the comments made.)

2.5 A further email was received by the same objector on 13th November related to 2 documents which comprise views from a property on Tomlins Grove (referred to as Document 1) and a cross section of Tomlins Grove (referred to as Document 2), the railway viaduct and Arnold Road.

- *Officer Comment: It appears that these views do not appear to be verified and limited weight should be given to them.*

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

3.1 Officer recommendation remains that planning permission should be GRANTED for the reasons set out in the main report and all conditions/obligations.