

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 6.30 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 23 JANUARY 2020

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

Members Present:

Councillor John Pierce (Chair)
Councillor Abdul Mukit MBE (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Kevin Brady
Councillor Val Whitehead
Councillor Zenith Rahman
Councillor Rabina Khan
Councillor Sabina Akhtar
Councillor Tarik Khan (Item 5.1)

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Andrew Wood

Apologies:

None

Officers Present:

Paul Buckenham	– (Development Manager, Planning Services, Place)
Jerry Bell	– (Area Planning Manager (East), Planning Services, Place)
Kevin Crilly	– (Planning Officer, Place)
Rachel Mckoy	– (Head of Commercial & Contracts, Legal Services)
Gareth Owens	– (Daylight and Sunlight Consultant, Place)
Zoe Folley	– (Committee Officer, Governance)

1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Councillor Tarik Khan declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in the following agenda items on the grounds that he was employed by Braeburn Estates (Canary Wharf Group)

- Item 5,2 - Fiftieth Floor, 1 Canada Square, London, E14 5AA (PA/19/02217)

- Item 6.1 North Quay, Canary Wharf - pre-application presentation (PF/19/00247)

He left the meeting room for the consideration of these items.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Strategic Development Committee held on 20th November 2019 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, Place 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, Place 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

There were none.

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

6.1 Quay House, Admirals Way, London, E14 3A (PA/19/01462)

Update report was tabled.

Paul Buckenham, (Development Manager) introduced the application for the demolition of existing building to deliver a single 40 storey building, consisting of a 400 bed hotel and separate 279 bed serviced apartment use with an ancillary restaurant at ground floor level.

Kevin Crilly (Planning Services) presented the report, describing the site location and surrounding area, including the good transport accessibility level and the planning history. An application for planning permission was refused by this Committee in 2014 due to concerns around: the quality of the public realm, the southern façade, the relationship with the southern dock and child play space issues.

He explained the key features of this application and the outcome of the public consultation. The consultation had resulted in the receipt of 4 representations in objection, 58 in support and a Petition in objection with 88 signatures that did not raise any new material issues.

In land use terms, the planning policy supported the proposed hotel and serviced apartments use. The height and massing of the development was considered to be an appropriate response to the local context and would make a positive contribution to the area. The building would be of a high quality design. This, together with the positive aspects of the development (including landscaping improvements, the activation of the DLR 'Underline' and the pedestrian access improvements) would be welcomed additions to the area.

A sunlight and daylight report had been submitted, detailing that there would be some negative impacts to neighbouring properties, particularly to the Wardian East development, as detailed in the report. The Committee report also described the contributing factors to this, relating to the position of the balconies at the Wardian development and its proximity to the application site. It was also noted that amendments had been made to the proposal at the pre – application stage to minimize the impacts in this regard. Overall in light of the benefits of the proposal – (in terms of optimising the development potential of the site, and the public benefits set out in the report), the impacts were considered to be acceptable. In highway terms, the proposal was also considered to be acceptable.

Officers were recommending that the application was granted planning permission.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Sean Woolley, Amo Chohan and Councillor Andrew Wood (Ward Councillor) expressed concerns about the application in respect of the following matters:

- The failure to comply with the South Quay Master Plan.
- The assessment regarding the deficiencies of the Wardian development. Concern was expressed about the 'bad neighbour description'.
- Loss of sunlight and daylight to the Wardian East development. The proposal would result in significant breaches of the BRE guidelines and VSC levels.
- Overshadowing and loss of privacy.
- Highway impacts.

- That there had been a lack of consultation with residents.
- That residents opposed the development. A Petition had been submitted with a large number of objections.
- Concerns over the 20 metre separation distances between the proposal and neighbouring buildings.
- Poor design and layout given the lack of adherence to the local context.
- Construction impacts
- Failure to take into account the Isle of Dogs Neighbourhood Plan.
- Lack of public benefits.
- Impact on local infrastructure

The following speakers then addressed the Committee in support of the application: Julian Carter, Jon Manns, James Sutton and Abdul Habib. They underlined the applicant's commitment to deliver the development and that they had worked with Council Officers to achieve a high quality proposal. There had been extensive community consultation and local residents had contributed to the proposals.

They also highlighted the following points:

- That due to the site constraints, the site was unsuitable for residential use.
- Provided a summary of the key benefits, including a high quality design, the provision of an innovative Parkour facility, the creation of jobs, and contributions for a skills training programme to be run by a local organisation.
- Highlighted the results of the independent sunlight and daylight assessment of the Wardian development. This showed that the impacts overall, would be acceptable. Every effort had been made to minimise the impacts and the owners of the Wardian development had not objected.
- That the proposal complied with the Council's recently adopted Local Plan

The Committee's Questions

The Committee sought clarity on the nature of the sunlight and daylight impacts on the Wardian building, and the justification for the major loss of light to this development.

It was confirmed that a number of the windows would be affected within the Wardian East building, as detailed in the report. 313 would be outside the BRE guidance and 301 windows would experience a major loss of – of 40%. As mentioned in the presentation, this was mainly due to their overreliance on the application site for light and the design features of the Wardian building. Whilst recognising the impact from the development, Officers were also mindful of the merits of bringing forward this particular development on the site and that it would optimise the use of this site. Other options for the site

had been explored but they were considered to be less suitable. It was also noted that any development of this site would impact on the Wardian development, unless it was of the same scale as the existing building. It was also noted that the Committee report for the Wardian development highlighted the issues around its relationship with this site.

With the permission of the Chair, a Member of the developer's team, described in further detail the issues around the design of the Wardian Development and the impact this has had on the daylight and sunlight assessment.

In response to questions about the separation distances, Officers reported that the 20 metre separation distance exceeded the policy requirement of 18 metres, which is for the purposing of protecting privacy. The guidance related to all buildings regardless of the height. In some places, the distances were 22 metres. Officers therefore considered that they were reasonable.

In response to questions about the consultation, Officers reported that details of the Council's consultation and the applicant's consultation were set out in the Committee report. It was confirmed that the Council's consultation exercise was carried out in accordance with the relevant requirements. The local area was experiencing significant changes and the Wardian development was unoccupied. However, the owners had been notified of the proposals and had not submitted any comments.

Questions to the objectors.

Regarding the daylight and sunlight issues, the objectors drew attention to the large number of windows in the Wardian East building that would be greatly affected. The development would be in close proximity to one of its façades, therefore it would have a significant impact.

In response to questions about the building height, the objectors spoke in further detail about their concerns about that the lack of compliance with the South Quay Master Plan, regarding building heights. In response, Officers confirmed that the plan had recently been revoked following the Council's adoption of its new Local Plan.

Other issues discussed were the 2014 planning application, specifically - the local residents awareness of this and the possibility that another application could come forward for the site in the future.

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

1. That Planning permission is **GRANTED** at Quay House, Admirals Way, London, E14 3A for:
 - Demolition of the existing building and redevelopment to provide a mixed use development comprising a hotel (Class C1) and serviced apartments

(Class C1) with ancillary gym, retail, parking, landscaping and public realm works (PA/19/01462)

SUBJECT TO

2. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the Committee report and the update report
3. That the Corporate Director of Place is delegated the power to negotiate the legal agreement. If within three months of the resolution the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director for Place is delegated power to refuse planning permission.
4. That the Corporate Director of Place is delegated the power to impose conditions and informatives to address the matters set out in the Committee report

6.2 Fiftieth Floor, 1 Canada Square, London, E14 5AA (PA/19/02217)

Update report tabled.

Paul Buckenham introduced the application for the change of use from Office (Class B1) to Non-Residential Institution (Class D1)- Higher education facility. He advised that this application was reported to the Strategic Development Committee as the loss of office space within a 'Primary Preferred Office Location' (PPOL), is a departure from the Development Plan and the change of use is to floor space in excess of 2,500 sq. metres.

Gareth Owens (Planning Services) presented the report, highlighting the proposed plans and the outcome of the consultation. The Greater London Authority had raised no objections and no responses had been received from neighbouring occupiers.

It was considered that the proposal was acceptable and would not undermine the Canary Wharfs function as a PPOL. This is because:

- The proposal would result in a minimal loss of office space
- It would introduce a use which would support the function to the Canary Wharf PPOL which would be a main Town Centre use within the (emerging) Canary Wharf Metropolitan Town Centre.
- The specific University use would also be beneficial to surrounding businesses and the PPOL as a whole.
- That the Wood Wharf development would provide a large amount of office space

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

1. That Planning permission is GRANTED at Fiftieth Floor, 1 Canada Square, London, E14 5AA for

- Change of use from Office (Class B1) to Non-Residential Institution (Class D1)- Higher education facility. (PA/19/02217)
- 2. That the Corporate Director of Place is delegated the power to impose conditions and informatives to address the matters listed in the Committee report and to add any other conditions and informatives as necessary.

7. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

7.1 North Quay, Canary Wharf - pre-application presentation (PF/19/00247)

The Committee noted the contents of the report and pre-application presentation

The meeting ended at 8.00 p.m.

Chair, Councillor John Pierce
Strategic Development Committee