

**UPDATE REPORT, STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE. 24<sup>th</sup> September 2020**

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.1	PA/19/02717	Marian Place Gasholder Site, Bethnal Green, London, E2 9AP	<p>Demolition of existing buildings, decontamination/remediation of the site and retention (including dismantling, refurbishment and reinstatement) of the two existing gasholder frames to facilitate redevelopment for a mixed-use development comprising 5 buildings ranging between 6-13 storeys (up to 63m AOD) to contain 555 residential dwellings and 4,182sqm (GIA) non-residential floorspace in flexible A1-A4, B1 and D Use Classes (maximum provision of up to 180sqm A1/A2, up to 1,300sqm A3/A4, up to 2,485sqm of B1(a) and up to 635sqm of D1/D2 use class floorspace), together with access, car and cycle parking, associated landscaping and public realm, public open space and works to the existing canal wall, Pressure Reduction Station and existing gasholders.</p> <p>This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.</p>

**1. Summary Recommendation**

- 1.1 Correction to state 'Grant planning permission subject to conditions and obligations and GLA Stage II approval'

**2. Additional Representations**

- 2.1 Since publication of the agenda 9 more letters of representation have been received from members of the public. The additional material planning considerations raised include potential for green energy installations in the gasholder voids. A report was referenced in relation to a similar gasholder site in Bell Green (LB Lewisham).
- 2.2 4 further representations have been received from Interest Groups, the Greater London Industrial Archaeology Society (GLIAS), Friends of the Regent's Canal, Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) and East End Waterway Group (EEWG).
- 2.3 The first states that GLIAS is disappointed that there have been no physical amendments to the submitted proposals and think the consent conditions

need adjustment to achieve a better outcome. The letter contains recommendations on how the conditions could be adjusted.

- 2.4 The second representation, from the Friend's of the Regent's Canal, wrote to re-confirm their original objection, as reported within the Committee Report, and to support the East End Waterway Group's position to retain the guide frames in situ and leave the smaller gasholder empty. 2
- 2.5 The third representation, from CPRE, states that scheme being proposed would fail to preserve the integrity of the gasholders and miss a rare opportunity to create new public green space. The fourth representation, from the EEWG, makes a further objection to the proposals stating that the main Committee Report is selective and incorrect when summarising the EEWG's previous three letters sent to the Local Planning Authority. The EEWG reiterates the objection to the English Heritage Advice Report from 2015 which has been used by Historic England in their observations to the proposed development.
- 2.6 The letter goes on to draw attention to previous concerns highlighted including the international significance of the gasholders and that it considers the Committee Report misleads the decision-maker by not properly assessing the scheme against relevant policies. The letter also expresses concerns around the in-ground tanks and roller carriages.
- 2.7 It is officers' view that the Committee Report has assessed matters relating to Heritage comprehensively in line with the Development Plan and the relevant NPPF tests. Officers have engaged with Historic England, the government's expert advisor on England's heritage, who have confirmed the proposed conditions would afford a high level of protection to the gasholder frames.
- 2.8 As of 23rd September, the 1st petition by the EEWG has amassed 1772 signatures.

### 3. Clarifications and Corrections

- 3.1 Paragraph 7.40, Table 1: Correction to replace table as follows (highlighted sections show revised figures):

Unit Type	Market		Intermediate		Affordable rent		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Studio	48	12%	0	-	0	-	48	9%
1 Bed	182	45%	38	59%	13	16%	233	42%
2 Bed	148	36%	26	41%	12	14%	186	34%
3 Bed	30	7%	0	-	36	43%	66	12%
4 Bed	0	-	0	-	22	27%	22	4%
Total	408	100	64	100	83	100	555	100

- 3.2 Paragraph 7.69: Correction from 69% family within the affordable rent tenure to 70% (as correctly stated at 7.112).

- 3.3 Paragraphs 7.76 and 7.225: Correction from 55 wheelchair homes to 53.
- 3.4 Paragraph 7.263: Correction to omit the reference to removing the gasholder tank. The tank will not be removed. The brick and concrete tank structures will remain in situ. Those elements would be incorporated into the new scheme as part of the basement structures. The Greater London Archaeological Advice Service has recommended a relevant condition (Condition 2 as detailed on Page 105 of the Committee Report) to ensure the tanks are protected. The tanks will not be exposed but they will still physically be in the ground.
- 3.5 Paragraph 7.393 and 8.1 (c iii): Correction to state that a Travel Plan will be secured by condition, rather than an obligation within the S106.
- 3.6 Paragraphs 7.440 and 7.441: These paragraphs should be deleted and replaced with the following:
- ““The CIL Regulations (as amended) (the ‘Regulations’) allow the Council, as charging authority, to accept full or part payment of CIL liability in respect of the development by way of provision of land and/or infrastructure, in accordance with the relevant requirements set out in the Regulations. The proposed development includes the provision of strategic open space (as required in the Site Allocation) and the Council and the developer propose to enter into an agreement in writing to apply the cost of providing such open space (which includes the value of the land and the associated delivery costs) as a payment (full or part, depending on the value to be ascertained and agreed between the Council and developer) towards the CIL payable for the development.”*
- 3.7 Paragraph 8.1 (c vii): Correction to state ‘28 Private’ and ‘11 Affordable Rent’
- 3.8 Paragraph 8.4: Additional compliance conditions to include; restriction on PD rights and minimum/maximum quantum’s of A1-A4 and D1/D2 floor space.

5.2	PA/20/00571	Site Bound by Raven Row Stepney Way, Sidney Street, London	<p>Demolition of existing buildings and erection of three blocks comprising residential units (Use Class C3), commercial floorspace, off-street car parking spaces, communal courtyards, associated landscaping and associated ancillary works.</p> <p>Minor Material Amendments to Planning permission Ref: PA/18/00917, Dated 12/09/2019:</p> <p>Amendments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall increase of residential units [from 648 to 698];</li> <li>• Increase in affordable unit provision [from 159 to 180 (32% to 35% of total)];</li> <li>• Increased height to blocks A and C (up to two additional storeys). Block A would be up to 22 storeys and Block C up to 26 storeys.</li> <li>• Amended residential unit mix</li> <li>• Reduction in on-site parking spaces</li> <li>• Increased office floorspace (use class B1)</li> <li>• Additional amenity space and associated works</li> </ul> <p>The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement</p>
-----	-------------	--	---

## 1. Description of Development

- 1.1 In the Description of Development, 183 rather than 180 affordable units are proposed. In 2.4, 20% of the B1 floorspace would be offered at a 10% discount (as set out in the recommendation at 8.3. In 7.58 it should state that the previous scheme had 32 rather than 27 off-street parking spaces.

## 2. Additional Representations

- 2.1 Since publication of the agenda, one more letter of objection has been received.
- 2.2 The additional material planning considerations raised include; 1) object to additional height on the tower and the units facing Raven Row; 2) The scheme will set a new benchmark across Whitechapel for height; 3) Daylight/Sunlight Assessment understates impact and should be updated following late changes to scheme. Other studies i.e. wind should be updated

too; 4) Applicant's consultation material is misleading; 5) A condition should ensure that the open space should be available to the public throughout the year and not be closed or gated at any time; 6) There should be a security management plan.