

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 6.00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 17 SEPTEMBER 2020

ONLINE 'VIRTUAL' MEETING - [HTTPS://TOWERHAMLETS.PUBLIC-TV/CORE/PORTAL/HOME](https://towerhamlets.public-tv/core/portal/home)

Members Present:

Councillor Abdul Mukit MBE (Chair)
Councillor John Pierce (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Kahar Chowdhury
Councillor Dipa Das
Councillor Rajib Ahmed (Substitute for Councillor Mufeedah Bustin)

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Sirajul Islam (Statutory Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Housing)

Officers Present:

Jane Abraham	– (Housing Project Manager, Corporate Property and Capital Delivery)
Jerry Bell	– (Area Planning Manager (East), Planning Services, Place)
Sally Fraser	– (Team Leader (East), Place)
Siddhartha Jha	– (Principal Planning Lawyer, Governance, Legal Services)
Antonia McClean	– (Planning Officer, Place)
John Miller	– (Planning Officer, Place)
Gareth Owens	– (Daylight and Sunlight Consultant, Place)
Zoe Folley	– (Democratic Services Officer, Committees, Governance)

Apologies:

Councillor Mufeedah Bustin
Councillor Leema Qureshi

1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interests in items on the agenda

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 9 July 2020 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. The procedure for hearing objections and meeting guidance be noted.
2. In the event of changes being made to recommendations by the Committee, the task of formalising the wording of those changes be delegated to the Corporate Director, Place along the broad lines indicated at the meeting; and
3. 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 be delegated authority to do so, provided always that the Corporate Director does not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision

4. DEFERRED ITEMS

There are none.

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

5.1 Existing garages, Vawdrey Close, London, E1 4UA (PA/20/00580)

Jerry Bell (Area Planning Manager (East), Planning Services, Place) introduced the application for the demolition of existing garages and construction of four new family-sized houses. It was reported that following the removal of the application from the August 2020 Committee agenda, due to an issue with the consultation, additional consultation had been undertaken and the results were noted in the update report.

Antonia McClean (Planning Services) presented the report, describing the proposals and the existing site.

Two rounds of consultation had been carried out. In response concerns had been raised regarding a number of issues. Details of how these would be managed were noted and set out in the report.

The Committee were advised of the key elements of the scheme including:

- That the development would result in the provision of 100% affordable rented housing with two dwellings designed for persons with autism.
- The standard of the accommodation would be high and included external amenity space.
- That the development would be of a good quality design and fit in with the area.
- That the development would provide a number of security features, including the provision of fob access to maintain access to Vawdrey Close.
- That the proposal also included measures to protect amenity whilst maximising sunlight and daylight levels.
- The site had a good PTAL rating and residents could apply for blue badge parking.
- There will be a net gain of biodiversity given the landscaping improvements.

In summary, whilst officers were mindful of the issues with the displacement of vehicles from garages, given the benefits of the scheme (including the provision of the affordable housing) Officers considered that the application was acceptable and should be granted permission.

The Chair invited the registered speakers to address the Committee.

Mashraf Ali and Abul Monsur spoke in objection to the application. They expressed concerns regarding the:

- The impact on the character and appearance of the area.
- Overdevelopment/overcrowding.
- The design and the scale of the scheme. It would be out of keeping with the area.
- Overshadowing and loss of privacy. The height would overshadow existing developments.
- Increased parking and traffic congestion due to the loss of the garages. It was explained that the garages were currently in use, therefore, their loss would result in parking displacement, and potentially increased parking on the pavement.
- The impact on access, (i.e. emergency access, deliveries and waste vehicle access). Concerns were expressed that the road was already very narrow leading to restrictions on access.
- Inadequate consultation.
- Loss of amenities

Anna Woodeson, Jane Abraham (Housing Project Manager, Corporate Property and Capital Delivery) and with the permission of the Chair, Councillor Sirajul Islam (Statutory Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Housing and ward Councillor) spoke in support of the application. They highlighted the merits of the scheme including:

- The delivery of good quality environmentally friendly family homes that complied with policy. The accommodation comprised family sized housings for autistic persons. The development would deliver

affordable homes for local residents, that would help meet the housing needs.

- The retention and protection of the large Tree
- That in response to the consultation, the scheme had been amended to address issues and review the impact on parking displacement.
- Of the 14 garages, ten would be re -provide. The remaining garages used for storage or rented privately would not be provided.
- That the parking arrangements were in line with policy.
- That Highway Services had considered the scheme and found the servicing arrangements to be acceptable.

Questions to the applicant:

In response, the Committee asked questions about vehicle access, in view of the concerns about vehicles reversing on a narrow road and emergency access. It was considered that the delivery of housing on the site could improve the situation in this regard. The issues had been examined in detail and the Waste Services Team had no issues in regard to access for waste vehicles. The application should have no adverse impact on the pavement or the highway. Regarding the loss of garages, it was confirmed that of the 14 garages, 10 would be re - provided.

Regarding the landscaping improvements, it was proposed to provide such improvements up to the 'red line'. The Council could provide further improvements to the wider area under separate plans. A range of landscaping enhancements would be provided including: the provision of dense plants, resulting in a net uplift of biodiversity enhancements, alongside the retention of the tree.

In relation to the consultation issues, it was reported that the applicant had carried consultation in line with their original commitments.

In response to further questions, the speakers highlighted the growing need for new housing for people with autism. It was also noted that the local letting policy applied to this scheme, requiring that a percentage of the dwellings were let to local residents.

Questions to Officers

In response to questions, it was confirmed that the daylight and sunlight impacts had been carefully assessed and that the majority met the guidelines. It was also emphasised that the Council carried out two rounds of statutory consultation.

On a vote of 5 in favour and 0 against the Committee RESOLVED:

1. That, subject to any direction by the Mayor of London, planning permission is GRANTED at Existing garages, Vawdrey Close, London, E1 4UA for the

- Demolition of existing garages and construction of four new family-sized houses
- 2. 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

5.2 Land at Bancroft TMC and Wickford Street Garages, Wickford Street, London, (E1PA/19/02611)

Jerry Bell introduced this application for the demolition of Bancroft TMC building and Wickford Street garages and construction of a part-two, part-three and part-six storey mixed use development.

John Miller, (Planning Services) presented the report advising that the application related to the Bancroft TMC site and the Garages site. The following points were noted:

- That the proposed land use could be supported, given that the proposed residential use complied with policy and the quality of the replacement office/commercial space.
- The development would result in the provision of 100% affordable rented housing, resulting in a mixed and balance community in housing mix terms.
- The housing mix would be broadly in line with policy, including a number of wheelchair accessible units.
- The density of the scheme was in line with London Plan standards.
- There would be an overprovision of child play space, in excess of policy.
- The design would respond well to the surrounding area, and would be secure by design
- Whilst the scheme would result in a net loss of open space, the proposal sought to improve the offer. The wider landscaping plans included, hard and soft landscaping and child play space and biodiversity enhancements.
- In terms of amenity, the scheme had been designed to maximise separation distances, which were broadly in line with the Council's amenity policy. Therefore, the development would result in no undue amenity impacts.
- The impact on daylight and sunlight had been carefully assessed as detailed in the report. Whilst the scheme would result in localised impacts (particularly at Wickford House, and 64 -134 Cambridge Heath Road), the impacts were found to be acceptable given the context, as detailed in the report and the wider benefits of the scheme.
- The proposal would be acceptable with regard to highway and transportation matters including parking, access and servicing. The Council's Highway Officer had no concerns about the loss of parking bays and garages or the transport and highway issues in general.
- A range of contributions had been secured.
Officers were recommending the proposed development was granted planning permission.

It was noted that the objector registered to speak had decided to withdraw from addressing the Committee. With the Chair's permission, the applicant's representative, Viviana Vivanco was permitted to answer questions from the Committee.

In response to the presentation, the Committee asked questions about: the increase in residents from the development and the impacts from the scheme. It was confirmed that the density tests had been completed and that the density was in line with London Plan Standards.

Regarding the noise impact from the nearby railway track, it was noted that the submitted noise assessment had been carefully considered by the Council's noise officer and conditions would be secured to ensure that the impact on the most noise sensitive properties would be acceptable. Subject to the conditions, the officer considered that the plans were acceptable. In addition, the layout had been designed to position noise sensitive rooms away from tracks. It was also noted that the relationship between the development and the railway track was not an uncommon situation.

In relation to parking, it was noted that a Transport Survey had been carried out and anyone who used the garages should be able to park in the wider estate.

It was also confirmed that since the development provided 100% affordable housing, it is exempt from providing CIL contributions.

The Committee also asked questions about the tenure split given the slight overprovision of one bed units. Members also noted that the level of three bed units marginally fell below policy requirements. In response, the applicant's representative highlighted the high number of family sized units to be provided in the development. Due to the emphasis on this and the site constraints, it was noted that there would be a slight overprovision of one bed units. It was also pointed out that there was a need for one bed units and that the strategic provision of housing should result in the provision of a large number of family housing in the Borough.

On a vote of 5 in favour and 0 against the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That, subject to any direction by the Mayor of London, planning permission is GRANTED at Land at Bancroft TMC and Wickford Street Garages, Wickford Street, London, E1 for:
 - Demolition of Bancroft TMC building and Wickford Street garages and construction of a part-two, part-three and part-six storey building comprising Class D1/B1(a) community/office use at ground/first floor and 15 x Class C3 residential dwellings on the upper floors together with associated private amenity areas, cycle parking and refuse/recycling stores (Site 1) and a part 3 and part 5 storey building comprising 18 x Class C3 residential dwellings together with associated private amenity areas, cycle/blue badge car parking (in the

form of 3 x new accessible parking bays and 1 x replacement accessible parking bay) and refuse/recycling stores (Site 2) and new and enhanced public realm, associated hard and soft landscaping, new and improved vehicular and pedestrian access and associated highways improvements to Wickford Street.

2. Subject to the conditions set out in the Committee report

5.3 Brunton Wharf Estate, Salmon Lane, London, E14 (PA/19/02608)

Update report was tabled.

Jerry Bell introduced the application for the construction of a part-four and part-nine storey building comprising 32 x Class C3 residential dwellings, hard and soft landscaping works, security enhancements, and the re-opening of an existing undercroft parking structure.

Sally Fraser (Planning Services) introduced the report, describing the site location and views from the surrounding area. Public consultation had been carried out, resulting in the receipt of 27 objections including a survey of residents opinion. A summary of the responses was noted.

The following issues were noted:

- In land use terms, the scheme will deliver 100% affordable housing with 50% of the units to be offered at the London Affordable rent and the remaining 50% at the Tower Hamlets Living rent.
- The scheme would deliver a broadly compliant housing tenure mix, with a minor deviation in policy.
- The housing would be of a high quality.
- There would be wheelchair accessible units and 3 disabled parking bays.
- In terms of the design, the 9 storey element would mark the corner of site. It had been through various iterations and the height had been reduced. It was considered that the development would fit well into the area with a strong architectural approach and robust material palette.
- In terms of the landscaping, the quantum of communal amenity space exceeded policy requirements. The proposed site wide landscaping works would enhance and expand upon the existing provision, for the benefit of existing and future residents
- The plans sought to provide a generous level of child space which was policy compliant in relation to new units.
- The application proposed changes to parking arrangements, including the relocation of parking spaces and revised on site serving arrangements, accessed off Yorkshire Road, which were supported.
- Details of the site wide security enhancements would be secured by condition. There would be no gates to the community garden.
- The impacts on neighbouring amenity had been carefully tested. It was considered that there would be no noticeable impacts to properties in terms of daylight, sunlight, overshadowing, outlook or enclosure.
- The public benefits of the scheme were noted.

Officers were recommending that the application was granted planning permission.

The Chair invited the registered speakers to address the Committee.

Ian Campbell, spoke in objection the scheme. He expressed concerns about the following issues:

- That the drawings were out of date on the Council's planning portal. They had been changed very recently with the loss of security features, visitor space and changes to the community food garden.
- Overdevelopment of the area and reduction in amenity space
- Size and height of the development.
- Fire access issues
- Increased noise.
- The plans should be deferred to allow further consideration to be given to the issues.

Simon Thorpe spoke in support of the application. He provided assurances about the stakeholder consultation. The feedback had informed the design of the proposal. He emphasised the merits of the scheme which included - the provision of affordable housing, estate improvements, new security features, improved access to the canal as well as the landscaping and child play space. The proposal had been evaluated by Officers and the sunlight/daylight impacts were found to be acceptable. There would be conditions to mitigate any impacts. He also underlined the developer's commitment to carrying out ongoing consultation to keep everyone informed.

With the permission of the Chair, Council Sirajul Islam spoke in support of the application. He advised that the development would contribute to the Council's housing targets. A percentage of the Housing would be let in accordance with the local lettings policy. He also highlighted a number of merits of the scheme and provided assurances regarding the mitigation measures.

Questions to Officers

The Committee asked questions about the removal of the gates from the plans to the community food gardens. It was confirmed that:

- The gates were originally proposed to restrict access to the inner parts of the site, and after discussions it was decided that the gates should be removed. Officers were of the view that other measures should be used instead in line with Council policy. There were many elements of the design that would enhance security. Conditions would be imposed to ensure that details of the landscaping were submitted and to ensure they were secure by design.
- It was also noted that the Management Plan could be amended to enable all residents to have freely available access to the food garden whilst preventing ASB.

- In response to further questions, Officers showed images of the layout of the scheme, including the food garden. This confirmed that the layout as proposed lacked a fence line.
- It was also noted that the food garden would remain in the existing location however with revised access arrangements, to allow residents to have free access to the gardens and the canal side garden.
- Access at present could only be secured currently through applying to the TRA.

Regarding the CCTV and linking this to the Borough system, it was noted that the conditions could be amended to ensure this.

Regarding the refuse arrangements for Anglia House, it was noted that it would remain as existing.

In response to questions about the changes to the plans, it was noted that the Council carried out consultation on material changes to the proposals. Only two non material changes to the plans had been made around the removal of gates to the garden and changes to the servicing arrangements.

Questions to objector,

In response to questions, Mr Campbell expressed concerns about the proposed relocation of the refuse area, given the additional walking distance for residents, particularly elderly residents. He also stressed the need for the gate to the food gardens prevent ASB, and the current arrangements to allow residents access. The garden was available to all, but was protected by a security gate, which could be accessed via the TRA.

Questions to applicant.

Mr Thorpe provided assurances about the plans to ensure the scheme was secure by design, and the provision of CCTV. The applicant was willing to ensure that this was connected to the Borough network. He also commented on the plans to allow free access to the reorganised food garden and the canal side amenity space.

The Committee also sought further clarify on the fire access issues.

In view of the issues raised, Councillor Dipa Das moved and Councillor John Pierce seconded a proposal that the consideration of the application be deferred for a Committee site visit.

On a vote of 3 in favour and 2 against the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That the application at Brunton Wharf Estate, Salmon Lane, London, E14 be **deferred** for a Committee site visit.

The meeting ended at 9.15 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Abdul Mukit MBE
Development Committee