

**STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE 14 DECEMBER 2021  
UPDATE REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL**

<b>Agenda item no</b>	<b>Reference no</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Proposal / Title</b>
5.1	PA/21/00288	Blackwall Way Yard Jetty, Blackwall Way, London	Full Planning Permission for a riverboat station, jetty and associated works at Blackwall Yard.  This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

**1. Additional representations**

1.1 Three additional written representations have been received to the application raising the following points:

- Insufficient time to consider conditions
- Impact of increased footfall to New Providence Wharf estate in terms of security and maintenance costs
- Existing maintenance issues in relation to the New Providence Wharf development
- Existing noise conditions at New Providence Wharf, including impact from intermittent craft operating the route in the area and departures from Trinity Buoy Wharf pier
- Impact on the river wall and increase in maintenance and repair costs
- Use of zero emission or Tier III emission vessels for the jetty
- Capping of the Clipper and river board traffic
- Existing and proposed air quality monitoring
- Air and noise pollution impact from the proposal to residents of New Providence Wharf
- Site's inclusion in the GLA's Air Quality Focus Area and Tower Hamlets Air Quality Management Area
- Policy documents and requirements in relation to air quality
- No consideration of existing jetties in the Tower Hamlets Air Quality Status Report
- Exceedance of the WHO limit of existing jetties, as indicated in the Air Quality Action Plan
- Existing NOx emissions from river vessels in Tower Hamlets to account to 13%
- Thames's designation as a Nitrogen Emission Control Area
- Failure of Thames Clippers fleet to meet IMO Tier III NOx emissions
- Inclusion of a condition to require the use of all craft producing zero emissions (or close to), no use of engines while moored at the pier and a low speed limit in the vicinity of adjacent buildings at New Providence Wharf and Recycling Centre
- Inclusion of condition that all vessels using the jetty must conform with IMO Tier III emissions or better, such as 100% electric
- Use of section 106 monies in respect of the New Providence Wharf development to mitigate maintenance, security and repair costs to reduce pressure on the leaseholders

1.2 A separate letter has been submitted from the New Providence Wharf resident detailing existing issues regarding maintenance and repair costs in relation to the river wall owned by Ballymore.

## **2. Air Quality – Clarifications**

- 2.1 An additional representation raised a concern in relation to the existing NOx emissions from river vessels. For clarifications, the reference of 0.2% in the Burro Happold's Air Quality Assessment is a London-wide figure while the reference of 13% in the representation relates to borough-wide area.
- 2.2 Having considered additional representations, Officers consider that the proposed pre-operational condition on details on operation times and number/frequency of vessels (condition No.24) should be substituted with a compliance condition which references the operation times, number/frequency and types of vessels as indicated in the submitted documents and assessments.
- 2.3 The proposed compliance condition would require the following:
  - a. Operating hours to be limited to the existing weekday peak RB1 route (7am to 9:30am, 6:00pm to 9pm) and the weekend RB1/5 route (8.30am to 10pm);
  - b. There shall be no more than 5 clipper movements per hour in the vicinity of the jetty, based on current clipper timetable;
  - c. All vessels should have an engine capacity of 1300kW and Tier III NOx emissions (2g/kWh) or better.

## **3. Flood Risk – Additional Information**

- 3.1 Following the re-consultation, Environment Agency raised an objection in relation to the Flood Risk Assessment's failure to take the impacts of climate change into account.
- 3.2 The applicant has provided additional information and revised elevational drawings to demonstrate how the proposed structure will tie into the existing flood defence line and its future raisings in the TE2100 Plan, as well as the operation of the structure to at least the 2065 Maximum Likely Water Level.
- 3.3 The additional information relating to the incorporation of climate change into the flood risk assessment resulted in a structural requirement to increase the height of the two proposed restraint piles to 7m AOD, as indicated on the revised elevational drawings.
- 3.4 Officers consider that the increased height of the restraint piles does not change the assessment of the proposal. The proposed change increases the height of the already proposed piles and results in a limited additional visual impact. In addition, the proposed height increase is required to ensure the usability of the development for its lifetime.
- 3.5 Following their review of the additional information, the EA removed their objection.

## **4. Public access – Additional obligation**

- 4.1 Additional non-financial obligation is proposed to secure public access in perpetuity to the proposed bankseat.

## **5. Substituted drawings**

- 5.1 Appendix 1 of the Committee Report lists application plans and drawings for approval. The following ones have been superseded:

Proposed Clipper Stop Elevations, Drawing No. 20100-WAB-ZZ-00-DR-A-(20)0114  
Proposed Clipper Stop Elevations, Drawing No. 20100-WAB-ZZ-00-DR-A-(20)0115  
Proposed Clipper Stop Elevations, Drawing No. 20100-WAB-ZZ-00-DR-A-(20)0116  
Proposed Clipper Stop Elevations, Drawing No. 20100-WAB-ZZ-00-DR-A-(20)0117

- 5.2 The following drawings should be added to Appendix 1 List of application plans and drawings for approval:

Proposed Clipper Stop Elevations, Drawing No. 20100-WAB-ZZ-00-DR-A-(20)0114 dated 13/12/2021  
Proposed Clipper Stop Elevations, Drawing No. 20100-WAB-ZZ-00-DR-A-(20)0115 dated 13/12/2021  
Proposed Clipper Stop Elevations, Drawing No. 20100-WAB-ZZ-00-DR-A-(20)0116 dated 13/12/2021  
Proposed Clipper Stop Elevations, Drawing No. 20100-WAB-ZZ-00-DR-A-(20)0117 dated 13/12/2021  
Proposed Clipper Stop Elevation (Showing Flood Defense Line), Drawing No. 20100-WAB-ZZ-00-DR-A-(20)0119

## **6. RECOMMENDATION**

- 6.1 As per the original recommendation to GRANT planning permission but subject to the following changes to the list of conditions:

1. Remove condition 24 requiring details on operation times and number/ frequency of vessels.
2. Include a compliance condition detailing the operation times, number/frequency and types of vessels as indicated in the Environmental Statement.

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.2	PA/20/02726	Site at 2-6 Commercial Street, 98 and 101-105 Whitechapel High Street, Commercial Street, Gunthorpe Street, London	Demolition of 101 Whitechapel High Street, 2 – 6 Commercial Street and the western annex of the Canon Barnett Primary School; partial demolition and partial retention of 102 - 105 Whitechapel High Street and redevelopment to provide a building ranging from ground plus 4-14 storeys, comprising office and retail (Class E); relocation and expansion of the existing school playground; associated cycle parking, hard and soft landscaping another associated works.

## 1. Site Visit

1.1 Committee Members undertook a site visit On Thursday Monday 13<sup>th</sup> December.

## 2. Additional Representations

2.1 Five additional representations have been received in objection to the application making the following points:

- Conservation Areas were created to protect against just this kind of over-development.
- Building is far too tall for the site; it is outside the Aldgate Tall Building Zone.
- The number of letters of objection from residents and respected organisations are a clear indication of disapproval.
- CADAP advised further reduction in height and massing, questioned the choice of glass and steel and expressed concern that the school playground would be overshadowed.
- Permission would set a dangerous precedent
- GLA notes that proposal's massing should be reduced.
- Significant loss of daylight. Officer's report does not detail how much the loss is over 40%. Numerous windows would experience losses of 50-60% or even higher.
- Loss of daylight to Canon Barnett Primary School playground is particularly troubling and would outweigh positive benefit of moving it away from street.
- Public benefits would be insufficient.
- No amount of money can compensate for the demolition of heritage assets in a conservation area. The heritage contribution is a slippery slope
- New public realm is tiny so not a significant public benefit.
- The removal of the public car park could equally be achieved by turning it into a park or putting a one-storey building on it.
- Occasional access to the roof terrace is not a public benefit.
- Additional employment could be achieved with a smaller building
- Only limited ecology and biodiversity benefits.
- Development is unnecessary.
- Improvements to existing building and playground land swap could happen anyway.

- Impact on Toynbee Studios has not been considered.
- The works programme will result in a total of 4 years of noisy works including deep piling which will vibrate through the school building and up to 35 HGVs each day. The
- Dust and pollution next to the school during construction will be enormous.
- Creation of an effective corridor trapping traffic fumes and pollution.

2.1 The applicant would like it noted that 79 support cards have been submitted to them in support of the application, though these were not submitted directly to the Council by signatories.

### **3. Additional points and clarifications**

3.1 The summary of S.106 financial contributions at paras. 7.122 and 8.2 in the report should include the £1,000,000 referenced in para. 7.48 for heritage improvements to be spent on shop front and street facing façade improvements set within close vicinity of the site. The summary of conditions should include conditions to require details of cranes, as sought by London City Airport, and the completion of water network upgrades, as sought by Thames Water.

3.2 Paragraph 7.24 refers to the gap site at 97-98 Whitechapel High Street. For the avoidance of doubt, the development would infill the gap at 98 Whitechapel High Street, with 97 Whitechapel High Street to be filled by extant permission PA/19/00535 (referenced in paragraph 3.1 of the report).

3.3 The concluding line of paragraph 7.70 should read *“any development of scale on the application site would result in a significant impact to these flats given that they face directly over the car park and towards the rear of Commercial Street.”*

### **4. RECOMMENDATION**

4.1 As per the original recommendation to GRANT planning permission but subject to the following additional conditions and financial and non-financial obligations:

Conditions:

- a) Details of any cranes as requested by London City Airport
- b) Completion of water network upgrades as requested by Thames Water

Financial Obligation:

- a) £1,000,000 contribution to improvement works within the Whitechapel High Street Conservation Area

Non-financial Obligation:

- b) Submission of a public engagement and management strategy for Canon Barnett Yard.

