

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 6.30 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 16 FEBRUARY 2022

**COUNCIL CHAMBER - TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE CRESCENT,
LONDON, E14 2BG**

Members Present:

Councillor Kevin Brady (Chair)
Councillor Abdul Mukit MBE (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Sabina Akhtar
Councillor Kahar Chowdhury
Councillor David Edgar
Councillor Tarik Khan
Councillor Val Whitehead
Councillor Kabir Ahmed

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Andrew Wood

Apologies:

None

Officers Present:

Paul Buckenham	– (Head of Development Management, Planning Services, Place)
Jerry Bell	– (Area Planning Manager (East), Planning Services, Place)
Patrick Harmsworth	– (Principal Planning Officer, Planning Services, Place)
Nelupa Malik	– (Principal Planner (East Area Team) ,Place)
Siddhartha Jha	– (Principal Planning Lawyer, Legal Services, Governance)
Zoe Folley	– (Democratic Services Officer, Committees, Governance)

1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER INTERESTS

None reported

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

RESOLVED:

1. That the minutes of the meeting of the Strategic Development Committee held on 14th December 2022 be agreed as a correct record

3. RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS AND MEETING GUIDANCE

To RESOLVE 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 Strategic Development Committee.

4. DEFERRED ITEMS

There were none

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

5.1 Ensign House, 17 Admirals Way, Isle of Dogs, London, E14 9XQ (PA/21/00952)

Update report published.

Paul Buckenham introduced the report for the demolition of the existing building and the comprehensive redevelopment of the site to provide a single tall building providing a mixed use development.

He also drew attention to the update report including the clarification of the Canary Wharf (Isle of Dogs) Tall Building Zone (TBZ).

Nelupa Malik presented the report describing the site and the key features of the application.

The Committee received details of:

- The outcome of the public consultation and the issues raised.
- Details of the proposed housing – comprising 35% affordable housing based on habitable rooms, with a tenure split of 71%:29% between Affordable Rent and Intermediate. Officers noted the issues with the overprovision and under provision of certain unit types in relation to policy. However the scheme will provide a range of much needed housing including the policy compliant affordable housing, of a good quality. Therefore, on balance, the housing mix was considered to be acceptable
- That the loss of office floorspace could be considered as acceptable, given the underutilised nature of the site and the benefits of the application.
- The scheme sought to provide landscaping enhancements, as well as a new pocket park and public realm with increased permeability. Child play space will also be provided in certain locations on the site. The level of this fell short of policy for certain age groups - Due to the site constraints and the difficulties with providing additional play space on site. This will be mitigated by a contribution to offset the shortfall.
- The height, scale, massing, form, architectural appearance and design is considered to be of a high-quality and had been designed to respond well to the area. Members noted an overview of the design and appearance of the proposal.
- Reassurances were also provided about the development's relationship with heritage assets. Historic England had no concerns about this.
- Reassurances were also provided about the impact on neighbourhood amenity - in terms of daylight, sunlight, overshadowing, outlook or sense of enclosure. Overall, the proposal would maintain a good level of neighbourhood amenity.
- Other key benefits of the scheme included: biodiversity enhancements.
- A range of financial and non financial contributions had also been secured.

Officers recommend the proposed development be granted planning permission, subject to conditions and obligations identified to be secured via a S106 agreement.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee

Councillor Andrew Wood spoke in objection to the application expressing concerns about the following issues:

- Capacity of local infrastructure to accommodate another new development in area given level of development. This was particularly in the context of the water supply issues, the lack of playground space, the closure of police stations, youth centre cuts and the lack of funding generally for infrastructure.

- Failure to comply with the Isle of Dogs Neighbourhood Plan. Particularly the failure to implement the elements in this relation to infrastructure.
- Poor doors.

John Connolly, applicant's representative, spoke in support of the application. He highlighted the following points.

- He provided details of the policy compliant level of affordable housing and the benefits of this.
- That the Fire Authority had been consulted. They were satisfied with the development subject to the conditions. The Applicant would continue to engage with them
- That the height, scale and massing had evolved and had been subject to detailed scrutiny. In summary, the development would provide a valuable addition to the area
- Other key benefits of the development included: high quality public realm with improved access.
- The applicant was aware of the challenges around the provision of infrastructure in the area and the importance of early engagement, in relation this. They had been involved in this from the onset. In addition, they participated in community partnerships and were committed to contributing to local employment, skills and training, as part of the scheme.

The Committee asked a number of questions of Officers and the registered speakers around the following issues:

- Fire safety issues. It was noted that the application had been accompanied by a Fire Safety Strategy report. The Fire Authority had confirmed they were satisfied with the development subject to compliance with the recommendations in the strategy and this will be secured by condition. The issue will also be managed under building regulations.
- Impact on infrastructure from developments in area, (such as on public transport network and the water supply). It was questioned how these concerns would be allayed? It was noted that Officers and the applicant had assessed this as part of the Environmental Statement, including details of the cumulative impacts from developments in the area. The assessment had been independently reviewed and found to be adequate. This assessment had taken into account a wide range of issues. Any impacts would also be mitigated by the CIL contributions.
- Regarding the water pressures and the responses of the statutory consultees. It was noted that they had a statutory requirement to supply developments. This was a matter for these bodies to deal with. They had not raised any concerns about the development. Officers were mindful of these concerns, but provided assurances these issues were being dealt with by the relevant processes.
- Officers also advised that the relevant policies had been considered including the Isle of Dogs Neighbourhood Plan as set out in the report.

- Councillor Andrew Wood expanded on his points about the capacity of infrastructure. He noted that there was a great deal of uncertainty regarding water capacity in the area and about electricity capacity – especially given UK Power Network concerns. He also drew attention to Mayor of London’s Infrastructure document. He considered that the Council were well behind in terms of delivering this. He also expressed concern about the lack of space in Marsh Wall to deliver CIL funded projects.
- The Committee requested a report regarding these issues – the capacity of infrastructure to accommodate new developments.
- The issue of ‘poor doors’. Members expressed concerns about the availability of a single door for all tenures. Members discussed whether steps could be taken to address this and to provide a single entrance to ensure that the scheme was tenure blind and inclusive.
- The Committee agreed to add a condition regarding the provision of a single door, whilst also ensuring properties remained affordable.
- Accessibility of the child play space and need for conditions to secure full access to this. Officers advised that conditions could be imposed to ensure the play space was fully accessible to all tenures at all times. In terms of the shortfall, contributions would be provided to offset this, based on a formulae.
- Landscaping. Members were keen to ensure the submission of a landscaping strategy to maximise the provision of green space. It was agreed that an additional condition should be added in relation to this.
- Members also discussed access to the resident’s amenity space and the clubhouse. It was questioned how best to ensure equal access to these facilities? Officers advised that the proposals met the policy requirements, in terms of the access arrangements. The additional facilities would have a charge and this was at the applicant’s discretion. The Applicant stated that everyone would have access to amenity space and the club house subject to the charges. The Applicant also added that they were working with a number of Housing Associations. They had consulted them and had incorporated their requests in the design.
- The energy usage and need for a carbon neutral development. It was questioned how does the development meet best practice? It was noted that the development exceeded the minimum requirements in this regard. It was also noted that the proposed landscaping plans including the provision of new trees with other features such as the provision of a biodiverse roof. Properties would be BREAM compliant
- The site-wide reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 57.4%. Officers confirmed that the Energy Strategy had been assessed by the GLA and the Council’s Energy officers. It went beyond what was normally required.
- Sound ventilation and noise management. The scheme had been designed to minimise any impacts. In summary, the noise impact has been assessed as part of the Environmental Assessment and found to be adequate. A condition would also be imposed to mitigate any impacts in this regard.

- Housing tenure mix. It was noted that officers had worked to improve the tenure mix, in terms of the affordable housing provision across the development. In relation to the service charges, these were set by the Council's Housing Team in accordance with policy.
- The need for a viability housing assessment. It was confirmed that since the scheme sought to provide a policy compliant level of housing, it qualified as a Fast Track scheme. Consequently, there was no need for a viability assessment to be submitted.
- The target for new jobs and how this had been worked out.
- Assessment of sunlight and daylight impacts.
- Density issues and the policy on this. Officers considered that the scheme was acceptable on these grounds.

Councillor Kevin Brady moved and the Committee agreed additional conditions as set out in resolution 3 below:

On a vote of 7 in favour and 1 against the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That subject to any direction by the Mayor of London, conditional planning permission is **GRANTED** for the following development:

- Demolition of the existing building (Use Class E) and the comprehensive redevelopment of the site to provide a single tall building (205m AOD to the top of the building and 230m AOD to the top of the spire) providing residential accommodation (Use Class C3) along with a mix of flexible commercial uses (Use Class E) at ground floor level with associated hard and soft landscaping including the delivery of a new pocket park providing general public realm improvements.

[The Application is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment]

2. subject the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the obligations set out in the Committee report.

3. The conditions set out in the report – subject to the following additional conditions agreed by the Committee relating to:

- Amended layout of ground floor to provide a single external entrance for residents in the market and affordable tenures
- Playspace Management Plan
- Details of the landscaping strategy.
- A strategy in relation to empty site policy and meanwhile uses
- Securing a Home Quality Mark Accreditation

6. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

6.1 Former Hatton House, Queen Mary University, Westfield Way, London, E1 (PF/21/00192)

Update report published.

The Committee considered the presentation in accordance with the protocol.

The Committee discussed a number of issues around:

- Work on materiality of building, particularly in terms of the heritage sensitivities.
- The landscaping was felt to be important, both on the campus section and where it related to the canal. Particular regard paid to the provision of soft landscaping and greenery; and the use of the open space at different times for different activities.
- Ensuring local consultation and engagement was extensive and robust.
- The extension to 357 Mile End Road and the importance of not undermining the heritage significant of that asset.
- Ensuring that the application is seen in terms of the wider requirement for additional university floorspace on the campus.

RESOLVED:

The Committee notes the contents of the report and pre-application presentation for the following development.

- Redevelopment of the former Hatton House site to provide Education and Teaching Floorspace (Use Class F.1)

The meeting ended at 9.00 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Kevin Brady
Strategic Development Committee