

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 6.30 P.M. ON MONDAY, 21 MARCH 2022**

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

**Members Present:**

Councillor Abdul Mukit MBE (Chair)  
Councillor Kevin Brady (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Leema Qureshi  
Councillor Dan Tomlinson  
Councillor Kabir Ahmed  
Councillor David Edgar  
Councillor Tarik Khan (Item 5.1)

**Councillors Present virtually:**

None

**Other Councillors Present:**

Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman

**Officers Present:**

Jerry Bell	– (Area Planning Manager (East), Planning Services, Place)
Paul Buckenham	– (Head of Development Management, Planning Services, Place)
Nicholas Jehan	– (Planning Officer, Development Management – West Area)
Diane Phillips	– (Lawyer, Legal Services)
Kitty Eyre	– (Planning Officer, Place)
Simon Westmorland	– (West Area Team Leader, Planning Services, Place)
Zoe Folley	– (Democratic Services Officer, Committees, Chief Executive's Office)

**Apologies:**

Councillor Kyrsten Perry  
Councillor Sabina Akhtar  
Councillor Sufia Alam

**1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER INTERESTS**

None declared

## 2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

The Committee **RESOLVED**

1. That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2022 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

### 4.1 Walker House, 6-8 Boundary Street (PA/20/01442/A1)

Update report published.

Paul Buckenham introduced the application for change of use of first floor office use to 4no residential units with the construction of a two-storey building to the rear to provide office space

As set out in the Minutes of the meeting, the Committee considered the application at it's previous meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2022 where they deferred the application to allow for a site visit to take place. This took place on 14<sup>th</sup> March with four Members in attendance. The update report sets out additional representations and proposed conditions.

Nicholas Jehan, provided an update on the application briefly reminding Members of the key features of the application including:

- The site location and surrounding area.
- The proposed extension plans.
- Elevations of the proposals

- Outcome of public consultation. A total of 50 representations were received, as well 4 additional representations from previous objectors. These raised no new planning issues.

Members were advised of the changes that had been made to the application to overcome the concerns. This was in relation to:

- Windows looking on to Wargrave House to the south. The Committee were reminded of the separations distances between the ground floor windows and the proposals (that ranged between approximately 18.7m to a minimum of 12.1m). They also noted that due to the mitigating factors, such as the position of the windows and that the Ivy growth should help obscure the windows, these features should lessen the impacts and the proposals accorded with the London Plan guidance. The applicant has also agreed that windows will now be obscure, which would be secured by condition as detailed in the Committee report. As requested at the site visit, the applicant had also provided an updated photograph of the proposal's relationship with Wargrave House. This was noted, illustrating the position of the Ivy and that the visibility of the building should not cause any concerns.
- Light Pollution from windows. Additional conditions had been agreed securing the installation and on-going maintenance (and replacement, if necessary) for the life of the development of an appropriate automated system such that the blinds are closed between certain hours all year round to alleviate concerns as to light pollution.
- Ivy retention on perimeter wall. It was proposed that details of the Landscape Plan condition be updated to ensure appropriate measures are introduced that will safeguard the existing level of growth and/or screening is retained in perpetuity. Following the discussions at the site visit, Officers are also proposing that a root protection plan for the existing vegetation be secured by condition to ensure that the vegetation will be appropriately protected throughout the development.
- Verified Views. The applicant has provided a summary of the methodology for the generation of the CGI visualisations which can be found at Appendix 2 of the report. Officers are satisfied with the accuracy of the imagery.

In summary Officers considered that that the proposed measures addressed the concerns and these would be outweighed by the benefits of the scheme. The application complied with policy and Officers remained of the view that the application should be granted subject to the proposed conditions in the Committee report and the additional conditions in the update reports.

The Committee discussed the following issues:

- The Committee sought further details of the relationship with Wargrave House and Leyton House, and the nature of the nearest properties that would be most affected. They also asked questions about the London Plan guidance policy on separation distances and how the proposals complied with this.

- It was confirmed that: due to the mitigating factors, including the design of the building that should prevent overlooking and the proposed conditions, Officers did not consider that there should be any potential for overlooking with residential properties.
- Tower Hamlets Local Plan stated that the 18 metre separation distances should be treated as guidance. The design and layout should also be taken into account in assessing separation distances. On this basis, Officers considered that the proposal complied with the policy. The measures should address the concerns.
- It was also confirmed that the separation distance between the north elevation and Leyton House would be 4.5 metres, but there would be intervisibility with the proposal.
- The windows most affected in Walker House served a commercial property. No residential windows would be affected according to the sunlight and daylight report. They were the only windows that would 'be blocked up'.
- It was also confirmed that the installation of the electric blinds and the measures regarding the retention of the Ivy would be secured via conditions, which would be enforceable.
- A Member reported that they were not satisfied with the height, bulk scale of the development in the location. They considered that it would result in overdevelopment and would be out of keeping with the area. They also expressed concerns about the distances with Wargrave House and Leyton House

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

1. That, subject to any direction by the Mayor of London, planning permission is **GRANTED** at Walker House, 6-8 Boundary Street for the following development

- Change of use of first floor office use (use class B1a) to 4no residential units (Use class C3). Construction of a two-storey building to the rear to provide office space (use class B1a). Amendments to residential entrance at junction of Boundary Street and Calvert Avenue (PA/20/01442/A1)

2. Subject to:

The prior completion of a legal agreement as set out in the original report dated 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2022

That the Corporate Director of Place is delegated power to impose the conditions and informatives as set out in the original report dated 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2022

The following additional condition set out in the 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2022 Update report:

- the amendments to the residential entrance of Walker House are to be undertaken prior to occupation of the new office and residential development.

The following additional conditions as set out in the 21<sup>st</sup> March 2022 report:

- approval of details and installation and on-going future maintenance of an appropriate automated blind system to be operated between certain specific times prior to first occupation; and
- obscure glazing to south elevation and rooflights above waste store.

The following additional conditions as set out in the 21<sup>st</sup> March 2022 Update report:

- Windows on the south elevation to be both obscure glazed and unopenable; and
- Submission and approval of a root protection plan for the existing vegetation prior to commencement of works.

Councillor Abdul Mukit MBE and Councillor Leema Qureshi voted against the recommendation to grant permission.

## **5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION**

### **5.1 Land comprising Harriot, Apsley & Pattison Houses and the Redcoat Community Centres, Stepney Green, London, E1(PA/21/02703)**

Update report published.

Paul Buckenham introduced the application for the redevelopment of the site comprising demolition of existing buildings to provide a residential led scheme.

Kitty Eyre presented the report highlighting the key features of the application including:

- Site location, the nature of the surrounding area and the existing site use.
- Heritage context.
- The public engagement, consisting of three phases. The residents ballots revealed widespread support for the development. In response to the statutory consultation: 17 representatives were received, along with two petitions in objection, and 20 representations in support. The issues raised were outlined.
- Regarding the land use, the principle of residential use has been established. The development would provide much needed new housing, with high quality community facilities.
- The development would provide landscaped open space that exceeded local plan policy requirements, whilst a reduction from existing

- The character, appearance, height and massing of the development will be in keeping with the local context.
- The proposal would re-provide 70 affordable rented and shared ownership properties on the site of a high quality. It would deliver 55% affordable homes overall (including the re-provided units) and 42% affordable housing (excluding re-provided units). The proposal would be delivered in phases which was noted.
- The impact in terms of amenity would be minimal.
- The Committee also noted details of the transport matters, (including the policy compliant cycle storage, the wheelchair assessable parking), the environmental benefits and the financial and non - financial contributions.

Officers were recommending that the application was granted planning permission.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the meeting.

Councillor Motin Uz - Zaman, the local Ward Councillor for Stepney Green, addressed the meeting in support of the application. He noted the level of support for the application and the positive work between the council and community to develop the scheme. He also advised that the existing building was in a state of disrepair and this should regenerate the site, providing affordable homes and community facilities.

The Committee asked questions around the following issues:

- Distance between the disabled parking and wheelchair assessable units. It was confirmed that 32 would be located within a ground level car park with two on the inner street. Officers were mindful of the distances between some spaces and the wheelchair accessible units and had engaged with Transport Services about the possible of addressing this.
- Electric vehicle charging points. It was requested that this should be increased to provide 50% from 20% given the need to provide such facilities. The Committee agreed to add an informative to this affect, as set out in the resolution
- Sunlight and daylight impacts to neighbouring properties. These were set out in the assessment in the Committee report. Officers confirmed that the impacts complied with policy as detailed in the report. It was also considered that any development of the site would have some impact on daylight and sunlight levels to existing properties.
- The impact on trees given the removal of trees. It was noted that most of the trees would be retained. It was proposed that a number of semi mature replacement trees would be planted, as part of the landscaping condition, in view of the removal of the category b and c trees. Overall, there would be a net increase in trees and biodiversity due to the development.
- Application of the Parking Permit Transfer Scheme. With the permission of the Chair, James Walsh, from the applicant's team,

outlined the proposed approach. The terms of the scheme would apply to the scheme as it would be car free. However, Highways Services had confirmed that the existing tenants will retain current rights.

- Accessibility of the landscaped open space to the occupants and the public. It was noted that the two communal courtyards would only be accessible to the future occupants of the development and that all of the occupants would have access to that space. The inner street including play space would be fully open to everyone.
- The differences between the Council's and the GLA's treatment of the resident leaseholder products, in terms of their classification as intermediate products as detailed in the report. The affordability of the rents which was set out in the Committee report
- Results of the residents ballots. A Member noted that it would be useful if more information could be included in the report, such as the number eligible to vote.
- Noise proofing. It was confirmed that conditions would be secured to ensure that the development met appropriate standards.
- Quality of the replacement housing. It was noted that all would be of a good quality, modern, at the same or of a larger size, than existing properties with private amenity. The applicant would work with the occupants regarding the need to provide an open plan layout or not.
- Damage to the environment from demolition works. It was confirmed that the proposed energy efficiency measures would result in a 72% net reduction in carbon emissions compared to the GLA baseline measurement. This exceeded London Plan requirements. In response to further questions about the merits of demolishing the building compared to refurbishment, Mr Walsh highlight the benefits of providing a new building. It was considered that the provision of a new building could better address the issues and provide a more energy efficient building.
- The status of the landlords offer set out the Cabinet report. The applicant provided reassurances that they fully intended to comply with this.
- The plans to re-provide the community centre. It was noted that the community uses may accommodate a number of different uses classes, which could include a place of worship. It was proposed that conditions be secured regarding amplified noise and hours of prayer with sufficient flexibility to accommodate prayer times.
- Regarding the Petition, it was noted that changes had been made to the application to address the issues raised in the Petition regarding the light and ventilation to the main hall of the proposed community space. The plans have since been amended to provide windows on the east elevation, providing natural light and ventilation to the main hall.

Councillor Dan Tomlinson proposed and Councillor Kevin Brady seconded an additional informative recommending that the developer work towards the provision of 50% Electric Vehicle Parking Points. On a vote of 5 in favour and 2 against this was **agreed**.

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

1. That, subject to any direction by the Mayor of London, planning permission is GRANTED at Land comprising Harriot, Apsley & Pattison Houses and the Redcoat Community Centres, Stepney Green, London, E1 for the following development:
  - Redevelopment of the site comprising demolition of existing buildings (including Harriott House, Apsley House, Pattison House, The Redcoat Centre and Redcoat Community Centre) to provide 412 residential units (Class C3) and 1,192m2 GIA of community use (Class E (e-f), Class F1 (e-f), Class F.2 (b)) provided across buildings ranging in height from 4-8 storeys, together with associated landscaped communal amenity space, accessible car parking, secure cycle parking spaces and refuse/recycling storage facilities.
2. Subject to the conditions set out in the report with the additional informative agreed by the Committee that the developer work to provide 50% Electric Vehicle Parking Points

## 6. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

There were none

The meeting ended at 9.00 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Abdul Mukit MBE  
Development Committee