

**STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE 16 JULY 2024
UPDATE REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL**

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
7.2	PA/22/00731	3 & 4 Harbour Exchange Square E14 9TQ	Demolition of existing building and erection of a mixed-use residential led building containing 450 residential units (Class C3) and new podium level to accommodate flexible retail, community, creative, and amenity uses (Class E and F2) as well as basement level blue-badge parking, new public realm and landscaping, and all associated works.

1. Further information and Clarification


- 1.1 The applicant has provided further clarification and confirmation of the public realm improvement area underneath the DLR as an additional supplemental play area, which equates to approximately 330sq.m of additional provision.
- 1.2 As stated in the main report, the proposal already meets the minimum required dedicated provision of child play space for the projected child yield of 167 children (of all age groups), with an overall provision of 1,681sq.m. It is welcoming to see the additional supplemental external play space being provided for a high-density scheme. The total available child play space on site will now be 2,011sq.m.

Using the LBTH Playspace Calculator, the requirements are as follows:

Age Profile	Child Yield	Play space Requirement (m2)	Proposed Provision (m2)
0 – 4 years	64	638	644
5 – 11 years	52	522	525
12 – 18 years	51	506	512
Supplemental play	N/A	N/A	330
TOTAL	167	1,666	2,011

- 1.3 The Appendix (List of application plans and drawings for approval) to the report shall now add the following document:

- One East Point, Play space addendum. Dated July 2024. Planning/Rev00



- ① Publicly accessible supplemental play - 330m²
- ② Possible public access to level 02 play space
- ③ Private entrance
- ④ Affordable entrance
- ⑤ 203m² woodland play space

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
7.3	PA/24/00184 and PA/24/00187	Former London Chest Hospital, Bonner Road, London, E2 9JX	<p>Planning permission for demolition of all existing buildings and structures on site (excluding main hospital building, South Wing and Sanitation Tower) and to redevelop the site to provide residential dwellings (Use Class C3) and flexible commercial and community floorspace (Use Class E(b) / F2(b)) within a converted and extended hospital building and five new buildings ranging from five (5) to nine (9) storeys, with associated works to built heritage, selected removal of TPO trees, plus new tree planting and landscaping works including new shelter surrounding Mulberry Tree (T82), the provision of disabled car parking spaces, cycle parking, refuse storage, mechanical plant and other works incidental to the development, and a Transport for London bus driver facility. The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Listed Building Consent for works to the main hospital building and Sanitary Tower including: demolition of extensions to the rear of the main building, construction of extension across the rear of main building, retention and repair of the front of the main roof, including repairing (or replacing in replica where repair is not feasible) the existing chimneys and roof lanterns, the introduction of new roof dormers, alterations to the building including the removal and replacement of windows, various internal alterations, and associated works of repair across main building; works to the South Wing including the retention and repair of the front of the roof, a comprehensive repair of both roof slopes at the gable end, the removal of the external fire stair from the gable elevation, and various internal alterations, and associated works of repair across the South Wing; the demolition of all other buildings on site; repair and reinstatement of the gas lamp; and works to boundary features.</p>

1. Additional drawings and documents recommended for approval not listed in the previous SDC report

1.1 Schedule of additional documents

- Statement of Community Involvement prepared by London Communications Agency and dated July 2024 – provides corrected distribution areas of flyers and newsletters
- Additional Verified Views which replace views 4 and 20 in the TVIA and reflect the alterations to the staircase of Building A and minor changes to the south facing elevation of the same building.

1.2 The applicant has also provided drawings demonstrating the carry distance of waste for residents.

2. Additional representations received since publication of the report

2.1 One additional representation was received following publication of the report from the Parkview Residents Association (PRA). The letter reiterates previous concerns raised by the PRA specifically relating to the height of Building E.

2.2 The representation refers to the refusal of planning application reference PA/24/00310 on 8 July 2024 for two additional storeys on top of Sotherby Court, and how the assessment of this refusal is relevant in terms of heritage policies and legislation relating to preserving the character and appearance of the Victoria Park Conservation Area. The representation also states that Block E should be treated as a tall building for the purposes of Local Plan Policy D.DH6.

3. Additional Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing review

3.1 The Parkview Residents Association submitted two independent Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing reports for consideration the business day before publication of the officers' report. These were as follows:

- A letter prepared by Rights of Light Consulting on behalf of a number of local residents and instructed by the Parkview Residents Association dated 5 July 2024; and

- A Shadow Analysis study prepared by Architectonic Studio dated 10 June 2024 to demonstrate the impacts of overshadowing on neighbouring properties;

3.3 The reports have now been reviewed by both the applicant's appointed daylight and sunlight consultant and the LPA's independent consultant. The additional reports of each have been included on the application file.

3.4 In summary, the Rights of Light Consulting letter appears to highlight the windows/rooms which fall below the daylight and sunlight guidelines at each of the properties at which the relevant residents who instructed the consultant, drawing particular attention to those with the largest losses. The LPA's consultant has highlighted some inaccuracies in the interpretation of the data by the PRA's consultant but otherwise does not change their previous advice. The letter therefore does not impact on officers' assessment of the daylight/sunlight impacts to neighbouring properties.

3.5 The Shadow Analysis demonstrates the existing and proposed shadow cast on the surrounding area at various times throughout the year. This method of assessment only provides a visual representation of the differences between the existing and proposed shadow paths, the actual technical Sun-on-Ground assessment undertaken in line with the BRE guide demonstrates that all neighbouring amenity areas will comfortably comply with the BRE guidelines and are expected to remain with adequate levels of direct sunlight in the post development condition.

3.7 The above interpretation of the submitted documentation also aligns with the applicant's own consultant's interpretation.

4. Clarifications

4.1 Paragraphs 2.3 and 7.433 of the report states that the social rented units represent 70% of the overall affordable housing provision by habitable room. This should in fact state 72.6%. Paragraph 7.429(h) and 8.3(a) state that the 76 affordable rented homes would be secured in line with the borough's usual split of 50% LAR and 50% THLR. These should read that all of the affordable rented homes would be secured as Social Rent.

4.2 Paragraphs 2.4 and 7.386 of the report states that 21no. individual trees will be removed, 9 of which are protected by TPO. As set out in paragraph 7.400 of the report, this should actually state 20no. trees with 8 protected by TPO as one of the trees has already been

removed, following appropriate legislative requirements, to ensure that it did not collapse into the road adjacent to the site.

- 4.3 The Highways consultee comments are reported as stating that 17 blue badge parking bays, the actual figure is 10, 9 of which are for residential use and the last is to be associated with the commercial/community facility. It is noted that paragraph 7.346 should also read “the remaining 7 blue-badge spaces”.
- 4.4 The Waste Consultee response is stated as having no objection. The Waste Officer did, however, raise concerns with the carry distances of waste above the LPA’s usually accepted distances and the justification for this. This is covered in paragraph 7.380 of the Report.
- 4.5 In Figure 24, the height of the equivalent building to Building E in the previous scheme should actually be 27.805m. It should also be noted that the figures including in Figure 24 are not AOD heights but rather heights of the buildings as measured from the ground to the tops of the buildings.
- 4.6 Two additional conditions which are referred to within the body of the report had not been included in the list of conditions at paragraph 8.6. Those are conditions to require installation of timber sash windows within the front elevation of the main hospital building and to secure further investigatory works relating to the retention of trees T22 and T58.

Updated View 4



Updated View 20

