

LONDON THAMES GATEWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

**PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
6.30 PM, THURSDAY 11TH JANUARY 2007
STRATFORD TOWN HALL**

DRAFT MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD 14TH DECEMBER 2006

Present: Prof Mike Thorne (Chair), Cllr Conor McAuley, Cllr Sid Kallar, Dru Vesty, John Worthington, and Lorraine Baldry and John Biggs (ex officio).

In attendance: John Allen (Director of Planning), Roxanne Misir (Committee Clerk), Sara Purvis (Planning Development Officer), and Adele Williamson (Planning Development Officer). Also in attendance were Howard Bassford and Caroline Chisholm of DLA Piper.

1. **Apologies, Announcements and Declarations of Interest**
 - 1.1 Atul Patel had sent apologies, and Conor McAuley sent apologies for lateness and arrived during item 3 (a). Mike Thorne declared that his employer was involved in Barking Learning Centre which was adjacent to the site at agenda item 3 (a), but this was not a prejudicial interest. Sid Kallar did not have a prejudicial interest in this item as he had not taken part in the discussion about this item at LBBD. John Biggs declared an interest in item 3 (b) due to his role as the vice-chair of the LDA and did not take part in the discussion on this item. Howard Bassford of DLA Piper declared that his firm has acted for the developer adjacent to the site under consideration in item 3 (b) but that the firm had not been instructed by them in relation to the matter before the committee.

2. **Minutes of Planning Committee meeting of 9th November 2006, and Matters Arising** *LTGDC/2006/PC43*
 - 2.1 Members **AGREED** the draft minutes of the Planning Committee meeting of 9th November 2006. In response to a query about why the Trad site at Knights Road E16 was not on the agenda, members were informed that a neighbour of the site had made comments and this process needed to run its course, after which the report would come back to committee. There were no other matters arising.

3. **(a) Town Hall Private Car Park, Axe Street, Barking** *LTGDC/2006/PC44*
 - 3.1 Sara Purvis introduced this item, an application by Barking and Havering LIFT to erect a five storey building to provide a health centre on three floors and twenty-two flats above. The main considerations were the principle of the development, design and sustainability matters, the loss of public car parking and the nature of the Section 106 agreement. Members noted that the proposal accorded with many relevant London Plan and UDP policies, would improve health care provision within the borough, and further the regeneration of Barking Town Centre. The application was therefore recommended for

approval subject to conditions and the completion of a S106 agreement in respect of the provision of 22 affordable housing units and a contribution of £400,000 towards the upgrade of the public realm directly abutting the application site and the submission of and compliance with a green travel plan. The application would need to be referred to the Secretary of State as the development constitutes a departure from the UDP wherein the site was allocated to be redeveloped for offices. The loss of car parking spaces was considered acceptable in the context of LBBB's proposals for re-provision of car parking spaces. The adjacent site would shortly be redeveloped for 85 spaces and a multi-storey car park for approximately 350 spaces was proposed on that site in the medium-term.

- 3.2 It was proposed that two additional conditions be added: (1) that a construction management plan be established to approve locally sourced materials and waste management, and (2) that the car park [on land outside the application site] be operational prior to the commencement of development on the site.
- 3.3 Members noted that this scheme would form part of the overall strategy for affordable housing in Barking Town Centre. It was noted that the scheme would be a car-free development and that the UDC was funding the Barking Town Centre Area Action Plan which included a parking strategy for the town centre.
- 3.4 Concern was expressed about the urban design concept applied to this scheme; it was felt that the ground floor looked dreary and there was not a sufficient sense of place. However members noted that LBBB's design advisor was happy with the proposal, and it was recognised that there were significant constraints on how the ground floor was designed because of its use as a health centre with concomitant security issues.
- 3.5 Sid Kallar proposed and Lorraine Baldry seconded that the application be delegated to the Director of Planning to approve subject to referral to Government Office for London and to the conditions set out in the report and the additional conditions laid out in paragraph 3.2 above, following the completion of a S106 agreement to secure the affordable housing provision, a green travel plan, and a contribution of £400,000 towards public realm works. Conor McAuley was unable to vote on this item as he had not been present for the whole item. The proposal was **AGREED** unanimously.

ACTION: Director of Planning

3 (b) Thames Wharf

LTGDC/2006/PC45

- 3.6 John Allen introduced this item, which was a proposal for temporary change of use and development to provide accommodation for four waste recycling and transfer businesses including construction of buildings for materials processing, fleet vehicle and equipment maintenance, offices, provision of external storage areas for materials and equipment and other related works. An addendum report was tabled which updated the committee on amendments and additions to the conditions following the submission of further information by the applicant and subsequent consideration by the GLA. It also updated the committee on amendments to the report following the submission of further information by the applicant and on matters relating

to the EIA screening report that was issued by LB Newham in respect of the proposed development.

3.7 Members queried whether consideration had been given to what would happen to the site once the proposed use had concluded, and felt it was important to make a statement about the development of the area regardless of the temporary status of this scheme. It was **AGREED** that this could be dealt with under minor changes to conditions.

3.8 Dru Vesty proposed and Sid Kallar seconded that:

3.8.1 The application be delegated to the Director of Planning to grant planning permission for a temporary period expiring on 31/07/2014 subject to:

- a. the necessary referral to the Mayor of London for any direction he may wish to give;
- b. to the conditions set out in the report and the addendum report;
- c. the adoption of a formal screening opinion by the Corporation following the procedure set out in the planning services agreement dated 3 January 2006 so that permission could be granted if and only if the screening opinion that is adopted is that the proposal does not constitute EIA development.

3.8.2 In the event that the formal screening opinion concludes that the proposal is EIA development, then the application for planning permission shall be referred back to the Committee for determination following the submission of an Environmental Statement

and this was unanimously **AGREED**.

3 (c) Site of 223 – 231 High Street, Stratford Way *LTGDC/2006/PC46*

3.9 John Allen introduced this item, drawing members' attention to the addendum report. This updated the committee on issues relating to affordable housing, revised plans showing enhanced car and cycle parking, and conditions 12 – 14. The precise mix of affordable housing had not yet been agreed, and the Corporation proposed an additional proviso that the scheme would come back to committee should the affordable housing offer be reduced below the level currently proposed i.e. 29% by unit or 35% by habitable room. Sara Purvis drew to members' attention that there had been an omission from the heads of terms relating to the provision of car parking spaces and the establishment of a car club.

3.10 Members discussed the scheme's proposed affordable housing offer, and noted that the offer was below that required by London Plan policy, and had been reduced since the Stage One report was prepared. It was noted however that the Mayor could direct refusal if the scheme did not meet policy requirements due to insufficient affordable housing. It was proposed that the application be deferred until LTGDC, LB Newham and the GLA agreed on a precise figure for the level of affordable housing but there was not a seconder for this.

- 3.11 Conor McAuley proposed and Sid Kallar seconded that the application for planning permission and listed building concept be delegated to the Director of Planning to approve subject to resolution of flood risk matters, agreement of the level of affordable housing provision and any issues raised in the GLA Stage Two report, and subject to the completion of a S106 to secure a range of benefits as detailed on page 66 of the report and also with the provision of car parking spaces and the establishment of a car club, and subject to the conditions laid out in the report. This was **AGREED** with one vote against.

ACTION: Director of Planning

4. Comments on LBTH Local Development Framework *LTGDC/2006/PC47*

- 4.1 John Allen introduced this report and drew members' attention to the proposed revised paragraph 2.67 as set out in the addendum report. The report was **AGREED** with this revision.

ACTION: Director of Planning

5. Comments on Revised London Plan *LTGDC/2006/PC48*

- 5.1 John Allen apologised to members for the delay in issuing this report, the purpose of which was to agree comments on behalf of the Corporation on the further alterations to the London Plan that had recently been published for consultation by the Mayor. It was **AGREED** that Lorraine Baldry, Sid Kallar, Conor McAuley and Dru Vesty would discuss the UDC's response on these alterations with the Director of Planning and the Chief Executive the following week.

The meeting concluded at 7.35 pm.