

London Thames Gateway Development Corporation

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING: 10 May 2007

Draft Minutes of Planning Committee held on 12 April 2007

Present: Cllr Conor McAuley (in the Chair), Cllr Sid Kallar, Atul Patel, Lorraine Baldry, John Worthington, Dru Vesty (delayed arrival) and John Biggs (delayed arrival).

In attendance: John Allen (Director of Planning), Will Steadman (Planning Development Officer), Sara Purvis (Planning Development Officer), Adele Williamson (Planning Development Officer) and Sarah Egan (Committee Clerk). Also in attendance was Howard Bassford of DLA Piper.

1 Apologies, Announcements and Declarations of Interest

1.1 There were no apologies or declarations of interest.

3C Pura Foods Ltd, Leamouth Peninsula North, Orchard Place

LTGDC/2007/PC22

3.1 This item was withdrawn at the request of the applicants. The Planning Inspectorate has agreed an extension of time for the submission of statements of case until 21 May. Consideration of the appeal application is therefore deferred until the May Planning Committee meeting when it is anticipated that the amended duplicate application could also be reported.

2 Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting of 8 March 2007 and Matters Arising

LTGDC/2007/PC19

2.1 Members **AGREED** to the draft minutes of the Planning Committee meeting of 8 March 2007.

3 Reports of the Director of Planning: Planning Applications

3A North End of 84 Leven Road

LTGDC/2007/PC20

3.2 John Biggs arrived during this item and did not participate in the discussion.

3.3 Chris Pittock from Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design spoke on behalf of the Poplar HARCA, the landlord of the Aberfeldy Estate adjacent to the proposed development, to oppose the granting of planning consent. He noted that at the Planning Committee on 8 March the item was deferred to allow time for the developer, Swan Housing Association, to consider the planning issues, including an alternative scheme, raised by Tibbalds at that meeting. Mr Pittock acknowledged that the quantum of development was related to financial viability. He believed that Tibbalds' alternative scheme would overcome the reasons for objection and result in a viable development. Tibbalds' reasons for objection related to the proposed housing density given the site's accessibility by public transport, the lack of communal amenity space and the design and appearance of the development.

3.4 Debbie Cordrey, Chair of the Aberfeldy Residents Board, also spoke to oppose

the granting of planning consent. She stated that while she welcomed the redevelopment of the site, she had concerns about public transport accessibility to the site and that the new development would increase demand for local parking, children's play areas and primary school places.

- 3.5 Simon Dunn-Lwin spoke on behalf of Swan Housing Association, the applicant. He stated that Swan had worked closely with officers from Tower Hamlets and the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation to respond to, and resolve, all the issues that have been identified by the objector. As a result, the proposal now before the Planning Committee has been revised to include shared amenity space at roof level which would serve the 3 and 4 bedroom family units located within the central block. Mr Dunn-Lwin stated that the sunlight issue has been investigated further by the London Borough of Tower Hamlets' Daylight/Sunlight expert and the Borough has since withdrawn its objection. Mr Dunn-Lwin stated that Tibbalds' alternative scheme reduced the amount of affordable employment space in the development and provided poor quality communal amenity space.
- 3.6 Dru Vesty asked Mr Dunn-Lwin if Swan Housing Association had had an opportunity to consider the ideas put forward by Tibbalds. Mr Dunn-Lwin confirmed they had had a couple of days to consider it, and Swan Housing Association's conclusions were that the proposal would result in a major reduction in employment floor space and the proposed density would be greater than the Swan Housing Association proposal. He felt he could not comment more without design detail, but had concerns about whether it would be economically viable due to increased costs.
- 3.7 Lorraine Baldry asked Mr Dunn-Lwin how access to the shared amenity space at roof level would operate. Mr Dunn-Lwin responded that it would be by security door.
- 3.8 Atul Patel asked Mr Pittock for a response to the criticism that his proposals will reduce the employment space. Mr Pittock acknowledged that it would, but said that Tibbalds believed that the benefits of making this change would outweigh the negatives.
- 3.9 Will Steadman introduced the report of the Director of Planning for this proposal comprising the demolition of the existing factory building and warehouse and the construction of 66 affordable housing units and 25 commercial artist studios. Following the Planning Committee deferring consideration of the report on 8 March, the applicant had submitted revisions to the proposed development that comprised the replacement of 3x3 bedroom units with 3x4 bedroom units, and the provision of an additional 350m² roof top communal amenity space. Mr Steadman tabled an addendum report providing details of Poplar HARCA's response to the latest revision to the proposal which presented Poplar HARCA's alternative scheme which, it was argued, would achieve the same development quantum and mix proposed in the planning application. Mr Steadman reminded the Committee that the merits of the alternative scheme were not for consideration and that members were required to determine the application before them. Mr Steadman advised that it is his view that, when taking into account the relevant planning policies, the application scheme was acceptable and the that reasons for objection did not justify a refusal of planning permission. It was therefore recommended that the planning application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in paragraphs 6.1 and 6.2 of the report.

- 3.10 John Worthington asked how the artist studios would be used. Will Steadman advised that a social landlord (ACME) has been identified to manage the occupation of the studios. ACME has been involved in the development and has a track record of successfully managing similar operations.
- 3.11 Sid Kallar asked how the impact on the local schools would be mitigated. Officers replied that the developers will be required to make a financial contribution towards improving education provision in the area.
- 3.12 Sid Kallar proposed that the planning application be delegated to the Director of Planning to approve, subject to:
- 3.12.1 a legal agreement securing the matters set out in paragraph 6.1 of the report before the committee;
 - 3.12.2 the conditions set out in paragraph 6.2 of the report before the committee; and
 - 3.12.3 advance notice being given to the Health and Safety Executive of the Corporation's resolution to approve the planning application and allow the HSE 21 days from the date of notice to allow them to consider whether they wish to request that the Secretary of State call-in this application for her determination.
- 3.13 This was **AGREED** with one abstention.

3B Land at Beckton Rectangle

LTGDC/2007/PC21

- 3.14 Adele Williamson introduced the report of the Director of Planning for this proposal comprising the installation of a materials recovery facility to recycle material from trench arisings from Thames Water's repairs, maintenance and installation of sewers and water mains. Planning permission is sought for a temporary period of three years. Ms Williamson stated that the whilst the proposal is a departure from Policy OS7 (Green Space Protection) of the London Borough of Newham Unitary Development Plan by reason of the loss of a former sports pitch, it is considered that the temporary loss will not significantly impact on the use and general availability of existing leisure facilities in the Borough. The proposal will result in the re-use of currently redundant land, and promote sustainable recycling and re-use of materials. The proposal is unlikely to have any negative impacts in terms of visual appearance, amenity, or vehicular movements. It is therefore considered that planning permission should be granted.
- 3.15 Ms Williamson advised that Sport England is a late consultee, with the 21-day consultation period ending on 17 April 2007.
- 3.16 Lorraine Baldry asked whether there was any reason to think that Sport England would object. Ms Williamson advised that it was possible that if the former sports pitch had been used in the past 5 years, they may object. However the site is privately owned, it is not open to the general public and therefore does not meet a local need.
- 3.17 John Biggs said he had no problem with the application but was concerned about the use of a former sports pitch. He would like assurance that it fits in with a wider strategy for sports facilities in the area.
- 3.18 Lorraine Baldry commented that she supported the development of a recycling facility. Dru Vesty questioned why it was only for three years. Planning Officers

where unable to say why, but noted that there is a longer term plan to develop this area.

3.19 John Biggs moved that the recommendations be supported subject to the Local Borough of Newham confirming that the former sports pitch in question is not part of its strategic plan for sports facilities in the area. This proposal was not seconded.

3.20 The Committee **AGREED**, with one abstention, to delegate the application to the Director of Planning to approve planning permission for a temporary period expiring on 30 April 2010 subject to:

3.20.1 the conditions set out in the report before the committee;

3.20.2 receipt of comments from Sport England relating to the loss of the former sports pitch and consideration of any comments/objections they may raise; and

3.20.3 referral to the Government Office for London as a departure application ONLY if an objection is received from Sport England relating to the loss of the former sports pitch and the LTGDC is still minded to grant permission.

The meeting concluded at 7.05pm