

London Thames Gateway Development Corporation

Minutes of Planning Committee held on 21 June 2007

Present: Cllr Conor McAuley (in the Chair), Cllr Sid Kallar, Michael Keith, Dru Vesty, Lorraine Baldry and John Biggs.

In attendance: Peter Minoletti (Planning Development Manager), Amanda Reid (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 Apologies were received from Atul Patel and John Worthington.
- 1.2 John Biggs declared a non-prejudicial and non-pecuniary interest in the item Royal Mail Parcel Force, Stephenson Street, Canning Town, due to his membership of the Board of the London Development Agency.

2 Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting of 10 May 2007 and Matters Arising LTGDC/2007/PC30

- 2.1 Members **AGREED** the draft minutes of the Planning Committee meeting of 10 May 2007. There were no matters arising

3 Land on North Side of Wyke Road Including Timber Depot LTGDC/07/PC35

- 3.1 The Committee **DEFERRED** consideration of application number PA/07/00257/LBTH until a future meeting.

4 1 High Street, Stratford LTGDC/07/PC32

- 4.1 Simon Dunn-Lwin from Stock Woolstencroft, representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application. He submitted that it should be considered in the context of LB Newham's emerging policy.
- 4.2 Peter Minoletti introduced the report. The application comprises the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of a 7 to 20 storey mixed use development comprising 120 residential units and commercial use, and 28 car parking spaces. He stated that it had been considered in the context of emerging policy and that the OAPF current expectation for the area is commercial buildings, with some residential. This proposal was for mainly residential with some commercial.
- 4.3 The application is recommended for refusal, for the reasons set out in the report LTGDC/07/PC32. Peter Minoletti reported that LB Newham's Planning Committee had that morning resolved to recommend refusal of planning permission for this development.

4.4 Sid Kallar moved the recommendation, and John Biggs seconded it.

4.5 The Committee:

4.5.1 **REFUSED** the application for the reasons set out in LTGDC/07/32; and

4.5.2 **DELEGATED** to the Director of Planning authority to amend the reasons for refusal following receipt of the Mayor of London Stage 1 report.

5 **Royal Mail Parcel Force, Stephenson Street, Canning Town** LTGDC/07/PC36

5.1 Lawrence Barry of Lawrence M Barry and Co, and Ray Clark of Britannia Wiper Co, spoke against the application for the construction of a bus garage and two storey office building. Their main concerns were about the effect that buses will have on other traffic in the area, the difficulties some buses will have manoeuvring in some of the streets, the limited number of car parking spaces in the area and consequent impact on existing businesses.

5.2 Dick Haille from Transport for London spoke in support of the application. He explained why this was the favoured site for the relocation of the bus garage, and that most of the bus movements would be outside normal working hours.

5.3 Chris Kershaw from London Buses commented that no difficulties had been encountered during a trial drive around the area with an articulated bus, other than at the Stephenson Street bridge and this was being addressed through routings of these buses.

5.4 Mark Hoskins from Tribal MJP spoke of how the car parking issues would be managed by East London Buses and would therefore not create a problem for other businesses in the area.

5.5 Peter Minoletti summarised the addendum report that was tabled at the meeting. The report advised Members of representations/correspondence that has been sent/received since the report went to print. He advised that the LB Newham Planning Committee had considered the application early that day. That Committee reiterated its objection to the proposal, but asked that if LTGDC is minded to approve the application, this should only be on the basis of a temporary use of the site. Peter Minoletti reported that the application is still recommended for approval, subject to conditions and agreement to a s106 agreement.

5.6 The Planning Committee discussed whether small businesses would be helped to relocate, whether the reduction in traffic from Parcel Force moving out had been taken into consideration, the route the buses would take to enter the site, and that the Secretary of State had said that an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required.

5.7 Lorraine Baldry moved the recommendation and Dru Vesty seconded it.

5.8 The Committee, on the basis of the report LTGDC/07/PC36 and the Addendum Report tabled at the meeting, **APPROVED** planning permission **subject to** conditions and a s106 agreement requiring:

5.8.1 an index linked financial contribution cover the cost of the provision of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the locality. The CPZ should allow

- permits to be issued to local businesses only and exclude provision for any bus depot staff;
- 5.8.2 an index linked financial contribution towards the improvement of the Stephenson Street bridge and/or adjacent highway improvements;
 - 5.8.3 a Green Travel Plan containing details of measures to be implemented in order to encourage staff, contractors and visitors to travel to the development by means other than by private car and to minimise car usage (particularly single occupancy journeys) and increase the use of public transport, walking and cycling to and from the development;
 - 5.8.4 a Green Travel Report to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority analysing the effectiveness of the measures implemented pursuant to the approved Green Travel Plan and setting out details of the new measures and initiatives to be implemented in order to improve the effectiveness of the Green Travel Plan;
 - 5.8.5 the developer to pay the Traffic Authority's costs for making a traffic regulation order preventing the Stephenson Street bridge from being used by articulated (bendy) buses.

and **subject to** referral to the Greater London Authority, for its Chief Executive to decide whether to direct to refuse permission, and to a decision by the Secretary of State not to call in the application following its referral as a departure.

6 Land Adjacent to Jenkins Lane, Barking

LTGDC/07/PC37

- 6.1 Peter Minoletti introduced the report recommending approval of an application for outline planning permission by LB Newham for construction of a bus depot on land within the borough of Newham adjacent to Jenkins Lane, Barking. He updated the Committee that the LB Newham Planning Committee had considered the proposal that morning and had supported the application, subject also to an informative regarding assessment of introducing bus priority lanes along both the A406 and A13.
- 6.2 Howard Bassford proposed that the assessment of bus priority lanes be the subject of either a condition or a clause in the s106 agreement (the latter is appropriate as this would relate to roads outside the application site).
- 6.3 The Committee **AGREED** to delegate authority to the Director of Planning to approve the application subject to a s106 agreement and conditions as detailed in the report under LTGDC/07/PC37 and including the bus priority lane assessment.

7 Peruvian Wharf North Woolwich Road, Silvertown

LTGDC/07/PC34

- 7.1 Alan Leckie, a resident of a local estate, spoke against the application. He felt that the attractiveness of the area for future development would be detrimentally affected by the building of an aggregate plant. He also felt that the plant would increase the air pollution for the residential areas surrounding it.
- 7.2 Alan Bulpin from Aggregate Industries Ltd acknowledged the concern of local residents. He said a comprehensive Environmental Assessment had been undertaken and that the company has experience and a commitment to running its operations to the highest possible environmental standards. The company has a policy to have local liaison meetings to address the concerns of the residents.

- 7.3 An addendum report was tabled that provided an update on representations received from local residents objecting to the application and comments from dp9, the agents for the owners of the site. It is not considered that the representations received raise material planning considerations that justify changes to the recommendation and associated conditions and s106 as set out in the main report.
- 7.4 The Committee discussed how to ensure that the impact on residents is kept to a minimum. Peter Minoletti advised that the conditions that would accompany any approval would ensure that the plant would not significantly impact on residential amenity. It was suggested that local liaison meetings be included in a s106 agreement.
- 7.5 There was also discussion of the number of vehicle movements during the night allowed by the proposed conditions, which seemed to members to be high. Alan Bulpin explained that it was a maximum amount and would not be the standard amount on an average day. A lot of the movement of materials will be by river, with the aggregate being barged up, and the processed product leaving the site by road.
- 7.6 Sid Kallar moved the recommendation for approval with an addition to the s106 agreement regarding a requirement to have local liaison meetings.
- 7.7 The Committee **AGREED**:
- 7.7.1 to delegate to the Director of Planning authority to approve the application subject to referral to the GLA, a s106 agreement (Heads of Terms outlined in the report under LTGDC/07/PC34) and the conditions set out in that report; and
- 7.7.2 to the addition of an item in the s106 agreement regarding the requirement for the company to arrange local liaison meetings with the residents in the area.

8 Concorde House, Caxton Street North, Canning Town LTGDC/07/PC31

- 8.1 Peter Minoletti introduced the application seeking approval to demolish existing buildings and to construct a new 5-8 storey residential led mixed use building comprising flats, commercial space and car and bicycle parking spaces.
- 8.2 Dru Vesty reported on the site visit undertaken by some members of the Planning Committee in May 2007. She said the site visit confirmed for her that the application should be refused. She commented that the St Lukes development near by is in quite a different situation to this site, nestling amongst already existing residential development.
- 8.3 John Biggs stated that while he was sympathetic to the development, he noted the comments from Eleanor Fawcett from Design for London (on behalf of the GLA) regarding the ad hoc introduction of residential uses into the Caxton Street Locally Significant Industrial Site.
- 8.4 The Committee **REFUSED** the application for the reasons set out in the reports LTGDC/07/PC24 and 31.

9 Planning Committee Site Visit Protocol

LTGDC/07/PC33

- 9.1 The Committee confirmed that the purpose of the site visit is for Members to become familiar with the site and its surroundings. If applicants and objectors are invited to attend a site visit there is a risk that they will try and lobby Members, which would be inappropriate.
- 9.2 The Committee:
- 9.2.1 **AGREED** that applicants and objectors would **not** be invited to Planning Committee site visits. An applicant or owner would only be present if they are required to give access to a site.
- 9.2.2 **APPROVED** the site visit protocol attached to the report LTGDC/07/PC33, amended to incorporate the decision in paragraph 9.2.1 above.

The meeting concluded at 8.00pm