
London Thames Gateway Development Corporation

Planning Committee Meeting

Thursday, 13 September 2007, 6.30pm
Old Town Hall Stratford, 29 The Broadway, Stratford

Present: Cllr Conor McAuley (Acting Chair)
Cllr Sid Kallar
Atul Patel
Dru Vesty
Alan Clark
Lorraine Baldry

In Attendance: Peter Minoletti (Planning Development Manager)
Will Steadman (Planning Development Officer)
Sara Purvis (Planning Development Officer)
Sarah Egan (Committee Clerk)
Esther Thornton (DLA Piper)

1. Apologies, Announcements and Declarations of Interest

- 1.1 Apologies were received from John Biggs, Michael Keith and John Worthington.
- 1.2 Alan Clark was welcomed to the meeting as a new member of the Planning Committee.
- 1.3 Sara Purvis was thanked for her work and wished well for her future endeavours.
- 1.4 Esther Thornton stated that DLA Piper acts for the landowner who objected to the application at Item 3, but not on planning issues.

2. Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting 9 August 2007 and Matters Arising

LTGDC/07/PC46

- 2.1 Members **AGREED** the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting of 9 August 2007. There were no matters arising.

3. Trad Scaffolding Co Ltd, Knights Road, Silvertown LTGDC/07/PC47

- 3.1 Will Steadman introduced the report recommending approval of the application to remove a condition restricting the use of the Trad Scaffolding Co Ltd site on Knights Road for a concrete and mortar batching plan for a 10 year period. An addendum report was tabled which provided details of an objection received from the owners of the Peruvian Wharf, and the Planning Officer's response to the issues raised.
- 3.2 In February 2007 the Committee imposed the 10 year condition as it felt that the operation of the development for 25 years could have a detrimental effect on the evolution of the planning policy in the area. This decision was informed by the draft Lower Lea Valley Opportunity Area Planning Framework (LLV OAPF) which at the time suggested that the application site might lie within an area identified as having the potential for industrial land release.
- 3.3 The Committee was advised that the LLV OAPF has now been adopted by the GLA. The Framework and associated maps locates the application site within an area to be retained as a Strategic Employment Location (SEL). The application site is located within an area of established industrial uses and within close proximity of safeguarded wharves. On this basis the permanent use of the site for an industrial activity is considered to be in accordance with the emerging planning policy context.
- 3.4 Dru Vesty noted that the London Borough of Newham objects to this application on grounds that it will compromise the Council's long term future regeneration aspirations for the area. She questioned how much weight the Committee should give to Newham's views.
- 3.5 Peter Minoletti advised that the Greater London Authority's LLV OAPF should be of greater consideration than LB Newham's aspirations. He also advised that LB Newham's adopted plans also have this site as protected for industry. He considers that refusal of this application would be difficult to substantiate on appeal.
- 3.6 Dru Vesty asked whether firms in the local area had been consulted on their long-term aspirations. Peter Minoletti advised that they were consulted two years ago as part of the initial work on the Thameside West study. There was no indication from the local businesses at that stage that they were keen to move out of the area.
- 3.7 Lorraine Baldry asked what would be the downside of keeping the 10 year condition. Peter Minoletti advised that the applicants would be able to appeal the decision, and it would be difficult to defend on policy grounds.
- 3.8 Lorraine Baldry queried why the owners of Peruvian Wharf were not recognising the policy in the OAPF. Peter Minoletti advised that they interpreted the document in a different way.

- 3.9 Lorraine Baldry asked if a decision to remove the 10 year condition would have a material impact on recommendations in the Thameside West study. Peter Minoletti said that it should have no impact as this work would be based on the LLV OAPF.
- 3.10 Conor McAuley moved the recommendation, which was agreed by the Committee with Dru Vesty voting against.
- 3.11 The Committee **AGREED** to delegate to the Director of Planning approval of application LTGDC-07-137-FUL for the reasons set out in section 11 of the Committee report LTGDC/07/PC47 subject to:
- 3.11.1 any direction from the Mayor of London;
- 3.11.2 a legal agreement securing the heads of terms of the section 106 agreement pursuant to planning permission ref: 06/01231/LTGDC; and
- 3.11.3 the conditions set out in paragraph 12 of the Committee report LTGDC/07/PC47.

4. 3 Cam Road, Burford Wharf, Stratford LTGDC/07/PC48

- 4.1 Peter Minoletti introduced the report recommending agreement to an application to construct a seven storey B1 office development on 3 Cam Road, Burford Wharf, Stratford. The application represents a variation to earlier planning permissions for a B1 office development at the site, with the principal difference being the addition of an extra storey.
- 4.2 Peter Minoletti advised that the main concerns of local occupiers have been addressed by conditions imposing a restriction on the use of the sixth floor terrace to maintenance and emergency uses only, as well as requiring certain windows in the building to be obscure glazed and fixed shut, to minimise overlooking of neighbouring properties.
- 4.3 Peter Minoletti reported that the London Borough of Newham's Planning Committee had recently agreed to recommend that the Corporation's Planning Committee refuse this application. This decision was against the advice of their planning officers.
- 4.4 The Committee **AGREED** to grant planning permission to application LTGDC-07-102-FUL, subject to the conditions in paragraph 10 of the Committee report LTGDC/07/PC48.

5. Leamouth Peninsula North, Orchard Place LTGDC/07/PC49

- 5.1 Sara Purvis introduced the report recommending approval of an application to erect a building on Leamouth Peninsula North, which would accommodate:
- 5.1.1 an electrical sub-station to serve the forthcoming larger development on the peninsula; and

- 5.1.2 a community centre/sports hall with temporary interim use as a marketing suite for the sale of residential units within the Leamouth Peninsula North development.
- 5.2 Dru Vesty questioned whether the plans for the Local Area for Play fulfil the conditions of the approved outline application and who will manage this space. Sara Purvis advised that it does fulfil the requirements and that the proposed condition 24 will require details on the surfacing, boundary treatment and equipment to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The management of the area will be covered in the section 106 agreement and will be required to be detailed at a particular stage in the development of Leamouth Peninsula North.
- 5.3 The Committee discussed whether the management of the play area should be the responsibility of the community centre management, or the responsibility of the company managing the public realm on the peninsula as a whole.
- 5.4 The Committee **AGREED** to delegate to the Director of Planning approval of application LTGDC-07-140-FUL subject to:
- 5.4.1 the referral of the application to the Mayor of London;
- 5.4.2 referral to the Secretary of State as a departure from the Development Plan;
- 5.4.3 the conditions listed in paragraph 12 of the Committee report LTGDC/07/PC49; and
- 5.4.4 completion of a section 106 agreement to secure the following:
- a) commitment to provide an agreed percentage of the energy requirements of the development through the use of renewable technologies;
 - b) sustainable travel strategy/travel plan, including temporary measures for visitors to the marketing suite;
 - c) unobstructed access to TfL/DBFO Traffic Control Centre to be maintained;
 - d) car parking management, and servicing management strategies;
 - e) provision of the community centre/sports hall prior to occupation of no more than 70% of the open market units and provision of a management strategy for it;
 - f) provision and management of public realm areas with flexibility as to how the play area might be designed and managed;

- g) provision of the riverside walkway and provision for public use of it and open space and routes within the site;
- h) site management scheme;
- i) repairs and maintenance of the river wall; and
- j) local labour provisions.

6. Barking Town Centre Area Action Plan: Issues and Options Report: Proposed LTGDC Response LTGDC/07/PC50

6.1 Peter Minoletti introduced the report proposing the Corporation's response to the Barking Town Centre Area Action Plan Issues and Options Report. He suggested that the Committee should also consider including in the response a reference to the servicing arrangements for the developments and businesses in the town centre.

6.2 Conor McAuley suggested strengthening the response in respect of East London Transit.

6.3 The Committee:

6.3.1 **ENDORSED** the suggested response set out in the Committee report LTGDC/07/PC50, and **AGREED** that it include:

- a) a paragraph about car parking provision, as proposed by the Board and set out in paragraph 4 of the Committee report;
- b) a paragraph about the servicing arrangements for the developments and businesses in the town centre;
- c) strengthening the response in respect of East London Transit to include the provision of Phase 1b as integral to the development of the wider area.

6.3.2 **AUTHORISED** the Director of Planning to respond to the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham accordingly.

The meeting concluded at 7.05pm.

Date of next meeting:

Thursday, 11 October 2007, 6.30pm
Old Town Hall Stratford, 29 The Broadway