LONDON THAMES GATEWAY

London Thames Gateway Development Corporation

Draft Planning Committee Minutes

9 August 2007, 6.30pm
Old Town Hall, 29 The Broadway, Stratford

Present: Cllr Conor McAuley
Dru Vesty
Lorraine Baldry
Atul Patel
John Worthington
John Biggs

In Attendance: John Allen (Director of Planning)
Peter Minoletti (Planning Development Manager)
Will Steadman (Planning Development Officer)
Sara Purvis (Planning Development Officer)
Sarah Egan (Committee Clerk)
Caroline Chisholm (DLA Piper)

---

1 Apologies, Announcements and Declarations of Interest

1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Sid Kallar and Michael Keith.

1.2 John Biggs stated that he was acquainted with the applicants for Item 5: Land on North Side of Wyke Road: Offices, General Industry etc, but that this would have no material impact.

1.3 Caroline Chisholm stated that DLA Piper acts for the land owner for Item 3: Plaistow and Peruvian Wharf North Woolwich, Road, Silvertown, but not on planning issues.

1.4 Conor McAuley stated that he was Vice Chair of Thames Gateway London Partnerships but that he was not involved with its consideration of this application and the writing of the objection.

2 Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting of 21 June 2007 and Matters Arising

LTGDC/07/PC38

2.1 Members **AGREED** the draft minutes of the Planning Committee meeting of 21 June 2007. There were no matters arising.

3 Plaistow and Peruvian Wharf North Woolwich Road, Silvertown

LTGDC/07/PC39

3.1 Alan Leckie, a resident of a local estate, spoke against the application. He detailed concerns about air pollution and odour, the increase in HGV traffic and resulting pollution, the proposal for night time shifts – especially with family houses and a primary school nearby, and the potential for the development to have a detrimental effect on the possibility of other residential developments coming forward.

3.2 John Boldon of Cory Environmental spoke in support of the application. He addressed the four reasons given in the recommendation to refuse. He detailed why it was not premature to consider this proposal now; that having a concentration of waste facilities in LB Newham was not a reason for refusal; that MRF is a required stage in recycling; and that concern that the proposal will adversely affect the amenity of residents of the surrounding area was inconsistent as an application for an aggregate plant was approved by the Planning Committee in June, and a traffic assessment showed that both uses could be accommodated on the nearby roads.

3.3 Peter Minoletti introduced the report recommending refusal of an application for a materials recycling facility (MRF) and container handling facility on Plaistow and Peruvian Wharf, North Woolwich Road, Silvertown. An update report was tabled detailing two additional letters of objection recently received.

3.4 John Biggs asked whether the reason for refusal regarding an undue concentration of waste facilities in LB Newham would be creating a precedent and wanted to be clear what this was based on. Peter Minoletti advised that the Joint Waste Development Plan Document (DPD), which is currently being developed, is giving consideration to the most appropriate and best locations for such developments in the east London boroughs.

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

3.6 The Committee **REFUSED** the application for the following reasons:

3.6.1 the proposal is considered to be premature pending the next stage of the Joint Waste DPD for East London in that it could prejudice the consideration of the location of waste and associated recycle facilities including conclusions as to the amount of waste involved and how that waste should be dealt with. It is also premature pending the outcome of the Thameside West study and the South Dagenham SIP work;

3.6.2 the proposal would result in an undue concentration of waste facilities in LB Newham and is contrary to the proximity principle contained in PPS10, Policies 4A.2 and 4A.3 in the London Plan and Policies EQ54 and EQ56 of the UDP;

3.6.3 the proposal would represent an unnecessary interim stage in the recycling process involving significant lorry movements through the borough and onwards to reprocessing outlets, contrary to Policies 3C16 and 3C24 of the London Plan and EQ54 of the UDP;

3.6.4 the proposal would adversely affect the amenity of residents of the surrounding area by virtue of noise and disturbance from the movement of lorries contrary to Policy 4A.3 of the London Plan and Policy EQ45 of the UDP.

4 Land on North Side of Wyke Road: Bus Garage LTGDC/07/PC40

4.1 Gavin Ridding, Manager of the Fish Island Business Club representing the local businesses, spoke against the application. He stated that all the businesses on Fish Island opposed the application and summarised their main objections. These included the question of whether the increase road traffic due to the Olympic site construction activity had been taken into account and the impact the bus garage will have on car parking in the area. He also stated that they would like the water feasibility study made public.

4.2 Robert White, barrister from 4-5 Gray's Inn Square, representing the land owner Neptune Wharf, also spoke against the application. He stated that the application was based upon a need – to relocate the bus garage displaced by the 2012 Olympics – and that this need was now absent as London Bus Services Ltd had recently submitted an application for a bus garage on an alternate site at Temple Mills. He referred to a recent decision on the London Development Agency's Olympic site relating to the compulsory purchase order. The Inspector had deferred confirmation of the compulsory purchase of this site until this planning application was heard. If the application was granted, then the land could be compulsory purchased. Robert White considered that having a CPO on this site would make using it for other purposes more complicated. He also stated that the fact that there was an alternative planning application for this site was a relevant consideration the Committee should have regard to.

4.3 Dick Halle from Transport for London spoke in support of the application. He stressed the suitability of the site – size, availability and location. He stated that there is no certainty with the alternate site they have found. TfL remains committed to this application to ensure that they have a site for the bus garage.

4.4 Conor McAuley asked Dick Halle which was the site preferred by TfL. Dick Halle replied that it was the other site at Temple Mills, but it is not clear yet whether that site is feasible.

4.5 John Biggs enquired if the travel arrangements for the bus drivers were adequately planned in order to reduce the pressure on the local car parks. Dick Halle replied that they were.

4.6 Peter Minoletti introduced the report recommending approval of the application to construct a bus garage with an ancillary two storey office building and associated facilities, hardstanding for bus and car parking and associated landscaping to the Hertford Union Canal. He stated that although there is another application for this site, this application needs to be considered on its own merits. He confirmed that the water feasibility study would be shared with the community. He stated that one of the conditions of approval is that a travel plan be completed and approved by

the Local Planning Authority, and that a Section 106 financial contribution towards the implementation of a Controlled Parking Zone will be required.

4.7 John Worthington asked what the long term plan for this area is. Peter Minoletti advised that it will remain an industrial zone and that while there are live/work developments in the area it is an industrial area and residential conditions can not be expected.

4.8 John Biggs acknowledged the difficulty in locating bus garages, as no one wanted one in their own community. He raised whether the application could be agreed in principle until a decision was made on the Temple Mills site.

4.9 Caroline Chisholm advised that the availability of alternative sites is capable of being a material consideration in some circumstances, but it may not be relevant in every case. The fact that there may be another site upon which the development could be yet more acceptable for planning purposes may not justify the refusal of permission upon the application site. However, where the development is likely to have some adverse environmental effects and a major argument for the development proceeding is that the need for the development outweighs any adverse effects, then it may be relevant for the Committee to consider whether there is a more appropriate alternative site elsewhere. It is for the Committee to conclude the extent of the materiality.

4.10 Lorraine Baldry noted that the Committee does not know if the Temple Mills site is more suitable. She also noted that this is an application for a bus garage, rather than a bus depot, and as buses will just be parked there, there will only be significant bus movement at certain times of the day.

4.11 Lorraine Baldry moved the recommendation.

4.12 The Committee **AGREED** that the application LTGDC-07-012 be delegated to the Director of Planning to approve for the conclusion and reasons set out in section 10 of the report LTGDC/07/PC35 of 21 June 2007, and section 3 of the report LTGDC/07/PC40 of 9 August 2007, subject to:

4.12.1 the planning conditions set out in section 5 of the report LTGDC/07/PC40;

4.12.2 a Section 106 agreement securing:

- a financial contribution towards the implementation of a Controlled Parking Zone, including the employer and its staff being prevented from applying for business parking permits;
- a £20,000 contribution towards the design and implementation of highway improvements;
- the applicant to submit a scheme detailing the highway improvement works to be carried out and entered into under a Section 278 agreement with the Local Highway Authority;
- a £15,000 contribution towards canal tow path improvements; and

- the preparation, implementation and monitoring of a Travel Plan.

5 Land on North Side of Wyke Road: Offices, General Industry etc

LTGDC/07/PC42

5.1 Peter Minoletti introduced the report recommending approval of an application for temporary change of use for the site to enable the building of premises for offices, general industry and storage and distribution, including the erection of a concrete batching plant and a barge loading area. He informed the Committee that the industry proposed for the site would help a nearby residential development meet its requirements to transport a certain amount of its materials by water. The development has a specific purpose, will be temporary and fits in with the area.

5.2 Peter Minoletti tabled four additional conditions.

5.3 John Biggs noted that additional condition 4 – that the development shall be restricted in its operating hours – shows the difficulties that arise from having live/work developments.

5.4 Atul Patel moved the recommendations, with the addition of the tabled conditions.

5.5 The Committee **AGREED** that the application LTGDC-07-081 be delegated to the Director of Planning to approve for the reasons set out in section 10 of the report LTGDC/07/PC42, subject to:

5.5.1 the planning conditions set out in section 11 of the report LTGDC/07/PC42 and the four additional conditions tabled at the meeting;

5.5.2 a Section 106 agreement requiring:

- a £7,200 contribution towards the implementation of a Controlled Parking Zone and the employer and its staff being prevented from applying for business parking permits;
- the applicant to submit a scheme detailing the highway improvement works to be carried out and entered into under a Section 278 agreement with the Local Highway Authority;
- a contribution towards local highway/environmental improvements;
- a £10,000 contribution towards canal tow path improvements;
- the preparation, implementation and monitoring of a Travel Plan.

6 Chloride Automotive Batteries Chequers Lane Dagenham

LTGDC/07/PC41

6.1 Peter Minoletti introduced the report recommending the approval of the application regarding the development of eight units for light industrial, general industrial and warehousing use at the Chloride Automotive Batteries site, Chequers Lane, Dagenham. This application proposes the redevelopment of the site to provide Phases 3 and 4 of the existing Thames Gateway Park.

6.2 Will Steadman proposed an additional requirement regarding the adoption of a screening opinion to confirm that the application does not constitute EIA development under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 1999.

6.3 John Biggs moved the recommendation.

6.4 The Committee **AGREED** that the application LTGDC-06-154-PP be delegated to the Director of Planning to approve for the reasons set out in Section 10 of the report LTGDC/07/PC41, subject to:

6.4.1 any direction from the Mayor of London;

6.4.2 adoption of a screening opinion to confirm that the application does not constitute EIA development under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 1999;

6.4.3 the conditions set out in Section 11 of the report LTGDC/07/PC41; and

6.4.4 a legal agreement securing the following heads of terms in a Section 106 agreement:

- transfer of the land east of Chequers Lane to Transport for London to use as the East London Transit Phase 1 terminus facility;
- safeguarding the land along the northern boundary to accommodate the proposed Dockland Light Railway extension and Sustrans link for its future transfer/acquisition;
- safeguarding the land along the eastern boundary to accommodate the proposed pedestrian/cycle bridge link;
- a contribution towards highway and public realm improvements;
- transfer of half the width of Chequers Lane to the London Development Agency;
- Green Travel Plan;
- local labour commitment;
- local goods and services commitment.

7 Town Square, Barking: Changes to Conditions LTGDC/07/PC43

7.1 Sara Purvis introduced the report recommending approval of an application to develop the land at Town Square, Clockhouse Avenue, Barking without complying with two conditions relating to the timing of the submission of reserved matters and the need to re-provide 50 public car parking spaces within the development. The application is considered to be acceptable in principle subject to the conclusion of a new Section 106 agreement to replace the existing agreement incorporating a financial contribution to allow the re-provision of the public car parking spaces elsewhere in the town centre, as well as carrying forward all of the provisions in the current Section 106 agreement for the Town Square development.

7.2 There was discussion of the fact that no stage one comments had been received from the Greater London Authority (GLA). It was noted that should this application be approved then the GLA would be required to provide stage two comments within 14 days.

7.3 It was noted that there is not yet an application for a multi-storey car park in the town centre, and that the development of one would depend on further funding being secured. The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham is supportive of this proposal.

7.4 Conor McAuley moved the recommendations.

7.5 The Committee **AGREED** that the application LTGDC-06-157-PP be delegated to the Director of Planning to approve subject to:

7.5.1 any direction from the Mayor of London or the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (the application involves a departure from the development plan and comprises land belonging to a planning authority); and

7.5.2 the conditions listed is section 10 of the report LTGDC/07/PC43 and the completion of a Section 106 agreement to replace the existing agreement for Town Square including the agreed financial contribution of £550,000 towards the off-site provision of public car parking spaces, and all of the requirements of the current Section 106 agreement which the new agreement will replace.

8 Town Square, Barking: Axe Street LTGDC/07/PC44

8.1 Sara Purvis introduced the report recommending approval of an application to erect on Axe Street, Barking, an eight storey building comprising 40 residential units with associated landscaping and car parking.

8.2 Conor McAuley moved the recommendations.

8.3 The Committee **AGREED** that the application LTGDC-07-081-FUL be delegated to the Director of Planning to approve subject to:

8.3.1 the conditions listed in section 10 of the report LTGDC/07/PC44 and the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure the provision of 18 three bedroom socially rented affordable homes

and to link the building into the sustainability and renewable energy requirements and other relevant obligations of the wider development; and

8.3.2 referral to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for her direction as it represents a departure application involving development of land belonging to a planning authority.

9 Quarterly Planning Performance Report LTGDC/07/PC45

9.1 John Allen introduced the fourth quarterly report advising the Committee of the performance of the Corporation's development control function. He noted that the data in Table 6 detailing housing units granted and potential net jobs created showed that, should they all be implemented, good progress is being made.

9.2 He noted that there were delays in the application handling process and there is a question of whether the Corporation should do more of the process 'in-house'. There are currently discussions with Boroughs about this issue.

9.3 The Committee **NOTED** the Quarterly Planning Performance Report LTGDC/07/PC45.

Date of next meeting:
13 September 2007, 6.30pm
Old Town Hall, 29 The Broadway, Stratford