

## DRAFT Minutes

---

### London Thames Gateway Development Corporation

#### Planning Committee Members Meeting

Thursday, 12 June 2008, 4-6pm

The Old Town Hall, 29 The Broadway, Stratford, E15 2BQ

**Present:** Conor McAuley (Chair)  
John Biggs – who left after item 4  
Alan Clark  
Sid Kallar  
Richard Turner  
Dru Vesty  
John Worthington

**In Attendance:** John Allen (Director of Planning)  
Peter Minoletti (Planning Development Manager)  
Lynette Duncan (Interim Committee Clerk)  
Howard Bassford (DLA Piper)

---

#### 1. Apologies, Announcements and Declarations of Interest

- 1.1 There were apologies from Lorraine Baldry and Atul Patel
- 1.2 There were no declarations of interest.

#### 2. Minutes of the Members' Meeting of 8 May 2008

- 2.1 The Committee **AGREED** the minutes of 8 May 2008. There were no matters arising.

#### 3. Land on West Side of Leamouth Road at South West Junction of East India Dock Road, Leamouth Road, London E14

- 3.1 Mr John Baker spoke in opposition to the application. His objection was to the high density of the development, the lack of open space and the lack of space for personal exercise. He urged refusal of the application.
- 3.2 Mr Pool spoke on behalf of the applicant. He agreed it was a high density scheme which had been worked out very carefully with the officers, but half of the area was either open space or play space. The space was on a number of levels which he considered could accommodate the density

level. There would be a management team to ensure the play areas would be co-ordinated and would take place. Also there were shops for convenience. He believed the applicant had addressed PPG 17 issues. The transport assessment meant that vehicle movements would be very low and lorries would be controlled. There was very low parking on the scheme.

- 3.3 Peter Minoletti introduced the committee report which was an application for a mixed use residential led scheme on a currently vacant site. The development proposals had been assessed against the LBTH Unitary Development Plan, the Interim Planning Guidance, associated supplementary planning guidance, the London Plan and Government Planning Policy Guidance
- 3.4 Discussions were at an advanced stage regarding the S106 on a range of issues including affordable housing, public transport and to ensure financial contributions for measures to mitigate the impact of the development.
- 3.5 Some items such as colours of materials would be a reserved matter and would be delegated to the Director of Planning to approve..
- 3.6 John Biggs had concerns on the level of affordable housing, whether there would be sufficient play and amenity space for families and access to public transport. He was assured that the calculations on affordable housing were in line with the GLA policy, the amenity spaces were in and around buildings and at different levels and bus and DLR services were within walking distances. He was also advised that TfL were still working on the details of some aspects.
- 3.7 Richard Turner asked to know how the servicing management strategy would work. He was advised that this was intended to limit movements on site, it would be part of the tenancy agreement and would be the subject of “booking arrangements” .
- 3.8 The Committee **AGREED** the recommendation by 5 votes in favour, there were no objections and no abstentions.

#### **4. Beckton Gasworks, Armada Way, London E6**

- 4.1 Mr Jim Rowland spoke against the application. He did not agree with the use of bio-fuels and considered solid fuels should be used. He also asked that the matter be deferred until a research paper for the Government (the Gallagher report) had been published and digested on the use of bio-fuels. He felt it was a moral issue not to use land for growing such fuels.
- 4.2 Ms Julia Brownlow also spoke against the application. She felt that there was a hazard effect for the area and that this was another development that had a cumulative impact which resulted in emissions above green levels. She felt a full assessment had not been carried out into the impact on the area. She referred to the increase in the level of asthma in children.

She also pointed out that a lot of the information on this application was in technical jargon which the public could not understand.

- 4.3 Mr Dimarco spoke against the application. He felt that Blue-NG had no accreditation and their website did not state their track record. He felt this scheme was being trailed by Blue-NG with no guarantee that it would work. He felt more explanation about what they are doing and how it would work was needed. In reply to a question from the committee he said his occupation was an engineer.
- 4.4 Mr Deepak Rughani spoke against the application. He felt the application should be reviewed with more relevant information as to what the company intended to do and how it would work. He stated that this would be more pollution in an already very polluted borough.
- 4.5 Mr Andrew Mercer spoke in support of the applicant. He referred to the statement issued by Greenpeace which had been submitted to the relevant officers of the Borough and LTGDC in support of the application and of it being the first of its kind in the world and spoke of its benefits and its efficient use of bio-fuels. There is no carbon use at all in the process. The application also had the support of Friends of the Earth.
- 4.6 John Biggs asked the objectors what value there was to defer a decision in this matter. Mr Dimarco said that it was because we do not know who Blue-NG are and therefore do not know if the technology would work. He referred to the Gallagher report commissioned by Ruth Kelly and urged a delay until that had been published.
- 4.7 On a request for advice from the Chair, Mr Bassford advised that the committee should listen to what each side had to say and the written data before it and then decide what weight should be given to the evidence.
- 4.8 Dru Vesty asked if the opportunity arose, could it be made to work by converting to a different source of material. She was advised that there was the capacity to convert the use to second generation bio-fuels. There might be technical issues in planning law, but it was intended to work with the GLA and local electricity requirements and they would be exporting to the grid. They could also plug into a district heat and power system in the future.
- 4.9 Peter Minoletti introduced the committee report and tabled an addendum report providing an update on various aspects recommending approval to the application, subject to the satisfactory completion of a S106 agreement on the lines detailed in the report. The application is for a combined cycle bio-fuel electricity Plan at the Gas Pressure Reduction Station. The facility will consist of a Turbo Expander building, a CHP building housing two bio-fuel storage area comprising three 75,000 litre tanks. The facility will generate electricity by utilising wasted thermal energy required in the gas pressure reduction process. The predicted electrical output is 19.5 megawatts of electricity which equates to the electricity needs of approximately 48,000 homes.

- 4.10 The Committee heard that the EHO from Newham was satisfied with the technical information received. It was also advised by Mr Bassford that this application was not one that required an Environment Statement in Planning Law.
- 4.11 The Committee unanimously **APPROVED** the application subject to the conditions set out in the report and the satisfactory completion of a S106 agreement to secure:-
- Air Quality and Odour Management Strategy
  - Noise Management Strategy
  - Fuel Sourcing Statement
  - Research and Development Statement

## **5. London Borough of Hackney LDF Work**

- 5.1 Peter Minoletti introduced the committee report which considered the elements of the Hackney Council Core Strategy – Preferred Options paper which was out for public consultation, with direct relevance to the LTGDC in the Hackney Wick area and also the wider planning context that the proposed Core Strategy would have implications for.
- 5.2 Richard Turner referred to option 32 – designing out crime and how servicing requirements would be taken into account. Hewas advised that this was a high level document, design details into such a strategy would come later once matters cascaded down.
- 5.3 Dru Vesty wished to be assured that local firms with larger lorries would not be squeezed out. She was advised that this would not be the case
- 5.4 The Committee **AGREED** the contents of the report should form the basis of the LTGDC's response to the Hackney Council's consultation document.

### **Date of next meeting:**

Thursday, 10 July 2008, 6.30pm

The Old Town Hall, 29 The Broadway, Stratford, E15 2BQ