

## Minutes

---

### London Thames Gateway Development Corporation

#### Planning Committee Meeting

Thursday, 10 July 2008, 6.30pm

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

**Present:** Conor McAuley (Chair)  
Lorraine Baldry  
John Biggs  
Alan Clark  
Atul Patel  
Richard Turner  
Dru Vesty  
John Worthington

**In Attendance:** John Allen (Director of Planning)  
Will Steadman (Planning Officer)  
Lynette Duncan (Interim Committee Clerk)  
Nigel Hewitson (Norton Rose)

---

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

- 1.1 There were apologies from Sid Kallar
- 1.2 There were no declarations of interest.

#### 2. Minutes of the Members' Meeting of 10 June 2008

- 2.1 The Committee **AGREED** the minutes of 10 June 2008. There were no matters arising.

#### 3. Vanesta Wharf, North Woolwich Road, Silvertown

#### 4. Minoco Wharf, North Woolwich Road, Silvertown

- 4.1 Items 3 and 4 were taken together because of the locational link of the two proposals.
- 4.2 Will Steadman introduced each item in turn. The application at item 3 is to construct a riverboat pier and riverside walk at Vanesta Wharf. The application at item 4 is to redevelop Minoco Wharf with a significant

residential-led mixed use development oriented around a new marina and lock access with the River Thames. Both applications were submitted in duplicate. The Minoco Wharf application straddles the boundary between the Corporation and the LBN. The Minoco Wharf application was presented first.

- 4.3 In April 2008 the Committee and the LBN considered two appealed applications relating to Minoco Wharf. The Committee and LBN resolved that had an appeal not been lodged they would have refused the application for several identical reasons. On 2 May and 16 June 2008 the applicant revised the applications in order to address the reasons for refusal. The Minoco Wharf application proposed a comprehensive mixed use development comprising residential, employment retail, professional, food and drink uses, community, health, education, cultural, recreational and leisure. The scheme amendments related to development height, scale and massing, affordable housing, housing mix, amenity space, ecology and a S106. The Committee was asked to resolve how it would determine the revised duplicate application.
- 4.4 The Vanesta Wharf riverboat pier will replace an existing pontoon. The pier will extend 100m into the River Thames and provide access to a structure for passengers waiting to board a river bus. The application also proposes an 8m wide riverside walkway that will extend the Minoco Wharf riverside walkway along the Vanesta Wharf riverfront.
- 4.5 Members requested an explanation of 'best endeavours' and 'reasonable endeavours' in relation to the applicant facilitating the provision of a river bus service for an agreed minimum period of time. Nigel Hewitson advised that best endeavours meant that the applicant would be expected to do "all in its power" to bring about whatever they signed up to, whereas reasonable endeavours meant that the applicant would "do what was reasonable but without detriment to itself".
- 4.6 Members wished to know if the river bus services would be guaranteed if it was demonstrated that they were not commercially viable. Officers advised that if the river bus was not in place or it was unviable, then the financial offset credited to the applicant for providing the riverside pier would be paid as part of the discounted standard charge. There was also an option for subsidy for this service.
- 4.7 Members expressed concern that the public realm and riverside walkway would not be made accessible to the public. Will Steadman advised that this requirement would be incorporated within the S106 Agreement.
- 4.8 Members requested clarification that the housing density was appropriate for the site' public transport accessibility, how play space was provided within the site and how the development would be phased. Officers confirmed that the applicant had agreed to make financial contributes to improve the public transport network, the scheme provided a range of opportunities for play and is located within proximity of two parks and that the development phasing would be agreed through the S106 Agreement.

- 4.9 Members expressed concern about the viability of retail provision within the site. Officers explained that the quantum of retail floorspace had been agreed to provide a convenience offer and complement the proposed district centre at Silvertown Quays.
- 4.10 Members were advised that LBN's resolution was the same as the recommendation before them.
- 4.11 The Committee **AGREED** to delegate authority to the Director of Planning to grant planning permission for the Vanesta Wharf and Minoco Wharf applications subject to:-
- A. Any 'call in' direction following referral of the Minoco Wharf application to the Government Office for London as a departure from the adopted Unitary Development Plan
  - B. Any direction from the Mayor of London to refuse planning permission
  - C. The planning conditions set out at section 12 of the reports and
  - D. The completion of a S106 Agreement securing the head of terms set out in paragraph 11 of the reports.

## 5. **75-77 Chequers Lane, Dagenham**

- 5.1 Will Steadman introduced the application for the erection of an extension in connection with the part conversion of the premises into a biomass renewable energy turbine house. Officers tabled a letter submitted by the applicant's planning consultants dated 10 July 2008. Officers explained that consultants had been appointed to provide the Corporation with an independent assessment of the application and consider the strength of the case being advanced by the Greater London Authority. The advice received recommended that the Corporation refuse the application as it does not include sufficient information to justify the technology proposed, its impact on the environment nor demonstrate that it makes the fullest contribution to the mitigation of and adaptation to climate change.
- 5.2 The applicant had appealed against non-determination which meant that the Corporation could not determine the application as this was now in the hands of the Secretary of State. Officers explained that the Committee was required to resolve how it would have determined the application had an appeal not been submitted to the Secretary of State.
- 5.3 The Committee recognised that the application had the potential to reduce disposal of waste at landfill. This policy objective was outweighed by the areas of policy conflict identified in the report. The Committee **AGREED** the statement of case to be submitted to the Secretary of State, and subject to Counsel's advice, be based on the reasons for refusal set out in paragraph 11 of the report.

**Date of next meeting:**

Thursday, 11 September 2008, 6.30pm

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