



## Minutes

---

### London Thames Gateway Development Corporation

#### Planning Committee Meeting

Wednesday 26 January 2011, 6pm

Old Town Hall Stratford, 29 The Broadway, Stratford E15 4BQ

**Present:** Cllr Conor McAuley (Chair)  
Dru Vesty (Deputy Chair)  
Malcolm Chumbley  
Alan Clark  
Neil Deely  
Sylvie Pierce  
Richard Turner

**In Attendance:** John Allen (Director of Planning)  
Peter Minoletti (Planning Development Manager)  
Stephen Allen (Planning Development Officer)  
Nigel Hewitson (Norton Rose)  
Angela Flanagan (Committee Clerk)

---

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

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Mick McCarthy.
- 1.2 The Chair declared an interest in Item 4 as he is also the Chair of LB Newham's Strategic Development Committee which had recently considered the application. It was agreed that the Deputy Chair, Dru Vesty, would chair the meeting for this item.
- 1.3 There were no other declarations of interest.

#### 2. **Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting 09 December 2010**

*LTGDC/11/PC01*

- 2.1 The Committee **AGREED** the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting on 09 December 2010. There were no matters arising.

**3. Royal Mail Parcel Force, Stephenson Street, E16** *LTGDC/11/PC02*

- 3.1 Peter Minoletti introduced the application by LOCOG to use the remainder of the former Parcel Force site by West Ham Station as a temporary depot for athletes' buses for both the Olympics and the Paralympics.
- 3.2 The Committee asked if any of the existing buildings on the site were occupied. The officer responded they were not, and confirmed that all the buildings on site including the largest building in the middle of the site would be demolished as part of the scheme. Confirmation was also sought that the timescale of 4 weeks for dismantling the site after the Games was finished would be achievable. The Officer advised that LOCOG had specified this timing in their application.
- 3.3 The Committee **AGREED** to **GRANT** time limited planning permission subject to the draft conditions as listed in Section 12 of the committee report (LTGDC/11/PC02).

**4. Western Gateway, West Silvertown, London E16** *LTGDC/11/PC03*

- 4.1 Conor McAuley vacated the chair at this point and stated that, as he had participated in the consideration of a related application for part of the cable car system by Newham's Development Control Committee which had resolved to grant planning permission, in order to avoid any perception of bias in this Committee's consideration he would not speak or vote on this item. Dru Vesty took the chair for this item.
- 4.2 Alan Haughton, a resident of Tower Hamlets, spoke against the application. He said that whilst he supported the cable car project his objection related to public safety. He believes there is a breach to the Public Safety Zone (PSZ). Whilst he noted that Department for Transport's (DfT) policy had been quoted in the main report he found it "shocking" that they had not been one of the consultees for the application. He said that the DfT were the appropriate authority to provide policy and advice on Public Safety Zones. He added that the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and the London City Airport (LCA), who had been consulted, had no responsibility for PSZs and that airport safeguarding was not the same as Public Safety Zones.
- 4.3 Jenny Bates, Friends of the Earth London Campaign Co-ordinator, also spoke against the application. Ms Bates said she was in favour of the cable car, but had concerns relating to public safety too. Reiterating Mr Haughton's point she stressed the importance of aircraft safety being a separate matter from Public Safety Zones. She also commented that whilst the committee report made reference to DfT guidance she could not see any evidence that any analysis of safety risks had been carried out, and referred to the risk assessment for the Thames Gateway Bridge as an example to be followed.

4.4 The Committee were invited to ask the objectors questions:

- In response to a question as to whether there was any evidence that the Committee should not be satisfied that the Public Safety Zones had been considered, both Mr Houghton and Ms Bates said yes due to the alleged lack of analysis to the PSZs.
- Both objectors confirmed to the Committee that they were requesting that analysis be carried out into the potential accident zone and Public Safety Zone to look at the implications of an aeroplane crash and the potential safety implications for the public.

4.5 Richard de Cani, Head of Strategy and Policy, Transport for London (one of the applicants) spoke in favour of the application. Addressing the concerns raised by the objectors he advised that the applicants had worked to the London Borough of Newham's adopted Strategic Planning Guidance, which indicates that the scheme only encroaches slightly into the Public Safety Zone. He added that the risks of constructing a cable car system in a location near to the safety zone had been fully considered, and had been subject to various technical inputs including from London City Airport, the Civil Aviation Authority and the National Air Traffic Services. Mr de Cani stressed that Transport for London, as the strategic transport authority, would not propose a scheme which would put public safety at risk. Mr de Cani concluded by stating that the proposal would have strong transport benefits and was part of a broader TfL strategy for connecting regeneration areas.

4.6 A Committee member asked Mr de Cani for his response to both objectors' points on the Department for Transport's guidance. Mr de Cani answered that Circular 01/10 is applied locally through the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) which Newham had done. The applicants had worked to and complied with the Newham SPG. It was also pointed out that several structures exist within the Public Safety Zones including the DLR, the pedestrian crossing of the Royal Docks and road crossings.

4.7 Peter Minoletti introduced the application by the London Development Agency and Transport for London, which sought planning permission for part of a cable car proposal to link Royal Victoria Dock with Greenwich Peninsula. Due to the physical length of the proposal the overall scheme requires permission from the Corporation, the London Borough of Greenwich and the London Borough of Newham. The application before the Committee involves two towers for that part of the proposal cable car link, between sites close to the O<sup>2</sup> and ExCel, which falls within the Corporation's area of responsibility. An Addendum Report sets out various amendments to detailed points within the main report and several conditions, as well as confirmation that London City Airport had withdrawn its objection and that the London Borough of Newham had approved their part of the scheme on 18 January.

Meeting: 10 March 2011  
Agenda Item: 2  
Report No: LTGDC/11/PC07

- 4.8 In response to a question from members Nigel Hewitson reminded the Committee that their duty was to determine each application in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise. Although not technically part of the development plan, the Newham SPG "London City Airport Safeguarding" was intended to provide guidance and detailed advice on UDP policies. As such it should be accorded appropriate weight in the decision making process - the more so as it was derived in any event from the DfT guidance alluded to by the objectors.
- 4.9 Confirmation was sought that there was permission to use the land needed for the north intermediate tower between the dock and the river. The officer confirmed the land was owned by the London Development Agency, one of the applicants for the proposal.
- 4.10 The Committee **AGREED** to **GRANT** planning permission, subject to the Stage 2 referral response from the Mayor of London and the conditions listed in section 11 of the main report (LTGDC/11/PC03) as well as the amendments detailed in the Addendum Report.

**5. 90 White Post Lane, London E9**

*LTGDC/11/PC04*

- 5.1 Cllr Conor McAuley resumed the chair.
- 5.2 Peter Minoletti introduced the application by Regentmart for a ground floor plus mezzanine restaurant and five floors of light industrial use to be erected on the cleared site, within the Fish Island Strategic Industrial Location which is surrounded by a wide range of commercial uses. An Addendum report provided details on changes to materials following comments from Design for London and the London Borough of Hackney.
- 5.3 A member referred to the Servicing Management Plan (pg 15 of the main report) and asked if the wording could be amended to request that the details of the Servicing Management Plan be submitted and approved prior to any work commencing on site.
- 5.4 Neil Deely remarked that the architect should be congratulated on the design.
- 5.5 The Committee **AGREED** to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the condition listed at Section 11 of the main report (LTGDC/11/PC04) and the above requested amendment for the details of the Servicing Management Plan be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of any work on site.

**6. Planning Performance Monitoring Quarterly Report**

*LTGDC/11/PC05*

- 6.1 The Committee **NOTED** the regular quarterly report detailing the Corporations development control function.

Meeting: 10 March 2011  
Agenda Item: 2  
Report No: LTGDC/11/PC07

**7. S106 Monitoring Quarterly Report**

*LTGDC/11/PC06*

7.1 The Committee **NOTED** the contents of the report.

The meeting concluded at 6.39pm.

**Date of next meeting:**

Thursday 10 March 2011, 6pm

Old Town Hall Stratford, 29 The Broadway, Stratford E15 4BQ

DRAFT