

Minutes

London Thames Gateway Development Corporation

Planning Committee Meeting

Wednesday 21 April 2010, 6pm

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

Present: Cllr Conor McAuley (Chair)
Malcolm Chumbley
Neil Deely
Cllr Guy Nicholson
Richard Turner
Dru Vesty

In Attendance: 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 Alan Clark, Cllr Mick McCarthy and Sylvie Pierce.
- 1.2 Dru Vesty declared an interest in Item 5, as she is a member of the Homes and Community Agency (HCA) Board.
- 1.3 Nigel Hewitson declared an interest in Item 4, as the applicant is his client and he has been representing them in this matter. It was thought that legal advice was unlikely to be required but if it were needed then the item would need to be deferred so a legal representative from Denton Wilde Sapte could be in attendance.

2. Minutes of the Planning Committee Meetings

a) Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting on 11 February 2010

LTGDC/10/PC15

- 2.1 The Committee **AGREED** the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting on 11 February 2010.

2.2 The Chair referred to Item 4 in the minutes and the discussion members had on the lack of parking provision. He notified the Committee that he had taken this issue back to the Corporation's Board meeting and suggested that similar applications should be revisited given the Committee's concerns on this matter.

2.3 There were no other matters arising.

b) Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting on 30 March 2010

LTGDC/10/PC16 & LTGDC/10/PC17

2.4 It was noted under the apologies that Conor McAuley had not attended the meeting as he had made a declaration of interest for the Rathbone Market application as he chairs the Newham Programme Board.

2.5 Reference was made to paragraph 2.5 in the minutes (of the open part of the meeting) and confirmation was sought that CABE would be involved in approving the materials for the facades. Peter Minoletti said that he understood from Duncan Cumberland of the applicants that that would be the case.

2.6 The Committee **AGREED** the minutes of the open part of the Planning Committee Meeting on 30 March 2010.

2.7 The Committee **AGREED** the exempt minutes of the confidential part of the Planning committee Meeting on 30 March 2010.

3. Land to north of Rainham Station bounded by Ferry Lane, Wennington Road and former Station Approach Road, Rainham

LTGDC/10/PC18

3.1 Cllr Jeffrey Tucker, Leader of the Independent Local Residents' Group (LB Havering) spoke against the application. He said the application was an overdevelopment as the LB Havering had received monies to build only a library and not residential flats. He added that the proposed residential flats were too high and would have a negative impact on the Rainham Village Conservation area. Cllr Tucker appealed to the Committee to save what he described as the last remaining village in London.

3.2 Cllr Mark Stewart, Leader of the Rainham and Wennington Independent Residents' Group (LB Havering) also spoke against the application. He said that the proposed five storeys breached LB Havering policy that states that all buildings should be three storeys or less. Cllr Stewart stated that there were also health and safety issues with the development, and he referred to the children's facilities located on the 1st floor as well as the lack of parking for library and retail staff and residents which would have an adverse effect on the village. He requested that the points he had made be carefully considered by the Committee.

3.3 Nigel Young from the LB Havering (one of the applicants) spoke in favour of the application. He referred to the Borough's Local Development

Framework which had identified the area as appropriate for a new civic square with mixed retail and residential use. The design of the building helps screen views of nearby pylons and the proposed five storeys steps down to two storeys towards the conservation area. Mr Young concluded that the application would provide a state of the art library which would replace the existing outdated building and services.

3.4 The Committee posed questions to the objectors/applicant and the responses included:

- Asked to confirm that the scale and bulk of the building was one of their primary concerns, the objectors confirmed that they felt that the future of Rainham Village was tourism due to its historical buildings and that they considered it was unacceptable for a five storey block of flats to be developed opposite a Grade I Listed building. A petition with 3,000 signatures demonstrated the opposition locally to the development.
- Asked whether a five storey building breached Havering planning policies, Nigel Young (on behalf of the applicant) stated that there was no site specific policy covering the development site which restricted the height of buildings on it.
- Nigel Young confirmed there would not be any vehicle parking facilities within the scheme.

3.5 Peter Minoletti introduced the report and provided the background to the application for a part-2 and part-5 storey building comprising a public library, lifelong learning centre and community facilities including space for a children's playgroup, a WC facility for bus drivers, retail, café and 16 residential units, together with a new public open space, landscaping and cycle parking.

3.6 The scheme has been revised several times in conjunction with LB Havering Officers and interested external bodies such as English Heritage and the National Trust. Design had been a particular focus. The site was acquired by LTGDC as part of its proposals for helping to regenerate Rainham Village. The LB Havering's Regulatory committee had raised no objections to the scheme, but there had been opposition locally mainly on the grounds of design/scale of the development, impact on the area and the provision of residential flats. A detailed letter of objection from Mr Randell of the Rainham Preservation and Improvement Society had been circulated to the Committee.

3.7 An addendum report was tabled at the meeting which confirmed the Environment Agency and the Health and Safety Executive had withdrawn their objection and requested three conditions as detailed in the report.

3.8 The Committee discussed the application and had concerns relating to the bulk and massing of the proposed buildings, lack of residential parking, and the lack of comprehensive servicing arrangements for the scheme

3.9 The Committee **DEFERRED** consideration of application LTGDC-09-100-REG3 and directed officers to request that the applicant provide more detailed servicing plans, justification for the lack of parking provision for the residential flats and to look again at the massing and design of the upper storeys of said flats.

4. Beckton Gas Pressure Reduction Station and Adjoining Lane Armada Way, Gallions Reach, Beckton, London E6 7FB *LTGDC/10/PC19*

4.1 Nigel Hewitson left the meeting for this item.

4.2 Maryla Hart, on behalf of Food Not Fuel, spoke against the application. She had objected as she thought the extent of the proposed changes should be subject to a new full application rather than considered as a Section 73 application; whilst, the new design may produce less pollution than was currently the case, it would still be adding to the pollution exacerbating the poor air quality in Newham.

4.3 Richard Harkinson also spoke against the application. He contended that the proposed changes were of such a profound difference to the original application that they should have been submitted as a new application. Concern about the air quality and health risks was also expressed. Mr Harkinson urged the Committee to reject the Section 73 application.

4.4 Tim Waters from Planning Perspectives (the agent on behalf of the applicant) spoke in favour of the application. The proposal by Blue-NG would generate cleaner and more proficient electricity. Only minor design amendments would be needed for a large single engine instead of the current two. The noise and air quality impact would also be less.

4.5 The objectors were asked by the Committee if they would have objected to the application if it were in principle rather than detailed changes. Reference was made to letters of support from Greenpeace, Forum for the Future and Friends of the Earth for the original application and the principle of the site. Both objectors confirmed they would still object as there had been no validation of the model and the station would still produce 59% higher emissions.

4.6 In response to questions from the Committee Mr Waters (Agent);

- Confirmed the materials would remain the same as per the original application to retain an 'iconic' look.
- Advised there would be technology on the stack to enable monitoring of the emissions.
- Advised the building would be built using silver aluminium, and would be a curved design to provide some architectural integrity.
- Confirmed that the building would be 28m high at its highest point, 3m taller than the previously approved scheme.

- 4.7 Peter Minoletti introduced the report which relates to an application to vary the design of a combined cycle biofuel generation plant to generate renewable electrical energy at the existing Beckton Gas Pressure Reduction Station. An addendum report was also tabled at the meeting which as well as advising that LB Newham's Planning Committee resolved to raise no objection to the proposal, also concerned the objections raised by Mr Harkinson. Planning Permission was granted in January 2009 following a resolution to grant permission by the Planning committee on 12 June 2008. More technical work on the implementation of the project has occurred along with further advances in technology, since permission was granted. The Section 73 application is for changes to the design of the buildings. The application does not alter the previous decision on the principal of the use.
- 4.8 The Committee discussed the application. Malcolm Chumbley requested that Condition 10 (relating to the operation details of an Air Quality Management Scheme for the monitoring of health affects and nuisance) should be verified by a third party expert. Neil Deely commented on the visual appearance of the proposed building and whether aluminium corrugated panels reflected the building's purpose of providing a green source of energy and iconic design as proposed originally. The officer responded that the Committee needed to consider what had previously been approved and the context of the area, i.e. industrial. The Committee could request a condition for more details on the elevations.
- 4.9 The Committee, by unanimous vote, **AGREED** to grant planning permission subject to the changes to condition 2, that officers ensure verification by a third party for condition 10, the additional two conditions as set out in section 12 of the main report (LTGDC/10/PC19), as well as an additional condition relating to the details of the design elevations, and the satisfactory completion of a Deed of Variation to the original Section 106 agreement delegated to the Director of Planning.

5. 150 High Street Stratford, E15

LTGDC/10/PC20

- 5.1 Dru Vesty left the meeting for this item. Nigel Hewitson returned to the meeting.
- 5.2 Peter Minoletti introduced the report. The application sought planning permission for alterations to an approved scheme. The design revisions had arisen from the involvement of the HCA as a source of funding as well as the hotel use being replaced by extra care facilities. An addendum report was tabled at the meeting which updated Members on responses from LB Newham, Natural England and British Waterways along with some suggested minor changes to a few of the conditions. The design of the 43 storey tower remained unchanged, but significant positive changes were proposed to the layout of the adjacent blocks fronting the waterfront as detailed at paragraph 9.9 of the main report. The affordable housing offer would remain the same and the revision of the S106 agreement would not be a significant departure from what had already been agreed.

An addendum report was also tabled at the meeting detailing the LB Newham's Planning Committee resolution to support the application at its meeting on 14th April, as well as clarification on some points in the main report and the further consultation responses received.

- 5.3 The Committee discussed the application. Clarification was sought as to what was meant by 'limited deliveries' in paragraph 9.20, pg 20 in the main report. Peter Minoletti responded that the scheme is part built and the provision relates mainly to removal vehicles and access to and manoeuvres in the central courtyard. A swept path analysis plan had been provided with the main report. Chris Beard from DP9 Planning Consultants (the agent) was invited to address the Committee. He provided the context for the layout plans and how access during the development and fit out would work. Mr Beard confirmed there would also be access for deliveries (Tesco's shopping, pizza etc) via a lay-by area on Warton Road, as well as access via the courtyard which had been designed to accommodate vehicles, though the intention is to keep it as community space as much as possible. A question was asked relating to the materials for the tower and whether these would be reviewed along with the suggestion that the scale of the drawings/elevations be 1:10 or 1:20. The officer reminded Members that the tower was exactly the same as that in the original consented scheme and drew attention to condition 5 which requires further details of materials. The suggestion that such details should be shown on 1:10 / 1:20 scale drawings was noted.
- 5.4 The Committee, by unanimous vote, **AGREED** to give delegated authority to the Director of Planning to grant planning permission subject to an additional condition for a detailed layout of the internal courtyard and the amendment of condition 5 to require larger scale (at least 1:20) drawings for the bays and winter gardens, the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement, a financial contribution of £4,633,134, agreement of the Works in Kind to be offset from the financial contribution and the conditions as set out in section 12 of the main report (as amended above) (LTGDC/10/PC20).

The meeting concluded at 7.35pm.

Date of next meeting:

Thursday 13 May 2010, 6pm

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