
London Thames Gateway Development Corporation

Planning Committee Meeting

Thursday 14 July 2011, 6pm

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

Present: Cllr Conor McAuley (Chair)
Malcolm Chumbley
Alan Clark
Neil Deely
Cllr Mick McCarthy
Sylvie Pierce
Richard Turner

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

1. Apologies, Announcements and Declarations of Interest

1.1 Apologies were received from Dru Vesty.

1.2 There were no declarations of interest.

2. Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting 10 March 2011

LTGDC/11/PC14 & LTGDC/11/PC15

2.1 The Committee **AGREED** the minutes of the open part of the Planning Committee Meeting on 10 March 2011.

2.2 The Committee **AGREED** the exempt minutes of the confidential part of the Planning Committee Meeting on 10 March 2011.

2.3 There were no matters arising.

3. Site of Former Sun Chemicals Inks (UK) Ltd., Sunshine Wharf, Bradfield Road, Silvertown, London E16 2AX

LTGDC/11/PC16

3.1 Peter Minoletti introduced this item, an application from Jighand Ltd for temporary planning permission (6 years) to use the northern half of Sunshine Wharf as a metal recycling plant. Whilst Sunshine Wharf is a

safeguarded wharf, the temporary permission was considered not to prejudice future uses involving the use of the Thames. The application area excludes a substantial part of the site which fronts onto the river itself. It was pointed out that the site is also within a safeguarded industrial area in Newham's UDP and policies in the submission draft Core Strategy did not contradict this proposed use allocation. The surrounding uses are industrial in nature with the nearest residential houses being over 260 metres away. Two objections had been received from local residents but were not considered to justify refusal given the industrial uses and land use allocation in the area and the fact that traffic generation would not be significant in the context of the site and surrounding area.

- 3.2 Malcolm Chumbley asked why the permission was limited to 6 years, and also sought clarification on the safeguarded wharf aspect. Peter Minoletti responded that the site is one of a number of sites owned by Ballymore and part of a larger masterplan, which may come forward in future. In response to the safeguarded wharf aspect, Peter Minoletti confirmed the site was protected but that the metal recycling plant would be situated mostly to the northern end of the site away from the river. The safeguarded status of the wharf was under review and the temporary permission would allow the situation to be reconsidered in the light of prevailing policy in a few years time without prejudicing the potential future use of the site.
- 3.3 Richard Turner questioned what size a 20 tonne lorry (as referred to in the committee report) was in real terms and also expressed concern about the appropriateness of the proposed dropped kerb being the entrance/exit to an industrial site. Peter Minoletti said his understanding was that it would be a medium sized lorry, adding that Bradford Road and Silvertown Way are able to accommodate larger vehicles from the other industrial uses in the surrounding area. With regards to the dropped kerb point, Peter Minoletti said officers would verify this with the Newham Highways Officer and if necessary Section 278 works could be carried out.
- 3.4 Sylvie Pierce noted that the Environment Agency had concerns relating to pollution to the River Thames and asked officers if they were confident the conditions addressed this. Peter Minoletti responded in the affirmative. The conditions were as recommended by the Environment Agency. The proposed recycling plant was to the north of the site away from the river bank. If any drainage were necessary it would be in accordance with regulations.
- 3.5 The Committee **AGREED** to delegate authority to the Director of Planning or duly authorised officer to grant time limited planning permission subject to the draft conditions and informatives as set out in section 11 and 12 of the report (LTGDC/11/PC16), together with any amendments or additions that he considers necessary, subject to the completion of a legal agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and other relevant legislation requiring the obligations listed in the report to Committee.

4. Tower Hamlets Development Plan Document Consultation (Sites and Placemaking, Fish Island Area Action Plan, Development Management) *LTGDC/11/PC17*

- 4.1 Peter Minoletti introduced the report which sets out the Corporation's proposed response to the three engagement drafts of the Development Plan Documents published by LB Tower Hamlets for consultation. The documents relate to the allocation of uses for significant development sites (Sites and Placemaking), an Area Action Plan (AAP) for the Fish Island area within the Borough and a Development Management Document which at this stage will give an overview of the policies needed to support objectives in the Core Strategy. A brief synopsis was provided on each document and the Committee was asked to agree the proposed responses as set out in Appendices A, B and C of the report.
- 4.2 Neil Deely referred to the zoning areas depicted in 'Figure 3 – Development proposals for Fish Island' (Appendix B1, page 6), in particular the 'mixed use transitional area' which he considered a loose term and asked officers if they were confident there would not be inappropriate juxtaposing. Peter Minoletti confirmed more detail was needed on how the transitional uses would occur, as well as how much employment space would be allocated.
- 4.3 The Committee **NOTED** the contents of the report and **AGREED** to the comments in the report forming the Corporation's formal response to the Development Plan documents.

5. Planning Performance Monitoring Quarterly Report *LTGDC/11/PC18*

- 5.1 John Allen introduced the quarterly report which provided details of the performance of the Corporation's development control function for the last quarter. Attention was drawn to page 5 of the report which detailed that in the last quarter the Corporation had determined 64% of its applications within the 13 week timescale or a timetable agreed with the applicant through a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA).
- 5.2 Malcolm Chumbley asked if there was a penalty imposed for not meeting government targets. John Allen advised there was not.
- 5.3 The Committee **NOTED** the contents of the report.

6. S106 Planning Obligations Monitoring Quarterly Report *LTGDC/11/PC19*

- 6.1 The Committee **NOTED** the report which detailed the Section 106 agreements that the Corporation has agreed and signed in the fourth quarter of 2010/11.

7. S106 Planning Obligations Monitoring Annual Report *LTGDC/11/PC20*

- 7.1 John Allen introduced the annual report drawing attention to Appendix 1, which detailed the monies which had been received or were still due, which had been negotiated by the Corporation via section 106 agreements. So far the Corporation has received around £6m of the £120m negotiated.
- 7.2 Following the Corporation's planning powers in the London Riverside area being handed back to the London Borough's of Barking and Dagenham and Havering in April 2011, it has been agreed that relevant sums of the section 106 monies would also be passed to those boroughs. It is also expected that a similar arrangement would happen when the Corporation's planning powers are handed over for the Lower Lea Valley area, in that any outstanding agreements/ monies would be collected by the relevant planning authority.
- 7.3 The Committee **NOTED** the contents of the report.

8. LATE ITEM - Mayor of London: Consultation Response on Draft CIL Charging Schedule *LTGDC/11/PC21*

- 8.1 John Allen introduced the report which informed Members of the Corporation's response to the Mayor of London's public consultation on the draft charging schedule, for setting a Mayor's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The Mayor was proposing to use the CIL to raise funds towards the costs of Crossrail. Due to the deadline for responses which expired prior to the Committee Meeting, an Officer level response (Appendices 1 and 2 to the report) had already been submitted. The Corporation's response was generally supportive of the Crossrail Levy Charge, but raised the need for provision to allow for exemption in certain circumstances, given the demand on contributions to support new development and regeneration within its area.
- 8.2 Richard Turner asked what the Crossrail Levy percentage would be. John Allen indicated it would be between 20% to 40%, which is a significant percentage when funds are needed for new schools, health provision and other forms of local infrastructure.
- 8.3 The Committee **NOTED** the contents of the report and **AGREED** the response.

The meeting concluded at 6.20pm.

Date of next meeting:

Thursday 11 August 2011, 6.30pm

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