

Minutes

London Thames Gateway Development Corporation

Planning Committee Meeting

Thursday 10 November 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
Richard Turner
Cllr Kosru Uddin

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 Neil Deely, Cllr Mick McCarthy and Sylvie Pierce.
- 1.2 The Chair declared an interest in Item 5 as LB Newham's Executive Member for Regeneration and Strategic Planning. It was **AGREED** that Item 5 would be taken last and 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 13 October 2011

LTGDC/11/PC32

- 2.1 The Committee **AGREED** the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting on 13 October 2011. There were no matters arising.

3. Land adjacent to H Forman and Son, Fish Island E3 2NT *LTGDC/11/PC33*

3.1 The following three objectors spoke against the application:

3.1.1 Mr Roberts, the freeholder of a site on Monier Road raised two concerns: 1) that he had not been advised of the transport arrangements during the Olympic Games and how this would impact on the access to his site, and 2) a map submitted with the above application showed his site as a possible coach park.

3.1.2 Ms Michelle Gabriel, a resident of the Ironworks, expressed her dissatisfaction with the process for notification of the Committee Meeting; the allocation of 5 minutes total for speakers to address the Committee and the lack of notice to review the Addendum Report. Ms Gabriel said that the proposed nightclub is 50 metres away from the Ironworks and a 2am finish for a period of four months would be very disruptive. She added that the application lacked a credible transport plan and the proposed private transport would have a negative impact locally by swamping the streets as well as health and safety issues. Drawing attention to the recently consented hospitality facilities at nearby Swan Wharf which has a capacity of 4,000, she said if this scheme were approved with its 8,000 capacity there would be a total of 12,000 capacity within a small area, which is three times more than other nightclubs around London. Ms Gabriel noted that the LB Tower Hamlets' had recommended refusal and appealed to the Committee to refuse the application.

3.1.3 Mr Frank Luke, a local resident, said he would be deprived of his home of 9 years during the period the proposed nightclub would be in operation. He raised concerns relating to the proposed removal of three 80 year old trees which have TPO's, damage to the conservation area, the negative impact to local businesses and the increase in traffic on the local roads which will result in them becoming gridlocked.

3.2 Mr Lance Forman, the applicant and proprietor of H Forman and Son, spoke in favour of the application. He said that his business has been on Fish Island since 1971 and since then he has built a factory, restaurant, visitor centre and art gallery, currently employing 85 staff from the local community – including from the Ironworks. Mr Forman said the Olympic Games is a one off opportunity and should be utilised to help regenerate East London; he claimed that his proposal will help bring a focus to Fish Island. However, Mr Forman said he had noted the concerns raised by the objectors and would work with them to minimise those concerns where possible. He added that he had received many messages of support from all over London following a recent news programme on the proposal.

3.3 The Committee were invited to ask the speakers questions. Mr Forman supplied the following responses:

- Confirmed that planning permission would be needed from April to September to allow for test events to be run, including during the Diamond Jubilee if possible, prior to the commencement of the Olympic Games.
 - Advised that the reason for the outline planning application was to obtain approval for the principle of the proposal to enable him to market and sell the idea to an operator.
 - Confirmed that he was agreeable to a requirement/condition for the trip generation figures.
- 3.4 Peter Minoletti introduced the application by H Forman and Son, for the temporary planning permission for a corporate hospitality venue from April to September 2012. All detailed matters are reserved with the exception of the use and the scale parameters. An Addendum Report was tabled at the meeting which provided an update on representations, officer responses and proposed changes to some of the conditions in the main Committee Report. The officer provided a summary of the report, and addressed some of the objector concerns, in addition to officer responses in the two reports, adding that it was considered that the recommended conditions and S106 clauses in both the main Committee Report and Addendum Report sufficiently dealt with the full range of concerns and objections raised. At their request, representations from Cllr Marc Francis and the planning consultants for the occupiers of Lock Keepers Cottages, had been circulated to the Committee. The officer indicated that the points raised did not, in his opinion, constitute material planning considerations to justify a change to the recommendations. In response to Mr Roberts' concerns (see para 3.1.1) Peter Minoletti advised that the transport planning around the Olympic Games was a matter to be raised with the OPLC and in terms of the use of Mr Roberts' site for coaches, this was only one of several options and could be accommodated elsewhere.
- 3.5 Alan Clark sought clarification on the role of the LB Tower Hamlets' Licensing Committee. It was advised that Licensing Committees are set up under separate legislation from Planning Committees and that the LB Tower Hamlets' Licensing Committee is not bound by the Corporation's Planning Committee' decision.
- 3.6 Cllr Kosru Uddin raised concerns about the increased traffic, the bulk and scale of the proposed development and how the venue itself would be managed, as well as related noise issues; why the venue needed to be in operation outside the Olympic Games period and suggested that the venue should be closed by 11.30pm all the time. Peter Minoletti reminded Members that it was an outline application. However details would be provided at a later date and examined carefully by officers. The officer added that the proposed hospitality facilities would have limited hours for the first two months, and during the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games would close at 2am. Peter Minoletti agreed that the bulk and scale were larger than the neighbouring buildings but again reminded Members it would be a temporary structure and that the Borough's Conservation

Design officer had been consulted and had raised no objections in relation to bulk and scale.

- 3.7 Dru Vesty noting that noise and opening hours were matters for the LB Tower Hamlets' Licensing Committee, asked how the resident's would be kept apprised of developments and if the S106 document is a public document. Peter Minoletti advised once the S106 agreement had been completed and signed it would be a public document.
- 3.8 Malcolm Chumbley referred to the similar scheme nearby at Swan Wharf which the Committee had recent approved, and asked about the consistency of both schemes. Peter Minoletti confirmed that the operating hours were consistent but the applications themselves were different as Swan Wharf had been a detailed application, rather than outline.
- 3.9 The Committee **AGREED** to **GRANT** outline temporary permission subject to:
- a) A Section 106 Agreement as outlined in section 10.2 of the main Committee Report;
 - b) Referral to the Mayor of London for his Stage 2 determination; and
 - c) The conditions listed in section 11 of the main Committee Report (LTGDC/11/PC33) and as amended in the Addendum Report.

4. **Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance – Response to Public Consultation** *LTGDC/11/PC34*

- 4.1 John Allen introduced this report which provided the Corporation's suggested response to the Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance (OLSPG) consultation document, which has been produced by GLA officers with input from LTGDC and the Boroughs.
- 4.2 Attention was drawn to section 7 of the report which details comments related to school provision – that recently approved education facilities at Bromley by Bow had not been included in the document.
- 4.3 Dru Vesty noted that paragraph 7.3 referred to the provision of a secondary school on Fish Island East and asked if there was a site in mind. Peter Minoletti responded that the legacy planning application proposes a health centre and primary school, and whilst the Borough had recently concluded that it should be a secondary school, it was thought there was a distinct possibility that an alternative site outside of the Olympic Park would be found for the primary school.
- 4.4 The Committee **NOTED** the contents of the report and **AGREED** that the proposed response would form the Corporation's formal response to the consultation document.

5. **Planning Performance and Planning Obligations Monitoring Quarterly Report** LTGDC/11/PC36

5.1 The Committee **NOTED** the contents of the regular quarterly report.

6. **Emerging Planning Policy in the Lower Lea Valley: Newham Core Strategy – further consultation on “Schedule of Post Submission minor changes to the Core Strategy Submission draft”** LTGDC/11/PC35

6.1 Cllr Conor McAuley left the meeting. Dru Vesty took the chair for this item.

6.2 John Allen introduced the report which sets out the Corporation’s proposed response to the above consultation document.

6.3 The officer confirmed to the Committee that;

- a map for the Lea River Park would be provided with the response, and;
- in reference to Appendix 1 – *SIL and release and consolidation of wharves* – that the wharves study carried out by URS on behalf of the Corporation had previously been provided to, and considered by, LB Newham. Consequently 4 out of the 5 wharves are proposed by the GLA to be de-safeguarded.

6.4 The Committee **NOTED** the contents of the report and **AGREED** that the proposed response would form the Corporation’s formal response to the consultation document.

The meeting concluded at 6.53pm

Date of next meeting:

Thursday 08 December 2011, 6pm

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