

## **Addendum Planning Committee Report**

---

### **London Thames Gateway Development Corporation**

### **Planning Application**

### **Report of the Director of Planning**

---

#### **1. Introduction**

1.1 This addendum report provides an update to members on matters that have transpired since the publication of the Committee report. Specifically, the scheme has been before the London Borough of Hackney Planning Committee, a formal response has been received from the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, the Olympic Park Legacy Company have provided comments and further comments have been received from Groveworld Limited. The deletion of an informative included in error is also recommended.

#### **2 London Borough of Hackney**

2.1 As set out at paragraph 5.1 of the Committee report, the scheme was reported to Hackney's planning sub-committee on 1st February. A letter has since been received formalising the committee resolution. This letter endorses all but the first reason for objection listed under paragraph 5.1 of the main committee report, being the justification of the quantum of retail floorspace.

2.2 Paragraph 5.2 of the main committee report responds to the points raised by Hackney.

#### **3 London Borough of Tower Hamlets**

3.1 Tower Hamlets have provided their formal response to the proposal, which has been endorsed by senior officers rather than the planning committee. A full copy of the response is appended to this report and the main points summarised as follows.

3.2 Tower Hamlets have indicated their support for the following elements of the scheme:

- The physical and mixed use regeneration of the site to create the first stage of a new vibrant neighbourhood hub;

- New pedestrian routes which aid connectivity across the area (subject to legal obligation)
- The provisions of new affordable employment space (subject to legal obligation)
- New central public realm area;
- Rational design and built layout of the development;
- Low levels of on-site car parking;
- Phase 1 development within Tower Hamlets.

3.3 The response also identifies the following areas of concern:

- Current lack of affordable housing provision and commitment on or off site;
- Lack of commitment in planning application and S106 to deliver the north-south underpass link and Hackney Wick Station improvements, including improved access and entrances;
- No current commitment to BREEAM 'excellent' and/or connections to District Heat and Power network at Kings Yard and Old Ford Waste Water treatment works;
- Lack of detailed design of the proposed buildings including materials, articulation and architecture.

3.4 The representation goes on to comment in more detail on each of the key features of the scheme and make recommendations on each.

#### *Affordable Housing*

3.5 Lack of on-site provision of affordable housing is the Borough's key concern. However, should on-site commitments not occur, an up-front commuted payment with an obligation to review future phase profitability has been requested. This request is considered reasonable and will form part of any future S106 agreement.

#### *North-South Underpass Link and Hackney Wick Station Improvements*

3.6 Tower Hamlets express concern that they have not been provided with written assurances that the underpass and station improvements will be delivered. A Grampian condition has been suggested to ensure the pedestrian underpass is in place prior to the implementation of the development, coupled with a S106 obligation requiring the developer to cooperate with Network Rail and London Overground.

3.7 Officers consider that neither a Grampian condition or S106 obligation is necessary, but a more specifically worded condition may be more suitable. To date, the underpass and station improvements have received £1.25m in OPTEMS funding and engineering studies into the underpass location and build are at advanced stages. The suggested wording is:

*“Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a scheme detailing the interim landscape works to White Post Yard and Wallis Yard shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved interim landscape scheme shall be implemented in full until such a time as the*

*Hackney Wick Station underpass and entrance works are completed, upon which time the final landscape proposals agreed in the reserved matters shall be implemented in full."*

- 3.8 The advantage of this condition over a Grampian condition is that the development can proceed concurrently with any underpass works, rather than having to wait for the underpass to be completed.

#### *Affordable Workspace*

- 3.9 Tower Hamlets support the approach to affordable work space within the S106 agreement. An alternative has been suggested that the applicant is obliged to fit out the units upon selection of an occupier with first preference from businesses and business start up located within the respective Borough.

#### *Sustainable Environment*

- 3.10 It has been suggested that condition 19 securing Code 4 for Sustainable Homes should be amplified to allow for potential future levels 5 and 6 for each reserved matters should these be submitted at a time when the policy requirements have increased.
- 3.11 Tower Hamlets also suggest that a clause or condition could be attached to require the developer to investigation connections to the Kings Yard Energy Centre and Old Ford waste water treatment prior to commencement. This is considered reasonable and will be conditioned along with a requirement to ensure passive provision to allow future connection to a district heating network.

#### *Open Space and Public Realm*

- 3.12 A design code condition has been recommended to ensure specific details of landscaping is agreed and an obligation within the S106 agreement to prevent development upon areas identified as public realm has been suggested. The design code element can form part of the reserved matters condition.

#### *Scale and Mass*

- 3.13 A condition requiring minimum distances and screening between habitable facing rooms has been requested. The reserved matters will be required to meet these standards if they are to be approved.

#### *Conservation and Heritage*

- 3.14 Again, a design code has been suggested to be secured by condition. This will be included in the reserved matters condition.

#### *Appearance*

- 3.15 The design code condition is recommended.

#### *Noise and Vibration*

3.16 A condition has been requested to secure suitable acoustic mitigation has been requested. Condition 8 is considered to meet this request.

#### *Sunlight/Daylight*

3.17 A condition to prevent single aspect north facing units has been requested. Condition 4 requires all residential units to meet the London Housing Design Guide, which will ensure no single aspect north facing units.

#### *Waste and Refuse*

3.18 A condition to secure a waste management plan has been requested. This will be included on the final decision notice.

#### *Construction*

3.19 A construction and logistics plan and a service and delivery plan have been requested. The construction and logistics plan is secured through condition 9 and a service and delivery plan will be secured by a further condition.

### **4 Groveworld East London Regeneration Limited (Groveworld)**

4.1 Further representations have been submitted on behalf of Groveworld which seek to expand upon and clarify the earlier comments.

#### *Ownership Representation*

4.2 Paragraph 7.1 of the main committee report, describes Groveworld as owning 117 Wallis Road and representing other parties in the area. It goes on to state that no comments have been received from other parties. Groveworld claim that this implies doubt about the ownerships represented. Groveworld have now provided correspondence from M & D Silk Properties, Pall Mall Investments Ltd, East London Commercials Ltd, Central Books Ltd and Daro Factors Ltd. These letters each state their intention to work with Groveworld acting as lead developer partner.

#### *Underpass Options*

4.3 The comments also state that the assembly of owners has explicitly come about to assist with the implementation of the AAP and that discussions have been ongoing with the LTGDC and LB Hackney. However, no pre-application discussions have occurred with planning officers at LTGDC who are the responsible officers in relation to any potential planning application.

4.4 Groveworld make reference to representation dated 9 December 2011 submitted to LB Hackney. Unfortunately, these comments were not passed to LTGDC. The comments attach the July 2011 business case for the Hackney Wick Station underpass works and refer to a diagram showing a preferred option reproduced from the earlier Engineering Feasibility Study report. This indicates a straight narrow route with stairs and lifts either side.

4.5 Members are reminded that the application does not include the location of the underpass. The scheme has allowed a zone for the underpass to be delivered and Network Rail have accepted this zone as being capable of delivering the underpass. The specific underpass location will not be known until the completion of the GRIP 4 study, however the outline nature of the application provides the flexibility around the station for the underpass location to shift as necessary.

#### *Block F*

4.6 Groveworld consider that the massing of Block F has not been tested for its impact on the development potential to the north. In its current form the buildings to the north of the site are commercial and therefore the same daylight/sunlight considerations are not applied as for residential development. It is acknowledged however that the sites to the north are allocated for land use change within the Hackney Wick AAP, however the specific development proposals for these sites are unknown. The specific design detail delivered with the reserved matters submission would need to take account of the adjacent development potential.

#### *Section 106 agreement*

4.7 The way in which the S106 is progressed has been described as confusing and contradictory. The comments state that the application proceeding to a decision without a S106 presents a prima facie case as there is a need to mitigate issues but no means to do so.

4.8 As LTGDC are both applicant and determining authority, this is the only legal way of securing the necessary requirements. The statement that there are no means to mitigate issues under this method is incorrect, as the development cannot proceed without the completion of the S106 agreement in the future. Any future developer of the site, which would not be the LTGDC, would need to submit another application addressing the requirements within the recommended conditions.

### **5 Olympic Park Legacy Company**

5.1 OPLC have provided design based comments on the scheme in relation to connections and routes, views, building layouts, space layout, private yards and workspace.

5.2 It has been suggested that the route beneath the station should be as straight as possible. The route will be decided by the GRIP4 study.

5.3 The views from the station level are supported, however there is concern that views are blocked. In response, the sections provided in appendix 3 show how views through the development are maintained.

5.4 The shapes of the buildings are suggested to take a simpler form than shown. The building layout has taken its lead from the building grain of the surrounding area, as required in the Hackney Wick AAP.

5.5 It has been said that the layout of the spaces need to relate better to the station so that the station does not exit directly into the space. Officers do not agree with this suggestion as the layout is informed by the AAP.

5.6 The character of the private yards should be emphasised and utilised for private events. This type of character may be delivered in the detailed design.

5.7 Local centre workspace has been suggested, including community, education, local shopping and overall employment.

## **6 Additional objection**

6.1 A neighbour objection was submitted to LB Hackney on the 28<sup>th</sup> of September 2011 and passed to LTGDC on the 6<sup>th</sup> of February 2012. Concern is raised that the character of Hackney Wick will be lost with the delivery of new development and that the area should be left to evolve without interference from developers and planners. There is also some concern that rents in the area are rising as a result of development potential resulting in artists and local industries being displaced. The provision of affordable workspace is to help ensure appropriate rental levels can be maintained.

## **7 Deletion of Informative**

Informative number 5 is not applicable. Regulation 9 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 provides that a planning permission obtained by an interested planning authority enures only for the benefit of that authority. However, an amendment came into force on 1 August 2011 providing that that restriction does not apply where the planning authority is an urban development corporation. It is therefore recommended that the informative be deleted.

## **8 Conclusion**

8.1 This addendum has provided an update to the committee report and responded to further comments on the scheme. The recommendation to members remains approval as per the committee report along with the additional conditions referred to in the section above regarding comments from Tower Hamlets.

**CASE OFFICER:** Stephen Allen

**Date:** 9 February 2012

Stephen Allen  
London Thames Gateway Development Corporation  
10th Floor, 2 Exchange Tower | Harbour Exchange  
Square | London E14 9GE

Development & Renewal  
Planning & Building Control  
Mulberry Place (AH) Anchorage  
House  
PO Box 55739  
5 Clove Crescent  
London  
E14 1BY  
[www.towerhamlets.gov.uk](http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk)

7<sup>th</sup> February 2012

Your ref:  
My ref: PA/11/01865

Enquiries to: Duncan Brown  
Tel: 020 7364 3308  
Fax: 020 7364 5415

[Duncan.brown@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:Duncan.brown@towerhamlets.gov.uk)

Dear Mr Stephen Allen,

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)  
Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure Order) 1995**

**RE: OBSERVATIONS ON HACKNEY WICK HUB OUTLINE APPLICATION TO THE  
LONDON THAMES GATEWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (Ref: LTGDC-11-062-  
OUT)**

**Location:** The site comprises a parcel of land to the east of the north/south section of Wallis Road, south of properties on the east/west section of Wallis Road, west of properties in Main Yard and north of Hackney Wick Station in London Borough of Hackney and a parcel of land to the south of Hackney Wick Station and north of White Post Lane in London Borough of Tower Hamlets.

**Proposal:** Outline application for mix use development of up to 18,889 sqm floorspace comprising 10,883 sqm (130 units) of residential (Class C3) 6,342sqm of employment Class (B1 office) up to 1,596 retail, food and drink uses together with up to 1,820sqm of public realm, public routes and associated parking.

I write with reference to the above outline planning application (ref PA/11/1865) submitted to the London Borough of Tower Hamlets (LBTH) on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2011.

You will note that Tower Hamlets Council have communicated previous observations in a pre-application advice letter issued 25<sup>th</sup> July 2011 to the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation (LTGDC) and the applicant agents AECOM. I also note the applicant's response note entitled 'LBTH Consultation Response' dated December 2011.

Based on the information submitted to the Council and meetings held with the applicant's agent since March 2011, officer's support the principle of regeneration and redevelopment at this site which is low grade industrial land that is mostly derelict and inaccessible to the public. By opening up the site and providing for new land uses the site will help promote high quality development and kick start much needed physical regeneration in Fish Island and Hackney Wick creating a new neighbourhood hub. This is a key objective of the Councils Core Strategy 2010-2025 and the draft Fish Island Area Action Plan (AAP) Development Plan Document.

Nevertheless I have significant concerns that the proposal does not conform to important



2009-2010  
Positive engagement of older people  
2009-2010  
Preventing and tackling child poverty  
2003-2009  
Winner of 7 previous  
Beacon Awards



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

local planning policies and the London Plan 2011 and these are set out within the Appendix of this letter.

The Council's main concerns relate to inadequate affordable housing provision on site and lack of commitment in the outline planning application to delivering much needed transport improvements to support the development. On balance the Council would not normally support an approval for such a proposal, however should the LTGDC recommend permission be granted, then we request to be party to agreeing the detail of any mitigating Section 106 legal agreement prior to an issue of decision.

Yours sincerely



**Owen Whalley**  
**Head of Planning & Building Control**

CC: Paul Comerford, AECOM  
Stephen Oakes, London Thames Gateway Development Corporation  
Peter Minoletti, London Thames Gateway Development Corporation  
Graham Loveland, London Borough of Hackney  
Justin Carr, Greater London Authority.

## APPENDIX

### 1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The Council welcomes the efforts by LTGDC to assemble sites into public ownership in order to better coordinate redevelopment and bring about comprehensive regeneration in Fish Island which broadly complies with the draft Area Action Plan (AAP). In terms of land use officers supports the principle of mixed use development on the sites included in the outline application proposal.
- 1.2 Tower Hamlets Core Strategy commits to the release of between 20 and 30 hectares of Strategic Industrial Land (SIL) over the lifetime of the plan which is until 2025. Much of this release will be focussed in Fish Island in order to secure regeneration that maximises the benefits flowing from the Olympic Legacy.
- 1.3 The Core Strategy sets out a vision for Fish Island north which states “A mix of uses including commercial, retail, leisure, work spaces and residential, will be set around and improved public transport hub and new neighbourhood centre at Hackney Wick.”
- 1.4 In terms of priorities, the Core Strategy seeks to work with Transport for London and others to improve Hackney Wick transport hub and connections to it. In terms of principles, the Core Strategy states that development around Hackney Wick Hub will be required to provide retail and commercial active frontages to assist in creating a neighbourhood centre for this area.
- 1.5 In terms of delivering the opportunities and growth for Fish Island the Core Strategy is clear that an Area Action plan will secure the phased, managed and coordinated approach to this area. The current SIL will only be de-designated once an AAP is in place, however clearly the regeneration of Fish Island particularly proposal delivering new housing and employment opportunities will be considered more positively. For example the CS estimates 2,400 new homes in Fish Island.
- 1.6 However the release of land will be considered on a criteria based approach regarding release of industrial sites and this site are exemplary in terms of setting a benchmark for future regeneration projects in Fish Island and demonstrate how they will help to secure elements of the long term vision to avoid the prematurity argument. It seems that a crucial aspect of this application will be to support the improvements to Hackney Wick Station along with new connections across the railway.
- 1.7 The following elements of the scheme are supported:
- The physical and mixed use regeneration of the site to create the first stage of a new vibrant neighbourhood hub;
  - New pedestrian routes which aid connectivity across the area (subject to legal obligation);
  - The provision of new affordable employment space (subject to legal obligation);
  - New central public realm area;
  - Rational design and built lay out of the development;

- Low levels of on site car parking
- Phase 1 development within Tower Hamlets

## 2.0 Elements that are of Significant Concern:

- Current lack of affordable housing provision and commitment on or off site
- Lack of commitment in planning application and S106 to deliver the north-south underpass link and Hackney Wick Station improvements, including improved access and entrances.
- No current commitment to BREEAM Excellent and/or connections to District Heat and Power network at Kings Yards and Old Ford Waste Water treatment works.
- Lack of detailed design of the proposed buildings including materials, articulation and architecture.

## 3.0 Affordable Housing

3.1 It should be noted that the Tower Hamlets Mayoral priorities for new development in the Borough include the provision of new affordable housing. Currently the proposed development does not meet the Councils and Greater London Authority housing requirements on new development sites which set out that a minimum of 35% of new homes are affordable as set out in the Core Strategy policies SP02 and the London Plan 2011.

3.2 Officers have evaluated the supporting Financial Viability Toolkit based of the BNP Paribas advice note that there are available funds within the development to contribute towards affordable housing delivery. While the borough has accepted flexible approaches to delivery of affordable housing it should be noted that on site provision is assumed on every site unless exceptional circumstances demonstrate otherwise. It is debatable whether this scheme qualifies as exceptional.

3.3 Furthermore currently there is no commitment within the proposal that the development will deliver family units (3 bed +) which also does not comply with the Core Strategy, thus not contribute to delivering a sustainable community at Hackney Wick and Fish Island.

### ***Suggested Mitigation***

3.4 Officers strongly urge the LTGDC to seek contributions and commitments towards delivering affordable housing on site. Should this not occur then the Council would expect at least a mechanism of an upfront commuted payment and in addition an obligation with S106 to review future phased delivery tracking profitability throughout the lifetime of the development. Without such commitments within the planning application the Borough is minded to support a planning permission that is refused.

## 4.0 North-South Underpass Link and Hackney Wick Station Improvements.

4.1 Officers are supportive of the sites permeability, particularly the intention to create a new north south link between the new station underpass linking north and south sites. However we still have significant concerns regarding delivery of

this link because the application is not seeking to commit any monies from the draft S106 agreement towards this delivery of this new infrastructure.

- 4.2 To date there has only been verbal assurances given by the applicant referring to alleged discussions between with interested parties including the landowner Network Rail, London Overground and LTGDC property department. No written evidence regarding progress on such discussions has been submitted as part of this application
- 4.3 Therefore, Officers consider this a key component of the schemes joint site approach and making it acceptable. Without the underpass link then the development across two isolated fails to meet comprehensive regeneration aspirations and key planning policies via the outline application.

#### ***Suggested Mitigation***

- 4.4 We urge LTGDC as planning authority to impose Grampian condition/s based on a phasing plan to ensure that scheme delivers the underpass and station improvements. There should also be legal measures within the S106 agreement obliging any future developer with a duty to cooperate with Network Rail and London Overground prior to construction or occupation per phase.

#### 5.0 Affordable Employment Space

- 5.1 The Council supports development which promotes and seeks to generate new jobs and economic activity as set out in Policy SO16 and SP06. This is supported in areas which are located around areas of good public access to Transports (PTAL) and existing or proposed town centres. Therefore the proposed provision of 6,000 sqm of new employment space and specifically the delivery of a new 'Innovation Centre' in Tower Hamlets is supported.
- 5.2 Provision of subsidised employment space is encourage within the start up years of a development and officers support the first phase being within Tower Hamlets which will give access to residents of the Borough.

#### ***Suggested Mitigation***

- 5.4 Officers support LTGDC suggestion that a time limited clause within the S106 allowing for a subsidy on employment space at least 25% below local market value rate for the first 7 years upon completion of shell and core of the commercial units. Alternatively Officers encourage that the applicant be obliged to fit out the units upon selection of an occupier with first preference from businesses and business start up located within the respective Borough.

#### 6.0 Sustainable Environment

- 6.1 Officers support the commitment to Code Level 4 on the new residential and request the applicant be obliged to commit to high levels upon delivery of each phase. For example Code Level 5-6 over the lifetime of the development.
- 6.2 We oppose the applicant's unwillingness to deliver BREEAM Excellent rating on new commercial units on the ground of commercial viability.
- 6.2 Furthermore it is regrettable that the development is missing and significant

opportunity to physically link and connect to the King Yards CHP centre and Old Ford Waste Recycling centre at the nearby Olympic Park given the proximity. Therefore we request as a minimum that a feasibility study is conditioned exploring in detail this matter.

- 6.3 Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS) is encouraged to be incorporated into the design of the buildings and public realm. Methods delivering rain water harvesting and installation of meters to minimise the developments impact on water resources is required. Further investigation with Thames Water is requested to link with Old Ford Waste Recycling facility to process black water waste.

#### ***Suggested Mitigation***

- 6.4 A condition/s is attached ensuring that residential accommodation is a minimum of Code Level 4 and phased against current planning policy upon reserved matters. Further a clause or condition to require the developer undertakes a feasibility study into connecting to the Kings Yard CHP centre and Old Ford Waste water treatment prior to commencement of development.

#### 7.0 Open Space and Public Realm

- 7.1 The north link section from the new piazza and Wallis Road is not within the control of the applicant and cannot be delivered via this planning application. Therefore due consideration to this element should not be given weight in any decision by the planning authority.
- 7.2 The east-west access creates the alternative route, in the absence of the northern link and this enhances the sites permeability.
- 7.3 Details of the surface treatment and gradient of the through route should be provided for the Council's Access Officer to review prior to submission.
- 7.4 Officers support the design response to provide new publicly accessible piazza space which has evolved over the course of the pre-application period. There may still be issues regarding the role and function and should be designed as inclusive and accessible to all at detailed stage should consent be granted. Efforts should be made to activate the frontages of the public realm and also provide artwork and potential for market stalls given its relative scale.

#### ***Suggested Mitigation***

- 7.5 A condition and/or S106 clause obliging the developer to submit a full detailed Design Code document and landscape plan committing to specific materials and treatments in consultation with Borough urban designers, access officers and other relevant specialist officers. Further commitments within the legal agreement to prevent development upon areas identified as public realm with safeguards at entrances to the station and underpass.

#### 8.0 Scale and Mass

- 8.1 The scale and mass of the building is at threshold of acceptability and careful articulation of the architecture will be required at a detailed stage. Please refer to the guidance regarding appropriate height is set out in the draft Fish Island AAP.

8.2 There are concern regarding the impacts of shadowing on the southern public realm and central piazza from the 9 storey building so that no more than 25% permanent overshadowing of the new open space. Supporting information is required to demonstrate as part of the planning submission.

8.3 The current distances between building façades on the southern blocks is currently unknown and should have minimum distance of 18 metres in order to protect privacy and overlooking.

***Suggested Mitigation***

8.4 A condition requiring minimum distances and screening of habitable facing rooms.

9.0 Conservation and Heritage

9.1 Policy SP10 seeks to protect statutory listed buildings, conservation areas, locally listed buildings, historic parks and gardens and archaeological remains.

9.2 National Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5): *Planning and the Historic Environment* seeks to protect heritage assets therefore the proposed developments design response will be assessed against the requirements of the above policy. Please note that the southern area of the development may potentially affect the future setting of the proposed White Post Lane Conservation Area. Therefore at reserved matters stage this form a statutory designation and materials will be required to be consider the character, particularly architectural elements of the adjacent Queens Yards site.

***Suggested Mitigation***

9.3 A detailed design code document is submitted as part of a condition in consultation with the relevant officers of the Boroughs and statutory consultees with due consideration on the southern site to proposed setting of White Post lane Conservation Area.

10.0 Layout

10.1 Officers support the proposed layout of building footprints following the evolution of the design process and latest layout is considered the most appropriate for the development and associated land uses. It is also sensitive to the character of the street in the area.

10.2 We support the concept of a new public accessible piazza in the central area of the site and smaller area of public realm to the south of the railway. This will provide an amenity space for local residents and employees working within the offices.

10.3 Officers support the proposal for a building on the eastern edge of the site boundary to provide for active frontage and enclosure of the piazza together with surveillance at the new entrance to the station.

***Suggested Mitigation***

10.4 None.

## 11.0 Appearance

11.1 Currently the proposed buildings appearance is unknown due to it being an outline planning proposal, therefore a robust design code guidance document is required in order to set out clear rules regarding appropriate specification across the site is request. The design code document should also include minimum floor to ceiling heights, balcony sizes, and minimum commitment to dual aspect dwellings.

11.2 My urban design officers have requested further discussions on the proposed materials and elevation treatment at application and reserved matters stage.

### ***Suggested Mitigation***

11.3 Full consultation with LBTH officers at reserved matters stage together with a requirement for the applicant to submit a more detailed design code document.

## 12.0 Noise and Vibration

12.1 The close proximity of new residential dwellings to the existing London Overland rail line is a cause for concern and appropriate mitigation through design and building fabric is require to mitigate this adverse impact.

12.2 The design also needs more detail on how conflicting uses between the residential and commercial parts of the development are to be resolved.

12.3 It is also important that structural transmission of noise from plant and equipment, ventilation, including kitchens and mechanical & equipment (M&E) is taken into account.

### ***Suggested Mitigation***

12.4 A suitable condition to control noise and vibration with glazing requirements, including acoustic ventilation, require full details to be submitted for approval prior to commencement.

## 13.0 Day Light and Sunlight

13.1 The technical report submitted has not been assessed by the LBTH officers and awaits advice from LTGDC relating to impacts upon residential properties in Tower Hamlets (Block A and B) and their daylight and sunlight levels. We await this information as part of the planning application submission.

13.2 Officers support dual aspect across the scheme and object to single aspect north facing units and failures in the BRE standards.

### ***Suggested Mitigation***

13.3 The design code document to set out a commitment to dual aspect dwellings across the scheme in the absence of floor layouts. A condition should be attached to prevent any single aspect north facing units.

14.0 Waste and Refuse

14.1 The outline scheme does not provide enough information and therefore a more detailed Waste Management plan is needed at reserved matters stage. Bin stores shared with bicycle stores do not detail capacities of bins. Access of refuse collection vehicle is not clear. We would be interested in knowing the autotrack for refuse vehicle with turning circles detailed. We would also be interested in knowing capacities of all bin stores. This must be calculated using London Borough of Tower Hamlets waste planning guidelines.

***Suggested Mitigation***

14.2 A condition requiring a submission of full Waste Management Plan to be approved by the local authorities prior to commencement of development.

15.0 Disabled Parking and Access

15.1 It should be noted that the proposal will need to be achieved within the requirements of principles of inclusive design and the Disability Discrimination Act as well.

16.0 Parking

16.1 Officers welcome the low level of parking for the site other than for future business and disabled bays and car clubs. Electronic charging points are recommended on 0.2 ratio basis.

16.2 We support TfL's preference that car parking spaces are leased rather than sold, that is to residents of the development only, and not leased to anybody else including employees coming into the area or commuters. Not only would this conflict with encouraging more sustainable travel, non resident car spaces tend to have a higher trip rate and consequent effect on highway congestion in the area.

We would therefore support conditions to limit the use of car parking spaces to resident only and see such principles embedded in any car parking management plan.

17.0 Cycle Parking

There is the potential to have a Cycle Hire Docking Station on the southern edge of the site fronting White Post Lane either fronting the public highway or in the piazza. Provision for this should be investigated further in future design proposals. It should also be noted however that such a docking station would need to be in addition to privately accessible cycle parking provided to meet the needs of the development itself.

17.1 The level of provision and the cycle parking design would need to be in accordance with the Parking Standards. It should be noted that Council accepts two tier cycle parking designs which enable a more efficient use of space, however sufficient space will need to be provided to enable the proposed cycle parking to operate correctly, be accessible, convenient to use and secure (meaning that both wheels and the frame can also be locked). Cycle parking should be considered at an early stage in the design of any scheme as it is often

deceiving how much space is actually needed to be allocated to cycle parking and the Council would expect this to be correctly provided in the initial design.

17.2 For further information regarding streetscape design in the borough (as requested by the applicant), the applicant should obtain *Tower Hamlets Street Design Guide 2003* available at [http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgs1/551-600/559\\_street\\_furniture.aspx](http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgs1/551-600/559_street_furniture.aspx)

### 17.3 Construction

17.4 A Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) will also need to be secured as part of the planning application. A CLP framework will need to be submitted as part of the Transport Assessment, and the full and completed CLP will need to be submitted and approved before construction works start on site.

17.5 A Service and Delivery Plan for retail elements of the scheme will need to be submitted to manage the impacts of servicing on the local transport network. Only a framework of this plan will need to be submitted at condition stage to control servicing times and potentially coach drop-off times to minimise conflicts between servicing vehicles using the drop-off around at the site

### ***Suggested Mitigation***

17.6 Recommended Construction Logistics Plan which accord with Tower Hamlets Code of Construction guidance is submitted together with a Servicing Management Plan is submitted prior to commencement of development.

### 18.0 Planning Obligations

18.1 The likely heads of terms of planning obligations involving a financial contribution have been identified in order of priority as follows (not exclusive to):

#### High Priorities

- Securing Affordable housing
- Affordable employment space (subject to legal testing)
- Skills, Employment & Enterprise
- Education Contributions based on child yield

#### Other Priorities:

- Transport Infrastructure Improvements to delivering station underpass and access improvements
- Highways and crossing improvements works across The Highway and other works to the surrounding highway network as deemed necessary by TfL/LBTH/LBH Highways
- Public Realm and Open Space

Non-financial contributions are likely to include – Code of Construction Practice Access to Employment and Local Labour in Construction, Car Free Agreement.