



Minutes of the Meeting of the London Legacy Development Corporation Planning Decisions Committee

Date: Tuesday 25 September 2018
Time: 6.00 pm
Venue: Rooms 1, 2 & 3, LLDC, Level 10, 1 Stratford Place, Montfichet Road, London E20 1EJ

PRESENT: Philip Lewis (Chair)
Sukhvinder Kaur-Stubbs
Piers Gough CBE RA
Pam Alexander
James Fennell MRTPI MRICS
Louise Wyman MRICS MLA
Councillor Dan Tomlinson
Councillor Terry Wheeler
Councillor Nick Sharman

IN ATTENDANCE: Anthony Hollingsworth, Director of PPDT
Catherine Smyth, Head of Development Management, PPDT
Josh Hackner, Planning Development Manager
Sara Dawes, Principal Planning Development Manager
Richard McFerran, Principal Planning Development Manager
Anne Ogundiya, Principal Planning Development Manager
Russell Butchers, Senior Planning Development Manager
Zena Hassan, Assistant Committee Secretary
Jamie Lockerbie, Legal Advisor
Jamie Mordue, Committee Secretary, GLA
Chloe Newbold, Committee Secretary, GLA

1 Updates, Order of Business and Requests to Speak (Item 1)

1.1 The Chair welcomed Councillor Dan Tomlinson, a representative from London Tower Hamlets, to his first Planning Decisions Committee Meeting.

1.2 The Chair stated there were update reports for: Item 6 – Land adjacent to Eastcross Bridge, Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park, E20 18/00340/FUL; Item 11 – Plot S4 Substructure 18/00355/REM; and Plot S4 Superstructure 18/00354/REM; and Item 12 – Decisions made under Delegated Authority.

1.3 The Chair stated that the order of business would be as set out on the agenda.

1.4 The Chair stated that the following requests to speak had been received:

- Item 5 – Review of the Local Plan – Publication stage draft Local Plan

In objection of Officers' recommendation:

Stephen Wilkinson (Lee Valley Park)

- Item 6 - Land adjacent to Eastcross Bridge, Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park, E20 18/00340/FUL

In support of Officers' recommendation:

Craig Roberts (LLDC)

Ed Fane (LLDC)

Peter Le Masurier (Skywalk Adventure)

- Item 7 - Land at Marshgate, Pudding Mill, E15 2NH 17/00669/VAR

In support of Officers' recommendation:

Laura Jenkinson (GVA)

Ian Dubber (Workspace)

Scott Bailey (Anthology)

- Item 9 – Sugar House Island (formerly known as Strand East) Plots R7 and R8 – 17/00468/NMA and 18/00366/NMA and 17/00369/REM and 15/00384/REM

In support of Officers' recommendation:

Machiel van Soest, Vastint UK B.V.

Lauren Gilling, Vastint UK B.V

Andrew Cobden, Vastint UK B.V

Christopher Schiele, GL Hearn

Jennie Bean, GL Hearn

Antony Nelson, Planit-IE (Landscape Architects)

Michael Westlake, ARCVS-ML (Architects Plot R7)
Fiona Young, ARC-ML (Architects Plot R7)
Richard Lavington, MaccreanorLavington Architects (Architects Plot R8)

2 Apologies for Absence (Item 2)

- 2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Emma Davies MRICS, Councillor James Beckles and Councillor Rachel Tripp.

3 Declarations of Interest (Item 3)

- 3.1 The Committee received the report of the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions which set out, for the purposes of transparency, where a Member of the Committee was an elected Member of a Host Borough to which a planning application and/or other related matters were to be dealt with at the meeting.

3.2 Resolved:

3.2.1 That the following declarations of interest be noted:

Elected Members of Host Boroughs to which planning applications relate (where applicable):

- **Councillor Rachel Tripp, London Borough of Newham, Elected Member (Item 6 - Land adjacent to Eastcross Bridge, QEOP – High Ropes; Item 7 - Marshgate Lane; Item 9 - Sugar House Island (formerly known as Strand East) Plots R7 and R8; Item 10 - The International Quarter London, Building S9; and Item 11 - The International Quarter London, Building S4).**
- **Councillor James Beckles, London Borough of Newham, Elected Member (Item 6: Land adjacent to Eastcross Bridge, QEOP – High Ropes; Item 7 - Marshgate Lane; Item 9 - Sugar House Island (formerly known as Strand East) Plots R7and R8; Item 10 - The International Quarter London, Building S9; and Item 11 - The International Quarter London, Building S4).**
- **Councillor Dan Tomlinson, London Borough of Tower Hamlets, Elected Member (Item 8 - 1-2 Hepscott Road and 33-35 Monier Road).**
- **Councillor Nick Sharman, London Borough of Hackney, Elected Member (Item 6: Land adjacent to Eastcross Bridge, QEOP – High Ropes).**

Independent Members

- **James Fennell is Chief Executive of Nathaniel Lichfields & Partners and Emma Davies is Managing Director of CBRE Planning UK (Neither member has been involved in decision making on any of the matters listed in the Decisions Made under Delegated Authority item on this agenda).**

4 Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 24 July 2018 (Item 4)

- 4.1 The Committee received the minutes of the previous Planning Decisions Committee held on 24 July 2018.
- 4.2 At the meeting in July, the Committee had agreed to delegate authority to the Director of PPDT to consider any implications arising from the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework for each proposal prior to the issue of decision notices. The Committee requested that the minutes be amended to reflect this.
- 4.3 Resolved (Unanimously):**
- 4.4 That the Minutes of the meeting on 24 July 2018 be amended to reflect the point raised above and then signed as a true record of the meeting.**

5 Review of the Local Plan - Publication stage draft Local Plan (Item 5)

- 5.1 The Committee received the report of the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions and a presentation was also provided.
- 5.2 The Committee noted that, in September 2017, the Legacy Corporation Board had agreed to initiation of the Local Plan review. The purpose of the review process was to ensure the Plan remained up to date and relevant. As a result of the public consultation, as well as the requirements of the New National Planning Policy Framework and draft New London Plan, a number of proposed changes to the Local Plan were highlighted for the Committee.
- 5.3 The Committee noted a revised Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule, proposed amendments to had been assessed against the required viability evidence and reflect the amount currently paid by development as a result of indexation and introduced some new types of development for which a charge is proposed.
- 5.4 Officers advised that the comments and views of the Planning Decisions Committee on the proposed changes to the Local Plan and the CIL Charging Schedule would be reported to the Board. The Board would consider whether to approve the

proposed changes, for the purposes of formal consultation and subsequent submission for Examination. Officers anticipated that the Examination was likely to take place in 2019 with adoption at the latter end of 2019.

- 5.5 Officers advised the Committee that the Local Plan Strategy for the area remained largely unchanged and the key issues were to ensure that the policies within the Plan were in general conformity with the new London Plan and met the requirements of current national planning policy.
- 5.6 Officers outlined the key potential changes to policies within the following areas: Employment and Economy; Housing; Design; Infrastructure; Sub areas; and site allocations.
- 5.7 The Committee heard that the key proposed changes within the Employment and Economy policies were as follows:
 - 5.7.1 Policy B.1 related to location and maintenance of employment uses. The policy had been updated to:
 - 5.7.1.1 align with the approach of the New London Plan, namely to protect industrial floorspace capacity within Strategic Industrial Location (SIL), Local Significant Industry Sites (LSIS), Other Industrial Location (OIL) and other non-designated sites;
 - 5.7.1.2 include recognition that the LLDC area is within the new 'retain capacity' category; and
 - 5.7.1.3 specifically support the introduction of a Cultural Enterprise Zone in Hackney Wick and Fish Island.
 - 5.7.2 Policy B.2 related to local centres, neighbourhood and a thriving town. The policy had been updated to:
 - 5.7.2.1 include a focus on culture and night time economy and;
 - 5.7.2.2 include new retail floorspace requirements, as provided for in the draft London Plan.
 - 5.7.3 Policy B.4 provided for low cost and managed workspace and had been updated to define and reflect London Plan definitions of 'low cost' and 'affordable' workspace.
 - 5.7.4 Policy B.5 was tailored to increase local access to jobs, skills and employment training. The policy had been updated to highlight opportunities of working with boroughs to support completion of apprenticeships and increase representation.
- 5.8 The key proposed changes within the Housing policies were:

- 5.8.1 Policy H.1 provided for a mix of housing types and had been updated to:
- 5.8.1.1 reflect the emphasis on small sites within the draft London Plan;
 - 5.8.1.2 seek diversification in the range of housing provided to meet identified requirements; and
 - 5.8.1.3 optimise housing delivery through Build to Rent models.
- 5.8.2 Policy H.2 was tailored to deliver affordable housing and had been updated to reflect the Mayor of London's Affordable Housing and Viability SPG and draft New London Plan threshold approach (35 per cent on private land/50 per cent on public land) whilst retaining the tenure mix of 60 per cent London Affordable Rent and 40 per cent Intermediate products.
- 5.8.3 New policies H.7 and H.8 were introduced to encompass Shared Living Accommodation and Innovative Housing Models, respectively. These policies set out approaches to suitable locations, design standards; achieving mixed and inclusive neighbourhoods and affordable housing.
- 5.9 The key proposed changes within the Design (Built and Natural Environment) policies, were:
- 5.9.1 Following a review by the Quality Review Panel (QRP), both Policy BN.4 and BN.10 had been updated. Policy BN.4 was expanded to contain policy addressing the design of both residential and non-residential, including mix-used schemes; and BN.10 had been redrafted as 'Policy BN.5' to be clearer and more specific on acceptable locations, designs and policy tests for tall buildings.
- 5.10 The Committee heard that the key potential changes within the Infrastructure policies, were:
- 5.10.1 The Infrastructure Delivery Plan had been reviewed and an updated list of identified projects provided, which LLDC and its partners would seek to fund and resource. A school's study was undertaken and confirmed the need to continue to pursue school expansion in the longer term, in accordance with population change and growth.
 - 5.10.2 The general policies remained as previously drafted. There was a continued focus on the importance of development and enhancement of local connectivity which was further supported by the Transport Study undertaken as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review.
- 5.11 The Committee heard that proposed changes within the Site Allocations, were:

- 5.11.1 SA1.4 Bream Street and SA1.5 Wick Lane had been deleted as both schemes had detailed planning permission and were under construction.
- 5.11.2 There had been three new site allocations: SA4.4 Three Mills; SA4.5 Bow Goods Yards; and SA2.4 Chobham Farm North.
- 5.11.3 Additional development plots and further residential development had been introduced to SA3.1 Stratford Town West.
- 5.11.4 All site allocations would include a minimum housing number and the applicable affordable housing threshold of either, 35 per cent or 50 per cent, dependent on whether the site was private or publicly owned.
- 5.12 The Committee heard from Stephen Wilkinson of Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA), in objection to the Officers recommendations. Mr Wilkinson told the Committee that LVRPA manages the Lee Valley VeloPark and Hockey and Tennis Centre, and that these venues closely identified with the LLDC's commitment to the convergence agenda. Mr Wilkinson told the Committee that planning permission previously secured for minor changes to the site had been hard to secure as the site is situated within Metropolitan Open Land. To ensure long-term viability for the site, LVRPA had requested an exception to the policy requirements within the Local Plan, and those that related to Metropolitan Open Land, to allow future development on the site.
- 5.13 The Committee noted the objection of Mr Wilkinson, on behalf of LVRPA, and expressed support for officers' view that such an exception could not be considered a sound approach for a Local Plan. It was noted that the LVRPA are a significant partner in the LLDC area and the Committee agreed that it should be possible for officers to discuss the issue further with LVRPA representatives to find a form of words that would satisfy the specific concerns of LVRPA and Officers. In addition, the Committee emphasised its continued commitment to the convergence agenda.
- 5.14 A Committee member noted the retail floorspace for the Stratford Metropolitan site had been expanded and questioned the evidence-base for the expansion and drew attention to the current retail market climate. Comments on the Bow Goods Yard site allocation were also provided, though the Member indicated that he was clearer on the purpose of the text following discussion with officers. The requirement to retain design teams as part of securing design quality was questioned.
- 5.15 Members raised a distinction between affordable housing as a whole and social rented housing. Officers confirmed that London Affordable Rent was equivalent to social rent. Officers advised the Committee of the 35 per cent affordable housing target and, within this figure, an affordable housing tenure mix of 60 per cent London Affordable Rent/40 per cent intermediate housing. The Committee sought to clarify that the 35 per cent threshold stood as a minimum. A Committee member

also commented on importance of the protection of industrial land and jobs within the Corporation area and ensuring adherence with the tall buildings policy.

- 5.16 The Committee asked what consideration had been given to safeguard the health and safety of children from the impacts of potentially mixed-use areas, for example from pollution. Officers advised that, although the school policy does not directly reference concerns such as transport and noise impacts, they were referenced elsewhere within other policy documents and agreed to ensure that the cross-referencing methodology is used to easily navigate between the applicable policies. A question was asked about the site allocation for Bromley by Bow district centre and whether there was sufficient on the requirement to provide new pedestrian and cycle links and crossings in that development. Officers confirmed that this was included in the text of the site allocation.
- 5.17 Members noted the introduction of a shared living policy and highlighted the importance of mixed-communities and achieving a mix of uses within such development schemes. Concerns were raised of short-term tenancies. Officers reassured the Committee that the policy was drafted in accordance with Policy H18 of the draft London Plan.
- 5.18 Members noted the CIL rates and queried the term 'all others uses' and if the associated charge would apply to high-value enterprises. Officers explained that the way in which CIL rates were required to be developed and presented meant that it was not possible to distinguish between the potential viability or profitability of particular potential development schemes. It was also highlighted that it remained more appropriate to capture specific contributions from some development through s.106 agreements and that the LLDC adopted S106 and CIL SPD set out the approach that is taken to S106 agreement and CIL. The Committee stated that it would be useful to receive a list of potential 'other uses'.

5.19 **Resolved (unanimously):**

5.19.1 **To NOTE the draft revised Local Plan.**

5.19.2 **To NOTE the draft CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule.**

5.19.3 **To NOTE the contents of the supporting documents attached to the report.**

6 Land adjacent to Eastcross Bridge, Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park - 18/00340/FUL (Item 6)

[Louise Wyman MRICS MLA left the meeting]

- 6.1 The Committee received the updated report of the Planning Development Manager and noted the additional consultation responses received, revisions to condition 8

(Event Management Plan) and the revised recommendation. A presentation was also provided.

- 6.2 The Committee noted the planning application sought permission for the construction of a high ropes adventure course with two single storey buildings containing reception, store, accessible W.C and associated landscaping and infrastructure.
- 6.3 The Committee noted the site is within the North Park area of Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park (QEOP), within the London Boroughs of Hackney and Newham. The site runs parallel with Eastcross Bridge and much of the site is contained on the East of the River Lea. The Committee was shown photos of the site location within QEOP and drawings of the proposed single storey buildings.
- 6.4 The Committee was advised that the proposed scheme promotes the QEOP as a major visitor and tourist destinations and complied with the relevant policies within the Local Plan and London Plan.
- 6.5 Officers told the Committee that the course would comprise of 23 'tree-like' columns, ranging between 6.8 and 14.8 metres in height with landing platforms on each. The key part of the proposal would be two zip-lines running across the River Lea. The single storey buildings would have a combined floorspace of 89sqm, which was considered minor in scale. QRP commended the design of the single storey buildings. The Committee were shown CGI drawings of how the scheme would look, both open and closed, and the area would be open to the public outside of operational hours.
- 6.6 Officers advised the Committee that the application was advertised in the newspaper and site notice. London Borough of Hackney had no objections. LLDC Design and Landscape Officers supported the proposals, subject to planning conditions securing material samples and detailed drawings.
- 6.7 The Committee was impressed that the structures resembled trees, would blend into the park and were influenced by the history of trees in the area. The main material proposed for the structures is Cumaru timber, which is commonly used in the Park and weathered well. Sampling of other materials was on-going.
- 6.8 Members queried how the existing trees would grow and interact with the facilities. Officers told the Committee that a planning condition would require the applicant to provide details of the relationship of the proposed structures with existing trees and how they would be maintained.
- 6.9 The Committee raised concerns as to whether one toilet would be sufficient for the scheme. Officers told Members that the site is in Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and it was important to minimise the scale of the building as much as possible in order to preserve the openness of the MOL, and a neighbouring café could manage

the additional flow of people. The applicant told the Committee that he had operational experience at a similar site in Sandown Park and that large queues were not a common occurrence.

6.10 The Committee questioned how the scheme would consider crowd control. Officers advised that the high-ropes would be ticketed and use timed. Customers would be unable to gain access when the course reached full capacity. Anticipated footfall is expected to be 240 people per day and the course could accommodate 60 people at one time. The applicant confirmed that the scheme was fully covered for insurance and no injuries had yet been reported on their facility elsewhere.

6.11 The cost to use the facility would vary between £10 and £30, and offers and discounts would be provided to local residents. Further, the scheme would employ between 10 and 25 staff, ideally from the local area. Members suggested collaboration with local employment schemes, such as Hackney Works be secured.

6.12 **Resolved (Unanimously):**

6.12.1 To APPROVE the applications, for the reasons given in the report and grant planning permission and advertisement consent subject to the conditions set out in this report.

6.12.2 To DELEGATE authority to the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions to:

- 1) Finalise the recommended conditions as set out in the report, including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions considers reasonably necessary and;**
- 2) Issue the decision notice following the conclusion of the consultation period, subject to no new material issues being raised in the consultation period.**

7 Land at Marshgate Lane - 17/00669/VAR (Item 7)

7.1 The Committee received the report of the Principal Planning Development Manager and a presentation was provided.

7.2 In May 2018, the Committee heard an application for a variation to condition 2 (approved drawings) of planning permission ref: 14/00422/FUL for a mixed-use development comprising 254 residential units within eight new buildings (ranging from 3-12 storeys) and 4,257m² Gross Internal Area (GIA) of commercial floorspace on three floors, within Buildings 1 and 2. The development would also provide public and private open space and routes; a 15m wide safeguarded area for new

bus/pedestrians/cycle link; 69 car parking spaces (29 of which are for use by people with disabilities) and 597 cycle parking spaces (residential and commercial).

- 7.3 The Committee, at its meeting in May 2018, deferred the application for full planning permission to allow officers to work with the applicant to consider:
- 1) the proposed architectural expression;
 - 2) the proposed mix of units;
 - 3) how the development would provide a high-quality living environment for future residents;
 - 4) the reduction in three bed units;
 - 5) the proposed amendments to the appearance of the amended buildings; and
 - 6) explore enhanced affordable housing.
- 7.4 Discussions with the applicant were held and the s.73 variation amended. The Committee was told that the s.73 variation would: increase employment use from 4,257m² to 5,472m²; decrease residential floorspace from 28,003m² to 27,514m²; optimise residential floorspace, increasing the number of residential units from 254 to 260, (an increase of 6 units over the consented scheme and a reduction of 15 units from the scheme deferred at the May Planning Decisions Committee (PDC) meeting). As revised since the May PDC meeting, the alterations proposed relate to Buildings 1, 2 and 3 only, including façades treatment.
- 7.5 In response to previously raised concerns by Members at the May PDC, the Committee was told that the figure for affordable housing had increased from 17.7 per cent to 21 per cent and overall family housing had increased from 60 per cent to 62 per cent, including a greater proportion of London Affordable Rent tenure. All previously proposed studio units had been removed and the provision of one and two bed apartments increased.
- 7.6 The Committee was shown the site location and CGI drawings of how the buildings would look on completion and advised that the recess between the commercial and residential floorspace had been reintroduced and was 2.5m in depth.
- 7.7 The Committee was provided with consultation responses from May 2018. No additional consultation was considered necessary and no further objections received.
- 7.8 Officers described the proposal as a sustainable regeneration scheme providing a significant amount of new housing, as well as commercial floorspace and new public open space, broadly in accordance with development plan policies; the application was considered to be acceptable in planning policy terms and the scale met the 'liveability' standards under the Mayor's Housing SPG.
- 7.9 A representative from Workspace (the applicant) was present and addressed the Committee. He advised that changes made to s.73 were to ensure that Workspace

could provide the widest choice of business space to the business community; provide improved and increased affordable housing, whilst maintaining design quality; and provide up to 450 jobs through additional commercial floorspace.

7.10 Members sought clarity on the market rent for the commercial workspace and if this extended to affordable rent. The applicant advised that modelled rent is £20 per sq. ft and 10 per cent of commercial space was allocated to affordable rent, and, as set out in s.106 agreements, this would provide a 20 per cent discount on market rent, or roughly £16 per sq. ft.

7.11 Some Members noted the improvements made by the applicant and were excited by opportunities arising from the development.

7.12 Some Members were concerned that 21 per cent affordable homes had not reached the threshold as set by the Mayor in the draft London Plan. Conversely, it was noted that the scheme is subsidising affordable workspace and it is likely that the younger generation would benefit.

7.13 Resolved (seven votes in favour; one abstention):

7.13.1 To APPROVE the application for the reasons given in the report and grant planning permission subject to:

- 1. the satisfactory completion of the deed of variation to the original legal agreement under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other enabling powers to secure the planning obligations set out in the recommended heads of terms which were set out in the report; and**
- 2. the conditions set out in the report.**

7.13.2 To CONFIRM that their decision has taken into consideration the environmental information addendum submitted in relation to the application, as required by Regulation 26(1) of the EIA Regulations.

7.13.3 To AGREE to delegate authority to the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions to:

- 1. Finalise the recommended conditions as set out in the report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions (including to dovetail with and where appropriate, reinforce, the final planning obligations to be contained in the deed of variation to the original s.106 legal agreement) as the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions considers reasonably necessary;**
- 2. Finalise the recommended deed of variation to the original legal agreement under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and**

other enabling powers as set out in this report, including refining, adding to, amending and/or deleting the obligations detailed in the heads of terms set out in this report (including to dovetail with and where appropriate, reinforce the final conditions and informatives to be attached to the planning permission) as the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions considers reasonably necessary; and

- 3. Complete the deed of variation to the original s.106 legal agreement referred to above and issue the planning permission.**
- 4. Determine the associated S96A application for non-material amendments referred to above.**

8 1-2 Hepscoth Road - 18/00302/DOV and 18/00303/DOV (Item 8)

- 8.1 The Principal Planning Development Manager introduced the report and a presentation was also provided.
- 8.2 The Committee noted that 1-2 Hepscoth Road was under construction and as approved would comprise a 6-storey mixed use development and provide 922 sqm (GIA) of commercial space with yard area, 30 residential dwellings (seven affordable homes), 14 x one bed, 12 x two bed and 4 x three bed units, amenity areas, disabled parking, cycle parking and refuse/recycling stores.
- 8.3 The Committee noted that 33-35 Monier Road also under construction and as approved would comprise a six-storey mixed use development and provide 667m² of commercial workspace on the ground floor and 45 residential flats (10 affordable homes) on the upper floors; 15 x one bed, 17 x two bed and 13 x three bed. The proposal includes landscaped public realm, roof top level amenity space, on site cycle parking and refuse facilities.
- 8.4 The Committee was shown CGI drawings of Monier Road and Hepscoth Road on completion, estimated for end of September 2019 and end of 2019 respectively.
- 8.5 The Committee was advised that the applicant wished to renegotiate the Heads of Terms of the s.106 legal agreements for both sites, as far as they related to affordable housing. The proposed deeds of variations sought to remove the requirement to provide seven units of affordable housing on the Hepscoth site and to increase the number of affordable homes on Monier Road from 10 to 17, located on two floors of the six-storey block. Officers explained that the increase on Monier Road would counteract the loss of affordable housing at the Hepscoth site.
- 8.6 In response to the consultation, the London Borough of Hackney had not objected to the proposed variations. In contrast, the view of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets was that the variation would result in off-site affordable housing provision, which should only be considered in special circumstances; the reason provided was

not considered sufficient by Tower Hamlets. Tower Hamlets also responded that a minimum of 50 per cent affordable housing should be secured; and that the proposal would be contrary to their Council's policy DM3 of the Managing Development Documents.

8.7 Officers told the Committee that Policy H2 of the Local Plan says that off-site provision could only be considered where it:

1. provides equivalent number and type of affordable units across all sites related to the proposal;
2. does not prejudice the delivery of affordable housing;
3. is delivered at no financial advantage to developer;
4. is linked to the completion of the market housing elements of the scheme;
5. is located where able to provide for local housing needs; and
6. would be beneficial to achieve and maintain mixed and balanced communities.

8.8 Officers stated that the possibility off-site affordable housing is provided for within the draft London Plan, where it would better deliver mixed and inclusive communities than if it was on-site. There was no financial advantage to the developer and figures had been cross-checked with LLDC viability consultants. The proposals as revised would still provide an appropriate balance and mix of units and the proposal would maintain the headline figures for affordable housing.

8.9 Some Members submitted that the proposal seemed to benefit only the housing association with no sufficient reason presented to the Committee. The Mayor had endorsed mixed community living and to approve the proposal would contradict the draft London Plan. Other Members submitted that affordable housing was present in three other of the developer's sites in this area, and that the request to release one building for private rental sector was reasonable.

8.10 A representative from Aitch Group, the applicant, was present and addressed the Committee. The Committee was advised that 256 residential units would be occupied by the end of October, subject to provision of utilities. The applicant's previous focus on private sales and affordable housing had now been extended to include a private rental portfolio. The applicant advised that property freeholds would be retained for both residential and commercial purposes and disclosed the intention to provide longer leases in future. Emphasis was placed on provision of different tenures and the challenges of residential housing were recognised.

8.11 Officers advised the Committee that a precedent would not be set if the recommendation was approved. Members were told that on-site affordable housing would still be the preference for affordable housing, and the current recommendation was the result of a unique set of circumstances and was a finely balanced decision.

8.12 Resolved (six votes in favour, two against)

Application reference 18/00302/DOV

8.12.1 To APPROVE the Deed of Variation pursuant to s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as detailed in Section 7 and the appended draft Heads of Terms.

8.12.2 To DELEGATE authority to the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions to:

- 1. Finalise the Deed of Variation referred to above as the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions considers reasonably necessary; and**
- 2. Complete and issue the Deed of Variation referred to above.**

Application reference 18/00303/DOV

8.12.3 To APPROVE the Deed of Variation pursuant to s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as detailed in Section 7 and the appended draft Heads of Terms.

8.12.4 To AGREE TO DELEGATE AUTHORITY to the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions to:

- 1. Finalise the Deed of Variation referred to above as the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions considers reasonably necessary; and**
- 2. Complete and issue the Deed of Variation referred to above.**

9 Sugar House Island - 17/00468/NMA, 18/00366/NMA, 17/00369/REM and 15/00384/REM (Item 9)

- 9.1 The Principal Planning Development Manager introduced the report and a presentation was also provided.
- 9.2 The applicant submitted applications for sites R7 and R8 related to Non-Material Amendments and Reserved Matters (including approval of details).
- 9.3 The Committee was presented with two applications for Non-Material Amendments to the 2012 Planning Permission:
- 9.4 The first application requested the alteration of the parameter plans for 'Building Line Requirement', 'Maximum Storey Heights', 'Uses at Ground Floor' and 'Underground Car Parking Strategy'. All proposed changes had been considered

non-material in nature and tested to demonstrate that they would not generate any significant, new or different environmental impacts.

9.5 The second application requested an alteration to the Site Wide Dwelling Mix specified in condition A15 of the 2012 permission. The application proposed increases to two and three bed units; and a reduction to the number of studios and one, four and five bed units. The total number of units remained the same and Officers considered the proposals acceptable.

9.6 The Committee was shown drawings of R7. The reserved matters proposals for Plot R7 were comprised of the following:

1. Scale and Appearance - a linear block along the Riverside Park with an 8 storey (Block A) element mirroring a similar block to the south at Plot R8, and a 4-storey element with a set-back fifth floor (Block B). In addition, a 14-storey accent tower with a 4-storey plinth element (Block C). The materials palette includes warm tones of brick and lighter tones of concrete. QRP have commended the scale and appearance of the Plot.
2. Land use and Layout - 82 residential units (44 x 1beds; 13 x 2 beds; 25 x 3 beds) of which 11 (13.4 per cent) would be wheelchair adaptable units. In addition, 330sqm of commercial floorspace.
3. A shared underground car park with Plot R8 which is accessed from Plot R7.
4. Landscaping - All associated hard and soft landscaping within and surrounding the plot.

9.7 The Committee was shown drawings of R8. The reserved matters proposals for Plot R8 were comprised of the following:

1. Scale and Appearance - a linear block along the Riverside Park with an eight storey (Building A) element, and a 4-storey element with a set-back fifth floor (Building B). A 16-storey accent tower to the south of the plot (Building C), with a four-storey plinth element to the west (Building D). The material palettes for the Plot were presented to the Committee and it was noted that QRP have commented on the simplicity and elegance of the 16-storey tower.
2. Land use and Layout - 116 residential units (52 x one beds; 20 x two beds; 23 x three beds; 21 x four beds, of which 12 (10.3 per cent) would be wheelchair adaptable units
3. A shared underground car park with Plot R7, also accessed from Plot R7.
4. Landscaping - all associated hard and soft landscaping within and surrounding the plot.

- 9.8 The applications also sought to discharge conditions related to housing quality, daylight, sunlight and overshadowing, parking management plan and waste management strategy.
- 9.9 Officers told the Committee that details of the applications were advertised by site and press notices and by letters sent to surrounding occupiers. No objections had been received but Officers drew the Committee's attention to consultation comments received. The Committee noted that QRP supported the proposals for Plots R7 and R8.
- 9.10 The Committee commended the design of the scheme and agreed with QRP comments.
- 9.11 Members asked Officers to expand on consultation comments received from the Canal and River Trust, which raised concerns for the height of Block C. Officers told the Committee that assessments of potential impacts had been carried out and overshadowing from this building was unlikely to be an issue due to its location. In addition, in order to protect the listed mill complex at Three Mills Island, the building heights parameter plan were amended in 2017 to remove storeys from Plot R2 and R4, and add them to Plots R7 and R8 so as not to lose units overall.
- 9.12 The Committee commented on the reduction of four and five-bedroom units, particularly the reduction of 5-bedroom units from 16 to zero. The applicant was present at the meeting and told that Committee that it was a necessary change to accommodate layout adjustments and retain high-standards of quality. The applicant assured the Committee that the scheme would continue to achieve the original agreement of 40 per cent housing units (two-bedroom units or above).
- 9.13 **Resolved (seven votes in favour, one abstention)**

Non-Material Amendments – Plot R7 and R8 (ref:17/00468/NMA)

- 9.13.1 To **APPROVE** the Application for Non-Material Amendments to Parameter Plans PP-1-101 rev B 'Building Line Requirement', PP-1-103 rev M 'Maximum Storey Heights', and PP-108 rev C 'Underground Car Parking Strategy' attached to planning permission ref: 12/00336/LTGOUT/LBNM dated 27th September 2012 (as amended).

Non-Material Amendments – Site Wide Housing Strategy (ref:18/00369/NMA)

- 9.13.2 To **APPROVE** the Application for Non-Material Amendments to vary Condition A15 (Site Wide Dwelling Mix) of planning permission ref: 12/00336/LTGOUT/LBNM dated 27th September 2012 (as amended).

9.14 **Resolved (unanimously):**

Plot R7, 17/00369/REM

- 9.14.1 **To APPROVE the Application for the Approval of Reserved Matters for the construction of two blocks comprising 82 residential units and approximately 330sqm of non-residential floorspace (falling within Use Classes A1 (retail), A3 (restaurants and cafes), A4 (drinking establishments) and/or B1 (office)), an underground vehicular car park (including a connection to development Plot R8 at basement level), and hard and soft landscaping, pursuant to conditions A3 (Time Limits) and C1 (Reserved Matters – Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping), and the partial submission of details pursuant to Conditions C8 (Housing Standards), C11 (Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing), C15 (Parking Management Plan) and C36 (Waste Management Strategy) of planning permission 12/00336/LTGOUT/LBNM dated 27th September 2012 (as amended)**
Plot R8, 15/00384/REM
- 9.14.2 **To APPROVE the Application for the Approval of Reserved Matters for the construction of two blocks comprising 116 residential units, an underground vehicular car park (including a connection to development Plot R7 at basement level), and hard and soft landscaping, pursuant to conditions A3 (Time Limits) and C1 (Reserved Matters – Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping), and the partial submission of details pursuant to Conditions C8 (Housing Standards), C11 (Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing), C15 (Parking Management Plan) and C36 (Waste Management Strategy) of planning permission 12/00336/LTGOUT/LBNM dated 27th September 2012 (as amended).**
- 9.14.3 **To DELEGATE authority to the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions to finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions considers reasonably necessary.**

10 The International Quarter London, Building S9 - 18/00255/REM (Item 10)

- 10.1 The Principal Planning Development Manager introduced the updated report to the Committee and a presentation was also provided.
- 10.2 The Committee was shown the emerging revised masterplan for the International Quarter Development. Buildings S5, S6, S7 and S8 had been built out and were occupied. Buildings at the northern end of the site were subject to on-going discussions related to the revised masterplan. Members were advised that an

application for amendments to the approved Zonal Masterplan would be forthcoming in conjunction with applications for the northern plots.

- 10.3 The Committee was asked to note that the application was presented in conjunction with Agenda Item 11.
- 10.4 The Committee was presented with a reserved matters application, which sought approval for revised landscaping around Building S9 including public realm character areas known as Redman Place, Gallery Gardens, Bridge Plaza and Railway Walk. The Committee was shown plans for each of the character areas and CGI drawings of how the areas would look upon completion. Building S9 is due to open in Summer 2019 and would provide office space for British Council and Cancer Research.
- 10.5 The Committee noted that Redman Place (previously known as Carpenters Square) covered the majority of the area between S4 and S9. A north/south pedestrian/cyclist/vehicle route would run through the site. The majority of Redman Place would consist of a linear landscaped area known as Gallery Gardens, the design of which had responded to the British Council exhibition and would incorporate a covered stepped 'amphitheatre' for viewing projections/gallery façade. Gallery Gardens would be divided into four planting zones: 'Rain Gardens'; 'Woodland Core'; 'Flowering Woodland' and 'Eastern Embrace'.
- 10.6 Officers advised the Committee that Orchard Walk and Bridge Plaza were located to the North of S9 and formed an important pedestrian route through the site. The service road for S9 is at the rear of the building. The Endeavour Square interface would be located to the South-east of Building S9. Bridge Plaza had been designed to host informal events such as buskers, dance and music; and Orchard Walk would link Bridge Plaza and Redman Place, framed with fruit-bearing trees including apple, plum and sweet cherry. The Committee was shown a detailed planting plan for each of the areas.
- 10.7 The Committee heard that Officers had assessed the proposed development and considered it to be in conformity with the Stratford City Outline Planning Permission and would largely be consistent with the approved Zonal Masterplan ('ZMP') and Site Wide Strategies for Zone 2. The reserved matter application proposed 4,765sqm of public open space, which would be in excess of the minimum requirements laid out in the ZMP. However, the character would be consistent with ZMP principles via provision of public gardens, pedestrian connections, park furniture, provision of public art, an area for seasonal displays and performances.
- 10.8 The Committee was provided with details of the various materials that would be used in the character areas such as stainless steel 'rails' that would evoke the area's railway history and would assist with wayfinding. The Committee noted that the quality and appearance of the public realm around Building S9 would be of a high standard and was supported by QRP.

- 10.9 Members commented on improvements to the landscape, namely the walkway by the railway, which would be a popular route; though concerns of encroachment into the public realm remained.
- 10.10 The Committee questioned access routes for pedestrians/cars/taxis. Officers advised that service access would be via Turing Street, at the rear of the building. Members were reminded of a requirement within the ZMP for the provision of a secondary vehicular route. This secondary route would be found North of Redman Place but due to on-going development, a temporary route had been in place. In addition, Officers told the Committee that car entry to Redman Place would be managed and restricted to blue badge holders, emergency vehicles and taxi drop offs.
- 10.11 **Resolved (Unanimously)**
- 10.11.1 **APPROVE application 18/00255/REM, with the FULL DISCHARGE of conditions B1, B8, B9, B10, Q1 and Q4 of the Stratford City Outline Planning Permission (10/90641/EXTODA) in relation to reserved matters for landscaping works for Plot S9 subject to the conditions set out within this report.**
- 10.11.2 **AGREE TO DELEGATE AUTHORITY to the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions to finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions considers reasonably necessary.**
- 11 The International Quarter London, Building S4 - 18/00355/REM and 18/00354/REM (Item 11)**
- 11.1 The Principal Planning Development Manager introduced the updated report and a presentation was also provided. The Committee was asked to consider the application in conjunction with Agenda Item 10.
- 11.2 The Committee noted the smaller footprint of Building S4, incorporated into the new masterplan. Various reasons were provided for the reduction, including the provision of additional space between sites. The new scheme would provide a 21-storey mixed building with a basement comprised of offices, retail and leisure uses; and associated landscaping.
- 11.3 The Committee considered two applications for reserved matters related to Building S4. The applications related to new substructure and superstructure details. The substructure application related to below-ground works in Building S4 and sought approval for details of the siting and engineering works, in-ground drainage services

and utilities. The superstructure application related to above-ground work in Building S4, specifically the floorspace, uses, massing and associated landscaping.

- 11.4 The updated report, provided to the Committee, outlined that the s.96A application had been approved, which permitted the redistribution of leisure floorspace from IQL North to IQL South. The proposed development was considered to be in conformity with the Stratford City Outline Planning Permission and would largely be consistent with the ZMP and Site Wide Strategies for Zone 2. Further, the updated report confirmed that the applications would not be likely to give rise to new or different significant environmental effects.
- 11.5 The Committee was told that cycle parking would be located in the basement and accessed via a ramp. Whereas previously, the cycle hub was located on the ground floor. Retail and leisure uses would be on the ground and first floors with offices spaces above. Building S4 qualified as a tall building. Accordingly, Officers assessed the scheme against Policy BN10 and considered it compliant.
- 11.6 The Committee noted that public realm information for Building S4 had been set out in Agenda Item 10.
- 11.7 The Committee noted the comments received from QRP, which recommended further exploration of how to activate Turing Street. Officers told the Committee that Turing Street would provide parking for vehicles, a service street and a main route for taxis. A focus of further activity had been actioned at the site and improvements made. In addition, QRP had commented on the success of the architectural expression of Building S4 by use of facades and materials. Officers informed the Committee of a new condition that would require a list of façade types and junctions to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, prior to commencement of the relevant part of the development.
- 11.8 The Committee raised concerns related to encroachment on the public realm and emphasised that acceptance of Building S4 should not suggest acceptance of any future IQL site applications. The Director of Planning Policy and Planning Decisions noted the comments made and confirmed that these comments had and would continue to be, put to the applicant as part of pre-application discussion on the amended masterplan for the northern part of the IQL south site.
- 11.9 The Committee recognised the challenges of mixed-use development and commended the design of the building.
- 11.10 **Resolved (Unanimously)**
- 11.10.1 **To APPROVE application 18/00354/REM with the FULL DISCHARGE of conditions B1, B8, B9, Q1 and Q4 and Q4 of the Stratford City Outline Planning Permission (10/90641/EXTODA) in relation to reserved matters for**

superstructure works for Plot S4, subject to the conditions set out in this report;

- 11.10.2 To **APPROVE** application 18/00355 /REM with the **FULL DISCHARGE** of conditions B1, B8 and B9 of the Stratford City Outline Planning Permission (10/90641/EXTODA) in relation to the substructure works for Building S4; and
- 11.10.3 To **AGREE TO DELEGATE AUTHORITY** to the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions to make any refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions to the proposed draft conditions as the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions considers reasonably necessary.

12 Decisions Made Under Delegated Authority (Item 12)

- 12.1 The Head of Development Management introduced an updated report of decisions made under delegated authority.
- 12.2 The Committee were advised that the original delegated decisions report for July 2018, published in the Committee agenda included 14 decisions made in August 2018. The information and statistics had been updated and were reflected in a revised report.
- 12.3 Between 1-31 July 2018, 68 applications had been received and approved.
- 12.4 Between 1-31 August 2018, 39 applications had been received, of which 22 were approval of details; and all were approved.
- 12.5 Members requested, that in the future, the font size for the delegated decisions information be larger, so that it can be more easily read.
- 12.6 **Resolved:**
 - 12.6.1 **To NOTE report and the attached Appendix 1 and 2.**

13 Any Urgent Business (Item 13)

- 13.1 A member commented on a recently decided planning application which allowed an additional storey to a house on the Trowbridge Estate. Concerns were raised that, as the application had been approved under delegated powers, a precedent could be set, which could have a detrimental impact on the estate. The Director of Policy and Planning Decisions noted the comments and confirmed that PPDT would set out a proposal for how future applications might be managed and that

this would be the subject of a future meeting with the residents and the ward Member to discuss concerns and provide guidance.

14 Close of Meeting (Item 14)

14.1 The meeting ended at 09.20pm.

Chair

Date

Contact Officer: Zena Hassan, Assistant Committee Secretary; Tel: 020 3288 8834;
Email: planningcommittee@londonlegacy.co.uk