

# MINUTES

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

**Date:** Tuesday 22 May 2018  
**Time:** 6.00 pm  
**Venue:** LLDC meeting rooms 1 and 2, Level 10, 1 Stratford Place, Montfichet Road, London, E20 1EJ

**Present:** Philip Lewis (Chair)  
Emma Davies MRICS  
Piers Gough CBE RA  
Sukhvinder Kaur-Stubbs  
Councillor Terry Wheeler  
Councillor Rachel Blake  
Councillor Julianne Marriott  
Councillor Nick Sharman  
Councillor Rachel Tripp  
Councillor Terry Wheeler

**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  
Susanne Andreasen, Legal advisor, Pinsent Masons  
Zena Hassan, Assistant Committee Secretary  
Jamie Mordue, Committee Secretary, GLA

### 1 Updates, Order of Business and Requests to Speak

- 1.1 The Chair stated there were update reports for: Item 5 - Land adjacent to Rick Roberts Way, E15 2LH RRW 18/00162/FUL & 18/00163/ADV; Item 6 - Wickside (McGraths) 16/00451/OUT; Item 7 - 25 Trego Road, London, E9 5HJ 17/00225/FUL; and Item 10 - Cherry Park, Stratford City, Zone 1 18/00061/REM & 18/00067/NMA
- 1.2 The Chair stated that the order of business would be as set out on the agenda.

1.3 The Chair stated that the following request to speak had been received:

- Item 5 - Land adjacent to Rick Roberts Way, E15 2LH RRW 18/00162/FUL & 18/00163/ADV

In support of Officers' recommendation:

Michael Doyle (Wildstone Planning)  
Javier Fernandez (Padel Solutions UK Ltd)  
David Mansilla (Padel Solutions UK Ltd)

- Item 6 - Wickside (McGraths) 16/00451/OUT

In support of Officers' recommendation:

Guy Forrester (BUJ Architects)  
Robert Sakula (Ash Sakula Architects)  
Phil Chadda (Project Planning Manager)  
Frank Green (BUJ Architects)  
Sven Munder (Creative Industries)  
Cany Ash (Ash Sakula Architects)

- Item 7 - 25 Trego Road, London, E9 5HJ 17/00225/FUL

In support of Officers' recommendation:

Glen Charles (City & Suburban Homes)  
Gavin Henneberry (pH+ Architects)  
Alex Russ (pH+ Architects)  
Andy Love (XCO2)  
Tim Gaskell (CMA Planning)  
Adam Williams (CMA Planning)

- Item 9 - 55 - 69 Rothbury Road, E9 5HA 17/00112/FUL

In support of Officers' recommendation:

Jan Donovan (Rolfe Judd)  
Nick Makasis (Rolfe Judd)

- Item 10 - Cherry Park, Stratford City, Zone 1 18/00061/REM & 18/00067/NMA

In support of Officers' recommendation:

Chris Goddard (DP9)  
Carolyn Ouwehand (Glen Howells Architects)  
Scott Cromack (PRP Architects)  
Kieran Hobbs (Westfield)  
Ryan Goghlan (Gillespies)  
Matthew Booley (Steer Davis Gleave)  
David Thompson (RPS)

## **2 Apologies for Absence**

- 2.1 Apologies for absence were received from James Fennell MRTPI MRICS and Louise Wyman MRICS MLA.

## **3 Declarations of Interest**

- 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 (unanimously):**

#### **3.2.1 That the following declarations of interest be noted:**

**Councillor Julianne Marriott, London Borough of Newham, Elected Member (item 5 - Land adjacent to Rick Roberts Way, E15 2LH RRW 18/00162/FUL & 18/00163/ADV, item 8 – Marshgate 17/00669/VAR, and item 10 – Cherry Park 18/00061/REM & 18/00067/NMA)**

**Councillor Rachel Tripp, London Borough of Newham, Elected Member (item 5 - Land adjacent to Rick Roberts Way, E15 2LH RRW 18/00162/FUL & 18/00163/ADV, item 8 – Marshgate 17/00669/VAR, and item 10 – Cherry Park 18/00061/REM & 18/00067/NMA)**

**Councillor Rachel Blake, London Borough of Tower Hamlets, Elected Member (item 6 – Wickside (McGraths) 16/00451/OUT, item 7 – Trego 17/00225/FUL, and item 9 – 55 – 69 Rothbury Road 17/00112/FUL)**

## **4 Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 30 April 2018**

- 4.1 The Committee received the minutes of the Planning Decisions Committee meeting held on 30 April 2018.

### **4.2 Resolved:**

- 4.2.1 **That the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 30 April 2018 be signed as a correct record.**

## **5 Land adjacent to Rick Roberts Way, E15 2LH RRW 18/00162/FUL & 18/00163/ADV**

- 5.1 The Committee received the update report of the Planning Development Manager. A presentation was also provided, which included photographs of the location and the existing and proposed front and rear elevations.
- 5.2 Committee was told that the applicant sought temporary planning permission for five years for a padel tennis facility in a single storey building, and that the site was a vacant plot that had previously been used for coach parking. The applicant also sought permission for

illuminated advertising banners on the north, south and west sides of the building, up to a maximum level of 300cdm.

- 5.3 Officers informed the Committee that temporary planning permission had been granted for five years (ref:17/00126/FUL) on land at Rick Roberts Way comprising the application site being considered. This was due to expire on 3 July 2022 but the applicant, Adidas UK Ltd, had not implemented the permission and had advised they were not intending to implement in the future.
- 5.4 The Committee heard that a public notice had been placed in the Newham Recorder newspaper and that one letter of support had been received. Three site notices were placed around the application site and notification letters were sent to 669 neighbouring properties.
- 5.5 Officers told the Committee that the applicant had provided an update to the Construction Management Plan. This had been found to be acceptable by PPDT's environmental consultants. It was recommended that condition four, which had required a submission of a Construction Management Plan, be removed.
- 5.6 The Committee heard that the hours of operation in condition seven should be from 10:00 to 22:30 Monday to Friday, 09:00 to 21:00 on Saturday and Sunday. This was a typographical error in the report.
- 5.7 Officers considered that the application was considered to support the principle of the sporting legacy of the Olympic Games.
- 5.8 The Committee heard from the applicant, Javier Fernandez. Mr Fernandez thanked LLDC staff for their support of the application. Mr Fernandez said that a padel tennis facility would be accessible for people from differing economic backgrounds, as little equipment was required, and it was a social sport, as it was played in pairs. The Committee was told that it was considered vital the facility have a positive impact on the community and emphasis was placed on encouraging all people to play the sport; female only tournaments would be held and the Wheelchair Tennis Association had been contacted for its input. Discounted rates would be given to local people and students, and local schools would be encouraged to use the facility.
- 5.9 The Committee noted the low response rate to the notification in the Newham Recorder and questioned whether the applicant could make sufficient money within three years, should the three-year break clause be activated. The applicant believed that they would, given the addition of a fitness area and café, and that they had had experience running previous padel tennis clubs and fitness facilities.
- 5.10 The Committee asked Officers whether this application would impede future applications. Officers confirmed that this scheme should not stop other schemes coming forward in the future.
- 5.11 The Committee requested Condition 4 (Luminance) of application 18/00163/ADV include restrictions on the hours of luminance during night time hours associated with the

proposed advertisements.

**5.12 Resolved (unanimously):**

**5.11.1 To APPROVE the applications 18/00162/FUL & 18/00163/ADV, for the reasons given in the report and grant planning permission and advertisement consent subject to the conditions set out in the report.**

**5.11.2 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.**

**6 Wickside (McGraths) 16/00451/OUT**

6.1 The Committee received the update report of the Principal Planning Development Manager. A presentation was also provided. The Committee noted that the application had been deferred from the meeting of the Committee on 27 February 2018. It had been deferred:

1. To allow the Quality Review Panel (QRP) to fully assess the proposal, including whether the tall buildings were outstanding and met policy for BN.10;
2. For consideration of affordable housing, including the affordability of intermediate units and pepper potting of affordable units;
3. For consideration of Creative Employment, Commercial and Community uses (CECC);
4. Further consideration of any potential harm from the loss of waste capacity at this location;
5. Further consideration of on-site sports provision; and
6. To consider reducing the number of car parking spaces.

6.2 Officers showed the Committee which of the buildings were taller than 20m and gave the QRP comments, which detailed how each building met the criteria to be considered to exhibit outstanding architecture. The Committee heard that QRP supported the approval of the planning application. The Committee noted that the 'Bridge House' building had been submitted in outline, and the detailed design would be fully considered at reserved matters stage, where it would be reviewed by QRP. The draft Heads of Terms include a design competition for that building and it was anticipated that this would ensure an exceptional design.

6.3 The Committee was told that the overall amount of affordable housing offered had remained at 35 per cent, however the proportion of habitable rooms offered for London affordable rent had increased from 30 to 35 per cent. Intermediate housing had decreased from 70 to 65 per cent. This represented a good offer that would satisfy the fast-track planning process requirements. The Committee heard that the Registered Providers' preference was for affordable units to be in single tenure cores.

- 6.4 Further discussions had taken place with the applicant regarding CECC, and outlined which workspaces it had been agreed would be offered at a discount for ten years, on a shell and core basis. This represented approximately 20 per cent of CECC floorspace.
- 6.5 The Committee was told that the Greater London Authority were satisfied that there would be no harm from the loss of waste capacity at this location but that the London Borough of Tower Hamlets had objected.
- 6.6 The Committee heard that Officers had further considered the need for on-site sport facilities and concluded that it was not necessary for such facilities to be provided on the site.
- 6.7 Provision of car parking space had been reduced to 0.25 space per dwelling to comply with the emerging draft London Plan, and this reduction had meant 40 additional cycle parking spaces could be provided. 48 parking bays would be provided for wheelchair users/disabled people.
- 6.8 Members questioned what salary level the intermediate housing would be provided for. Officers told the Committee: 30 per cent was aimed at households with salaries up to £50,000; 30 per cent was aimed at households with salaries between £50,000 and £65,000; and 40 per cent was aimed at households with salaries over £75,000.
- 6.9 Members were disappointed that progress had not been made on pepper potting affordable homes. Officers conceded that this element had not changed but that the location of the proposed affordable homes was well related to play spaces and mixed with market housing. The Committee also noted that there was no specific policy on pepper potting and therefore no policy basis to insist on this, or to robustly defend an appeal should permission be refused on the basis of the scheme not proposing this.
- 6.10 Some Members were disappointed that concerns regarding the height of the buildings had not been addressed. The Committee was reminded that BN10 was not a blanket restriction and that QRP were comfortable with the height of the building considered against the requirements of policy BN10.

**6.11 Resolved (five votes in favour; three against; one abstention):**

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

- 1. Referring the Application to the Mayor of London and any direction of the Mayor of London;**
- 2. The satisfactory completion of a 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 are set out in this report; and**
- 3. The conditions and informatives set out in this report.**

- a) **CONFIRM** that their decision had taken into consideration the environmental information submitted in relation to the application as required by Regulation 3(4) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 and **AGREE** that following the issue of the decision a statement be placed on the Statutory Register confirming the details as required by Regulation 24(1)(c) of the Town and Country Planning (EIA) Regulations 2011 including that the main reasons and considerations on which the Committee's decision was based were those set out in the Planning Officer's report to Planning Decisions Committee;
- b) **AGREE TO DELEGATE AUTHORITY** to the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions to:
  - i. **Consider any direction from the Mayor of London and to make any consequential or necessary changes to the recommended conditions and/or informatives and/or recommended s.106 heads of terms as set out in this report;**
  - ii. **Finalise the recommended conditions and informatives (including relevant definitions and annexes) as set out in this 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 s.106 legal agreement) as the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions considers reasonably necessary;**
  - iii. **Finalise the recommended 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**
  - iv. **Complete the s.106 legal agreement referred to above and issue the planning permission.**

## **7      25 Trego Road, London, E9 5HJ 17/00225/FUL**

- 7.1 The Committee received the update report of the Principal Planning Development Manager. A presentation was also provided.
- 7.2 The Committee noted that the application was for the demolition of existing buildings and for the erection of one building, ranging between one and six storeys in height. The building was to provide 52 residential units, of which 35 per cent was affordable housing, and 1,915 sqm of office/light industrial floorspace.
- 7.3 The development would rise to 20.4m, from ground to parapet, and to 21m to lift overrun height. QRP had considered the architecture to be outstanding and Policy BN10 compliant.
- 7.4 The provision of affordable housing was 35 per cent of dwellings and would satisfy the fast-track planning process requirements. Of the 35 per cent affordable tenures: 37.5 per

cent were London Living Rent; 31.25 per cent were London Affordable Rent; and 31.25 per cent were Shared Ownership.

- 7.5 Officers told the Committee that the redevelopment proposals would re-provide the existing commercial floorspace, in accordance with policy B1 of the Local Plan, which would be located at ground and basement levels. Different styles of brick would distinguish between commercial and residential space.
- 7.6 The Committee heard that four site notices had been placed around the site, a newspaper advert had been taken out in the Docklands and East London Advertiser and that 32 consultation letters were sent out.
- 7.7 The Committee heard from the planning agent, Adam Williams. Mr Williams briefly outlined the history of the planning application for the site and told the Committee that the applicant had worked closely with Officers to create a scheme that was fully integrated into the Wickside Master Plan.
- 7.8 The Committee noted that 35 per cent of dwellings could be categorised as affordable, and questioned the level and type of actual need for affordable housing in the area. Officers reminded the Committee that the scheme was policy compliant and that on the issue of wider housing need, officers would be briefing members on the Local Plan review and, in particular, the recent evidence work on housing need and on affordable housing, at their briefing meeting in June.
- 7.9 The Committee asked what consideration had been given to safety lighting in and around the area. The Committee noted that the scheme forms part of the Wickside Master Plan, which included a landscaping strategy on lighting, and that a s. 278 agreement for improvements to the public highway, which included lighting and improvements to the footpaths, would form part of the permission.
- 7.10 The Committee asked what was the plan for the existing tenants. Officers told the Committee that a relocation strategy had been provided and Strettons had been appointed to help the tenant find suitable work space accommodation elsewhere.
- 7.11 Members discussed concerns over whether the level of affordable housing was appropriate to meet local needs. The Chair commented that the LLDC was working within the guidelines and GLA recommendations.

**7.12 Resolved (seven votes in favour; none against; two abstentions):**

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

- 1. the satisfactory completion of a 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 are set out in this report; and**



**2. the conditions set out in this report.**

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

- 1. Finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this 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 s.106 legal agreement) as the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions considers reasonably necessary;**
- 2. finalise the recommended 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 s.106 legal agreement referred to above and issue the planning permission.**

**8 Land at Marshgate, Pudding Mill, E15 2NH 17/00669/VAR**

- 8.1 The Committee received the update report of the Principal Planning Development Manager. A presentation was also provided.
- 8.2 The Committee heard that the application was for a variation to condition 2 of planning permission reference 14/00422/FUL to increase commercial floorspace from 4,257sqm to 5,671 sqm; decrease residential floorspace from 28,00sqm to 27,210sqm; optimise residential floorspace to increase units from 254 to 275; and make alterations to the façades. Changes had been proposed to six of the eight buildings in the scheme. Members noted that there was no proposed change to the height, number of storeys or footprint of the buildings. Members noted that the percentage of affordable housing (per unit) had increased from 17.7 per cent (45 units) to 19.6 per cent (54 units).
- 8.3 Officers detailed the proposed variation for each of the buildings, in turn. It was proposed that the fourth floor in buildings 1 and 2 would be all commercial space, not residential as was consented; the residential units lost from the fourth floor would be re-provided on the upper floors.
- 8.4 In buildings 3, 4 and 6, it was proposed that the number of cores be reduced from two to one. This was to increase the number of residential units in the block. In building 3 it was proposed that the number of units increase from 60 to 64 and contain a number of market and affordable units. In building 4 it was proposed that the number of units increase from 20 to 29; in building 6 that the number of units increase from 22 to 29.
- 8.5 In building 7 it was proposed that a party wall be introduced and the refuse stores site be divided. The Committee noted that access to the refuse stores would remain as consented and that a detailed waste management strategy had been submitted. The proposed new

layout would result in the loss of one of the four duplex units on the ground floor, which would be re-provided as an additional single unit on an upper floor. The remaining three duplex units would be dual aspect.

- 8.6 The Committee noted that the application was advertised in the Newham Recorder in January 2018, four site notices were displayed in and around the site and that 368 neighbouring residential and commercial properties were consulted by post. No objections were received and there was general support for the scheme.
- 8.7 Officers explained to the Committee that 60 percent of the units, which had been consented as Affordable Rent, were now proposed to be London Affordable Rent and that circa half of the 40 percent Shared Ownership units were offered at London Living Rent. There was also a degree of pepper potting in the variation, as nine additional units were proposed within building 3 and 45 units in building 7; as opposed to the extant consent where all the affordable housing was contained within just one building (building 7).
- 8.8 Members noted that amendments had been made to the triggers to the remediation conditions 13 and 14 and that an informative on fire safety had been added. The applicant had submitted a section 96a non-material amendment application, which was to change the description of the development. Members queried whether the reduction in the number of cores would cause an increased fire risk. Officers reassured the Committee that the cores were fire protected and ventilated but that an informative had been included to the section 73 variation application reminding the applicant of their responsibilities for fire safety under the Building Regulations legislation.
- 8.9 The Committee noted that the level of affordable housing, although it had been increased, was still relatively low and that the number of three bed units had been reduced. Officers advised Members that the 3 bedroom units in the affordable tenure had not been reduced. Members commented that three bed units were often not being sold because they were too expensive, developers were therefore reluctant to build them, which maintained the price of three bed units. Officers told the Committee that policy required 50 percent of units to be two beds or more and that the proposed units were of a good size meeting or exceeding policy requirements. The density of the scheme was in accordance with The London Plan.
- 8.10 Ian Dubber, applicant, advised the Committee that the proposed increase in commercial space would partly form an operational base for the applicant and was partly as a result of growing demand within the LLDC area. In a response to Members questions regarding current occupation he said that sixty percent of the current commercial space was vacant as it was unfit for purpose. Existing tenants would be offered the chance to return to the proposed business space as required under the existing s106 legal agreement.
- 8.11 Members commented that, whilst there were some positive aspects, overall the s. 73 proposals were disappointing. The Committee had liked the previous architectural designs which included a recess between the commercial and residential floors to buildings 1 and 2, which had been removed under the current proposals. They also considered that the proposed changes to the mix of housing would not be advantageous.

## **8.12 Resolved (unanimously):**

- 8.12.1 The Committee resolved to defer the s. 73 application to allow officers to work with the applicant to consider the proposed architectural expression; to consider the proposed mix of units; and to consider how the development would provide a high quality living environment for future residents; to review the reduction in 3 bed units; and to reconsider the proposed amendments to the appearance of the amended buildings.**

## **9 55 - 69 Rothbury Road, E9 5HA 17/00112/FUL**

[Councillor Terry Wheeler left the meeting at this point]

- 9.1 The Committee received the report of the Senior Planning Development Manager. A presentation was also provided.
- 9.2 The Committee heard that the application was for the demolition of existing buildings and structures on the site and the erection of a five-storey building, plus basement level, with a total gross interior floorspace of 2,630 sqm. The application was for class B1 (business) floorspace. Growing businesses would be offered small units and shared services, and would be able to increase their unit size as the business grew.
- 9.3 Consultation letters had been sent in March 2017 and a further consultation was undertaken in November 2017, following amendments to the scheme. Site notices were erected in April 2017 and again in November 2017. A press notice was published in April 2017. Six neighbouring properties were consulted by post. No objections from the public or statutory and non-statutory organisations were received.
- 9.4 The Committee was told that the application was supported by the LLDC. The building was proposed to be 22.25m to the top of the fifth storey and 23.8m to the top of the lift overrun, but this could largely be attributed to the fact that the Hackney Wick Design Code required generous floor to ceiling heights for business units. Sunlight test results against neighbouring blocks were acceptable and the QRP considered the application to have the potential to satisfy the requirements for BN10, subject to further refinements, which have now been incorporated into the scheme to the satisfaction of officers.
- 9.5 An 8m gap between plot K1 and K2 had been proposed. It was envisaged that this would allow for off street cycle parking and access to bins and the heavy goods lift. The Committee noted the potential future use of the gap between blocks as a shared space or working yard. Officers felt that if the gap were to be required to be wider, it would change the proportions of the building development.
- 9.6 The Committee received a presentation from Jan Donovan of Rolfe Judd Planning and Nick Makasis of GML Architects. Ms Donovan and Mr Makasis told the Committee that the applicant had successfully operated a similar site in Waltham Abbey for over three years. The Committee's attention was drawn to the fact that two lifts had been proposed: a goods

lift and a regular lift, which gave opportunities for occupiers to move heavier goods and equipment.

9.7 Members asked whether the windows were considered to be too close to the shared property boundary. Officers confirmed that the windows would look over a courtyard space, as envisaged by the approved Hackney Wick Masterplan. The surrounding land is owned by LLDC and it was satisfied that this would not prejudice future sites coming forward for development in the future as the parameters of this development were broadly in accordance with those proposed within the HW masterplan.

9.8 Members heard that rents would be set at roughly £30sq foot and that five per cent of overall workspace would be offered at affordable rates, for five years. This was the equivalent of 3 units.

**9.9 Resolved (seven votes in favour; one against):**

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

- 1. the conditions set out in this report; and**
- 2. the satisfactory completion of a 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 are set out in this report.**

**9.9.2 to DELEGATE AUTHORITY to the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions to:**

- 1. 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 necessary;**
- 2. finalise the recommended 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 as the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions considers reasonably necessary; and**
- 3. complete the s.106 agreement and issue the decision notice.**

## **10 Cherry Park, Stratford City, Zone 1 18/00061/REM & 18/00067/NMA**

10.1 The Committee received the update report of the Senior Planning Development Manager. A presentation was also provided.

10.2 The Committee heard that the applications were for non-material amendments to a hybrid (part full/part outline) planning consent 15/00358/OUT and a reserved matters application

for the residential, commercial and landscaping that was given outline planning permission in the hybrid planning consent.

- 10.3 The Officer detailed changes under the non-material amendment application. Namely an increase in height to Blocks A1, A3 and A4 - small amendments to the location of Blocks A1, A3 and A4 - reconfiguration of Block A2 commercial floorspace - amendments to the massing of Block C - amendments to the basement levels.
- 10.4 Members were shown the details of the reserved matters scheme proposal. This included the layout and spacing of the blocks, public realm layout, layouts and facades of the towers, mansion blocks, and amenity space for residents. The Committee noted that the QRP supported the façade as a simple and non-fussy way to crown the building.
- 10.5 Consultation letters for the reserved matters application were sent out in February 2018. The Committee heard that the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority had submitted an objection. The issues raised would form part of the building regulations approval.
- 10.6 The Committee heard from the applicant, Mr Chris Goddard, DP9. Mr Goddard told the Committee that the residential scheme is 100 per cent private rental and that off-site affordable housing had been agreed with the GLA and the LLDC in the outline consent. There was no planned increase in the number of units or floors; the increase in height was for the installation of comfort cooling and to improve the quality of the units.
- 10.7 Members queried how the extensive gates and railings would be used through the scheme. The applicant confirmed that gates and railings would be in place to control access to Cherry Park during night time hours. During the day it would be freely accessible.
- 10.8 The Committee asked, given the size of the development, what was planned to ensure that a community developed. The applicant told the Committee that the residents' hub would form the focal point of community events and people would be encouraged to be a resident for the long term.
- 10.9 The applicant told the Committee that there were no single-aspect, north-facing units. All units were proposed to be north west or north east facing. In response to a question by a member regarding the high number of units off a core in one of the tall buildings, Officers told the Committee that they had gone through the Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) and determined that deviations from the SPG were not adverse, and nor would they result in low quality units. Officers were satisfied with the overall architectural impact and that the mansion blocks contrasted well with the towers.
- 10.10 **Resolved (two votes in favour; five abstentions):**
- 10.10.1 To AGREE 18/00067/NMA Non-Material Amendments to application 15/00358/OUT being an increase in height to Blocks A1, A3 and A4, small amendments to the location of Blocks A1, A3 and A4, reconfiguration of Block A2 commercial**

**floorspace, amendments to the massing of Block C, amendments to the basement levels with the amended drawings as set out in section 13 of this report.**

**10.10.2 To APPROVE 18/00061/REM the Reserved Matters application in respect of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the development comprising 1,224 residential units (101,639 sqm GEA) and 3,300sqm GEA of commercial floorspace with landscaped public realm and private amenity space, ancillary residential amenity space, basement car and cycle parking, residential servicing, plant and storage.**

## **11 Decisions Made Under Delegated Authority**

**11.1** The Committee received the report of the Director of Planning Policy and Decisions and its appendices, which listed all the decisions taken by officers between 1 and 30 April 2018. Officers highlighted that 37 decisions had been taken, 94 per cent of applications were dealt with within target time and only one refusal had been issued.

### **11.2 Resolved:**

**11.2.1 That the report and attached appendix be noted.**

## **12 Any Urgent Business**

**12.1** There was no urgent business.

## **13 Close of Meeting**

**13.1** The meeting ended at 9.29 pm.

---

Chairman

---

Date

**Contact Officer:** Zena Hassan, Assistant Committee Secretary; Tel: 020 3288 8834;  
Email: [planningcommittee@londonlegacy.co.uk](mailto:planningcommittee@londonlegacy.co.uk)