

---

## London Thames Gateway Development Corporation

### Planning Committee Meeting

Thursday 9 April 2009, 6pm

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

**Present:** Cllr Conor McAuley (Chair)  
Alan Clark  
Richard Turner  
Dru Vesty  
Cllr Guy Nicholson

**In Attendance:** John Allen (Director of Planning)  
Stephen Allen (Planning Development Officer)  
Nigel Hewitson (Norton Rose)  
Angela Flanagan (Committee Clerk)

---

#### 1. Apologies, Announcements and Declarations of Interest

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Mick McCarthy and Sylvie Pierce. Guy Nicholson was in attendance in his capacity as a substitute Planning Committee Member.
- 1.2 John Allen reminded Members that all future Planning Committee Meetings would now be starting at 6pm.
- 1.3 There were no declarations of interests.

#### 2. Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting 12 March 2009

LTGDC/09/PC13

- 2.1 The Committee **AGREED** the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting of 12 March 2009. There were no matters arising.

3. **Former Beckton Gasworks: Windsor Terrace, E6 7FB** LTGDC/09/PC14  
**LTGDC-09-005-REM**
4. **Former Beckton Gasworks: Windsor Terrace, E6 7FB** LTGDC/09/PC15  
**LTGDC-09-006-REM**
  - 4.1 As these two applications relate to the same location it was agreed that Stephen Allen would introduce both reports. They are both reserved matters applications seeking to secure full details of the layout, siting and design of buildings, means of access, treatment of areas not covered by buildings, landscaping proposals, road layout, parking and servicing, layout of footways and cycleways and lighting. These items are condition 2(b) of outline planning permission 05/1343 granted by the London Borough of Newham in 2006. Item 3 is the application (LTGDC-09-005-REM) without the Docklands Light Railway (DLR), and Item 4 the application (LTGDC-09-006-REM) with the proposed DLR Line through the site.
  - 4.2 The Committee agreed it would deal with Item 4 (application LTGDC-09-006-REM with DLR) first.
  - 4.3 Stephen Allen referred to the Addendum report (tabled at the meeting) which provided additional information, including the London Borough of Newham's Development Control Committee's resolution at its 8<sup>th</sup> April meeting recommending that the application be refused, as well as further recommendations and conditions from the Environment Agency (EA), Transport for London (TfL) and the Borough's Highways Officer. He added that there had been a change to one of the conditions relating to green roofs and that the full details would need to be provided prior to commencement.
  - 4.4 Alan Clark noted that reference had been made to the Port of London's radar station and sought clarification. Stephen Allen explained that this related to ensuring access to the radar station was not blocked.
  - 4.5 Dru Vesty asked about the riverside walkway and whether this had been included in the S106 agreement. Stephen Allen confirmed that provision had been made in the S106 agreement for a public walkway / space and a park.
  - 4.6 Richard Turner queried the servicing arrangements for the site. He was concerned that given the site's commercial / industrial use that no mention had been made about the types of lorries and the accessing arrangements to the site. Stephen Allen apologised to Members for the lack of clarity and confirmed that the Borough's Highways Officer and TfL were satisfied that all servicing requirements had been met, and that this would have been dealt with during the pre-application discussions. He advised that it was anticipated that the site would be accessed by large articulated vehicles and that they would be able to manoeuvre effectively to and from

the site. He added that the site had good linkages to the Royal Dock Road, the A13 and the M25.

- 4.7 John Allen advised that the Borough Officers carry out the necessary consultations work on behalf of the Corporation and then provide the information to the Corporation's officer, who would then incorporate this into their Committee report. He indicated that there is often a judgement made as to how much detail is required, but accepted the point made about the lack of specific reference in the report to servicing arrangements.
- 4.8 Conor McAuley referred to paragraph 5.1 in the addendum report and asked how the Corporation would impose the second recommended condition – *“The developer shall ensure that on-street parking restrictions on Armada Way are implemented prior to first occupation”*. John Allen replied that this would need some thought as to whether it would be via a condition or a legal agreement.
- 4.9 The Committee by unanimous vote **AGREED** to delegate approval of application (LTGDC-09-006-REM) to the Director of Planning, subject to the satisfactory resolution of an ecology survey as required by the Environment Agency and the further details of conditions or matters to be included in a legal agreement as set out in the addendum report.
- 4.10 The Committee then moved to Item 3 (application LTGDC-09-005-REM without DLR).
- 4.11 Richard Jones from Planning Perspectives spoke on behalf of their client (the applicant, National Grid Property Holdings) in favour of the application, which had been recommended for refusal. He said that his client understood the DLR aspirations for the area, but if funding was withdrawn and this application refused, it would leave his client in a very difficult position as their outline planning permission ran out in February. He asked the Committee to consider granting planning permission for this application subject to a condition that the permission would not be implemented unless the Transport and Works Act application for the DLR extension was withdrawn.
- 4.12 Richard Turner asked whether the land would still be usable if the application which includes the DLR was to be approved but the DLR was not built. Richard Jones replied that though it would not be unusable, the use of the site would be less efficient.
- 4.13 The Chair thanked Richard Jones for his representations to the Committee.
- 4.14 Richard Turner asked: if the DLR was not an issue, whether this application would be acceptable. John Allen replied that it is difficult to speculate on how development proposals should be assessed, in the absence of DLR proposals here, given that they had been, to date, central to the development layouts envisaged, and indicated that the suggestion by Richard Jones to condition a grant of permission was not practical since

the determination of whether or not DLR would proceed was still formally part of an undetermined Transport and Works Act process.

- 4.15 Stephen Allen referred Members to section 10 of the report – reasons for refusal – and indicated that reason no.1 would stand.
- 4.16 Nigel Hewitson addressed Richard Jones’ suggestion of linking a condition to the withdrawal of the Transport Works Act application. He advised that he could not advise the Committee that such a condition should be imposed as the withdrawal of the DLR TWA application would not overcome the policy objections in terms of failure to reserve land for the extension as required by the London Plan or in terms of prejudicing the ability of the London Borough of Newham’s Local Development Framework to be in general conformity with the London Plan. John Allen added that, pursuant to the London Plan requirements, the Borough should be reserving land for the DLR line, and it was difficult to see where else the line could go.
- 4.17 Alan Clark noted that there were no comments from the Mayor of London. John Allen advised that the Mayor does not comment on reserved matters applications.
- 4.18 The Committee by unanimous vote **REFUSED** application (LTGDC-09-005-REM).

**5. Consultation Response: London Borough of Tower Hamlets Core Strategy Options and Alternatives for Places Stage 2 Paper**

LTGDC/09/PC16

- 5.1 John Allen introduced the report seeking the Committee’s agreement to the Corporation’s suggested response to the London Borough of Tower Hamlets Core Strategy Options and Alternatives for Places Stage 2 Paper. He advised Members that this was the second consultation document from the Borough for their Local Development Framework Core Strategy, and there would be a third consultation document in due course.
- 5.2 Alan Clark referred to the “Tackling Climate Change – Working Towards zero carbon built form” section of the report (paragraph 4.2.54). He made the point that if it costs twice as much carbon to save combustion then it is counter productive, and suggested that a comment be added to the effect that the whole life carbon costs need to be looked at.
- 5.3 Alan Clark also indicated that paragraph 4.2.62 needed to be amended to say “requiring planning permission” after “all homes”.
- 5.4 Guy Nicholson commented that the areas for development and growth along with the Corporation’s suggested responses were welcome in particular for Fish Island, and indicated his thanks to officers for bringing forward their comments.

- 5.5 Alan Clark added that officers were to be congratulated on the report structure which was very legible providing the broad principle issues, options and preferred options.
- 5.6 Conor McAuley noted there was a slight contradiction between the London Borough of Tower Hamlet's document and the Olympic Delivery Agency's (ODA) LMF (Legacy Masterplan Framework) document, whereby the Borough's document indicated there would be a secondary school in Fish Island, and the ODA's document refers to it being near the stadium.
- 5.7 The Committee **NOTED** the contents of the report and **AGREED** to the comments along with the above amendments as forming the Corporation's formal response on the document.

The meeting concluded at 6.28pm.

**Date of next meeting:**

Thursday 14 May 2009, 6pm

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