

---

## London Thames Gateway Development Corporation

### Planning Committee Meeting

Thursday 10 December 2009, 6pm

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

**Present:** Cllr Conor McAuley (Chair)  
Malcolm Chumbley  
Alan Clark  
Neil Deely  
Cllr Mick McCarthy  
Richard Turner  
Dru Vesty

**In Attendance:** John Allen – Director of Planning  
Peter Minoletti – Planning Development Manager  
Amanda Reid – Planning Development Officer  
Amanda Peck – Planning Development Officer  
Will Steadman – Planning Development Officer  
Angela Flanagan – Committee Clerk  
Nigel Hewitson – Norton Rose

---

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

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Sylvie Pierce.
- 1.2 Neil Deely declared an interest for Item 3, 2 Broadway Chambers. He had previously reviewed the scheme in his capacity of vice-chair of design review at CABE.
- 1.3 Cllr Mick McCarthy declared an interest in Item 4, Barking Skills Centre. As the lead member on Skills at the London Borough of Barking Dagenham (the Applicant) he had been involved in discussions on this application.
- 1.4 The Chair advised that the Applicant (Item 5 - Vicarage Field Shopping Centre) was bringing a model of their scheme, but were delayed in traffic. It was AGREED that there be a five minute adjournment when the model arrived to allow Members to view before considering the application.

## 2. Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting 12 November 2009

LTGDC/09/PC53

- 2.1 The Committee **AGREED** the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting on 12 November 2009. There were no matters arising.

## 3. 2 Broadway Chambers, Broadway, Stratford E15

LTGDC/09/PC54

- 3.1 Neil Deely left the meeting for this item.
- 3.2 Peter Minoletti introduced the application by MCRP (No.1) LLP which sought full planning permission for the demolition and comprehensive redevelopment of 2 Broadway Chambers. The application was a revised proposal with the same character and general description as a previous planning application, which was refused by the Committee on 10 September 2009. The revised application was almost identical to the previously-refused application - the notable differences being the provision of an additional £500,000 towards off site social rented affordable housing and associated changes to the proposed Section 106 Agreement, including payments towards LTGDC's Community Benefit Strategy.
- 3.3 An Addendum Report was tabled at the meeting. It detailed a proposed minor amendment to draft condition number 10 and also provided details of the London Borough of Newham's consultation response which was to recommend refusal. The London Borough of Newham objected to the application on the basis of the unacceptable level of affordable housing, but had not objected to other elements of the scheme.
- 3.4 Malcolm Chumbley sought clarification on the design of the proposed buildings. He noted that the elevations provided with the main committee report were different from the drawings provided at the meeting. Peter Minoletti confirmed one of the buildings would have a white ceramic effect whilst the other would be brick.
- 3.5 Dru Vesty asked for confirmation that the development appraisal and affordable housing offer had been verified by the Corporation's independent consultants. Peter Minoletti confirmed they had.
- 3.6 The Committee, by unanimous vote, **AGREED** to delegate authority to the Director of Planning to grant full planning permission subject to the
- conditions and informatives listed in section 10 of the main committee report (LTGDC09/PC54), including the minor amendment to condition 10 as detailed in the addendum report;
  - referral of the application to the Mayor of London as a Stage 2 referral confirming that LTGDC is minded to grant planning permission;
  - any direction by the Mayor of London; and

- the completion of a legal agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and other relevant legislation between LTGDC and the Applicant covering the Heads of Terms set out at 9.3.9 of the main committee report (LTGDC/09/PC54).

3.7 Neil Deely returned to the meeting.

**4. Barking Skills Centre, Part of Market Square, East Street and London Road, Barking** *LTGDC/09/PC55*

4.1 Cllr Mick McCarthy left the meeting for this item.

4.2 Peter Minoletti introduced the application by the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham which sought full planning permission for a six storey Skills Centre building, as well as substantial alterations to the rear of the existing Methodist Church to provide improved facilities including a caretaker's flat. The delivery of the Skills Centre comprises the important first phase of the delivery of the London Road / North Street Masterplan (the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's framework for the future development of the area).

4.3 The Skills Centre would provide high quality vocational training to 14 – 19 years olds in a range of courses, as well as associated retail / food and drink units to include a hair salon and bistro café at ground and first floor level. The retail uses at ground level will provide active frontages onto the public square. The scale of the building and types of uses accord with the land use allocation in the Town Centre AAP. It was recognised that the quality and colours of the materials are key to the success of this scheme and these are proposed as reserved matters. It was also considered that the proposal had been designed to ensure that it would not impede the second phase of the masterplan.

4.4 Dru Vesty referred to Appendix 2 (from the main committee report) and asked about the servicing arrangements. Peter Minoletti advised that servicing access would be via London Road. Amanda Peck added that there would be some servicing from the new Market Square too, but this would need to be co-ordinated with the operation of the market.

4.5 Dru Vesty asked if the landscaping for the scheme would fit in with the Market Square. Amanda Peck responded that the Market Square was due to be landscaped during Phase 2 of the masterplan.

4.6 Dru Vesty asked what would happen about the landscaping if there was not a Phase 2. Amanda Peck answered that the temporary landscaping is of such a good quality that it could remain if necessary.

4.7 Malcolm Chumbley enquired about the McDonalds' building and the screen wall it is proposed to build as part of the temporary square works. He indicated that he had visited the site and noted that the arrangement was odd with a hording at ground level and one in the air. Amanda Peck

confirmed there would be a 'magic curtain' like screen at the rear of McDonald's which had existing planning consent from the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.

- 4.8 Alan Clark asked about the public consultation exercise for this scheme. He thought that the lack of resident response was a concern. Amanda Peck advised that the surrounding areas had been leafleted, and 38 responses had been received as part of the public consultation exercises.
- 4.9 Malcolm Chumbley welcomed the use of brick for the skills centre building. Peter Minoletti responded that the Corporation's concerns on this had been addressed.
- 4.10 The Committee, by unanimous vote, **AGREED** to delegate authority to the Director of Planning to APPROVE subject to:
- the conditions as detailed in section 12 of the main committee report (LTGDC09/PC55), including any minor modifications to their final wording, and
  - the negotiation and completion of a S106 legal agreement based on the heads of terms as detailed in section 10.1 of the main committee report.
- 4.11 Cllr Mick McCarthy returned to the meeting.
- 4.12 *The Committee adjourned for 5 minutes to look at the model of the Vicarage Field Shopping Centre.*

## **5. Vicarage Field Shopping Centre, Station Parade, Barking**

*LTGDC/09/PC56*

- 5.1 Peter Minoletti introduced the application by Lagmar (Barking) Ltd, which sought full planning permission for a mixed use scheme to provide residential units, extension and upgrading of the existing shopping centre, a much improved pedestrian route from Station Parade to existing homes behind the shopping centre and associated changes to access and parking arrangements.
- 5.2 Peter Minoletti also referred to a letter on behalf of the owners of the adjacent shops opposite the station repeating their earlier comments as to their client's right of vehicular access over part of the application site and that the application was unlawful. He advised Members that issues relating to property rights were separate from the planning considerations of the application and did not affect the ability of the Committee to come to a decision on the application and that this point had been confirmed by Nigel Hewitson.
- 5.3 The key elements of the scheme were outlined. These included the internal alterations to the shopping centre to create better and larger units, a 23 storey tower which would provide 162 private apartments with

additional private and affordable units in lower scale buildings to the south of the shopping centre and the significant benefit of the new St Awdry's Walk for the existing residential community south of the shopping centre.

- 5.4 Objections from businesses/owners were summarised at section 7.1 of the main committee report. It was noted that the London Borough of Barking Development Control Committee had recommended refusal on the grounds that the tower would be overbearing and the application did not fully comply with all relevant planning policies, and that there were insufficient spaces at local schools and health centres for the increase in families. Peter Minoletti informed Members' that the tower had been lowered and the design changed and was supported by both the Greater London Authority and CABE. It was noted that tall buildings are supported in the Town Centre AAP. It was acknowledged that whilst the application did not fully satisfy all the planning policies there were significant benefits arising from the scheme to outweigh those shortcomings.
- 5.5 Neil Deely asked if there were any plans to improve the main frontage of the shopping centre. Peter Minoletti responded that the Applicant would be looking at the existing units as part of the internal reconfiguration. An informative could be added suggesting improvements to the existing units.
- 5.6 Malcolm Chumbley asked if the scheme would be phased. Peter Minoletti confirmed it would be. Will Steadman added that Phase 1 would be for the residential units to the rear of the shopping centre, which would be funded by HCA monies with the intention of the units being managed by an RSL. The tower would be built in the second phase.
- 5.7 Malcolm Chumbley questioned when the multi-storey car park would be built. Will Steadman confirmed this would be completed in Phase 1.
- 5.8 Malcolm Chumbley referred to the heads of terms set out on page 33 of the main committee report. He sought clarification on (point 2) the Deferred Charge of up to £28,000 per unit. John Allen responded this figure was correct but was the maximum that could be achieved, and the minimum would be £6,000.
- 5.9 Malcolm Chumbley drew attention to point 1 of the heads of terms (in the main committee report on page 33) which indicated that the figures were dependent on the applicant achieving values and asked if this application would have specific thresholds as had been set out in the report on the Broadway Chambers application. Peter Minoletti advised that the specific thresholds are set out in the S106 Agreement.
- 5.10 Richard Turner enquired about the servicing arrangements. He noted that from the figures provided in the committee report that it would seem there would be on average 35 servicing vehicles a day. He questioned if there was adequate space for that number and had concerns that vehicles would park at the front of the shopping centre. Will Steadman said that advice had been sought from the Borough's Highway's Department who

had described the servicing arrangements as a workable solution on the basis that the landlords and tenants agree. Peter Minoletti advised that the front of the shopping centre had bus stops and yellow lines so vehicles would not be able to park there. He added that there had been discussions on the servicing arrangements and whilst it was not ideal there were compensations, for example the new and improved St Awdry's Walk as well as the improvements to the shopping centre.

5.11 Neil Deely referred to point 10 in the heads of terms and asked if the Applicant would be required to make alternative arrangements if they were unable to connect to the proposed community heat main. Peter Minoletti confirmed that would be a requirement.

5.12 The Committee, by unanimous vote, **AGREED** to delegate authority to the Director of Planning to grant planning permission subject to:

- any direction from the Mayor of London to refuse planning permission;
- the planning conditions as set out in section 12 of the main committee report (LTGDC/09/PC56)
- the submission of a S106 Unilateral Undertaking that is required to secure the heads of terms as set out in section 11.1 of the main committee report (LTGDC/09/PC56).

**6. The London Plan – Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London: Public Consultation Draft** *LTGDC/09/PC57*

6.1 Peter Minoletti introduced this report, which drew Members' attentions to the Mayor's replacement London Plan (Spatial Development Strategy) which had recently been published for consultation. It is a significant document for the London Borough's and the Corporation and given the Corporation's lack of policy making powers, it was important that the interests of the Corporation are reflected in any emerging policy.

6.2 Peter Minoletti drew attention to the Corporation's proposed response to the consultation which was set out at section 5 of the report.

6.3 Members' were invited to make additional comments at the meeting or to the Director of Planning by 23 December 2009.

6.4 Richard Turner noted that whilst the London Plan document had mentioned freight and delivery aspects via water and rail it had not included the 'last mile'. He asked if a comment could be added about the 'last mile' for example the increase to access for third party deliveries particularly in residential developments. Peter Minoletti said that the Mayor would expect the Borough's and their LDF's to provide that level of detail for servicing arrangements, but indicated that the suggestion of a guidance note could be included in the Corporation's response.

6.5 The Committee **NOTED** the contents of the report.

The meeting concluded at 6.44pm.

**Date of next meeting:**

Thursday 14 January 2010, 6pm

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