

**Development Control Committee**

**8<sup>th</sup> October 2008**

**Updates**

**Content:**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Agenda Page</b>
Item 5	London city Airport, Hartman Road, E16	7 - 112
Item 6	Plot N02, Zone 5 Stratford City	113 - 132
Item 7	Plot N07, Zone 5 Stratford City	133 - 152
Item 8	Plot N08, Zone 5 Stratford City	153 - 180

**Item: 5**

**Application:** 07/01510/VAR

**Application site:** London City Airport, Hartmann Road, Silvertown, E16

**Proposed Development:** Application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to vary conditions 13 and 15 of the outline planning permission no.N/82/104 dated 23 May 1985, as previously varied by the Secretary of State on the 26 September 1991 and by the London Borough of Newham on 21 July 1998 and 11 July 2007, to allow up to 120,000 total aircraft movements per annum (number of total movements in 2006 was 79,616) with related modifications to other limits.

This addendum concerns the following:

- 1. Additional responses from adjoining occupiers**
- 2. Additional consultation response**

1. A total number of 46 responses were received. Of these, there were 44 letters and emails objecting to the proposals and 2 letters of support. These are summarised below;

Objections

The following grounds of objection were made;

- Increased noise pollution
- Increased air pollution

- Increased health and safety risks
- The airport is flying larger noisier planes
- Current flight paths are unacceptable
- The proposals will detrimentally affect regeneration
- Health and safety issues
- The proposals will increase global warming and CO2 emissions
- Other airports should be expanded instead
- The conclusions of the Environmental and other technical studies are called into question.
- The NATS study for the Thames Gateway Bridge (TGB) was flawed.
- The National Air Traffic Services (NATS) study is called into question which indicated a different Public Safety Zone (PSZ) compared to the one London City Airport produced and therefore raises health and safety issues.

Officer Comments:

All of these issues are covered in the addendum report and original report. However, to expand on the issue of the NATS study for the TGB and third party risks, this was referred to the Department for Transport who confirmed by email on the 8<sup>th</sup> October 2008, that they were fully satisfied with the study and would not change their opinion that the proposals does not affect Public Safety Zone (PSZ) policy.

Given this, it is considered that these additional responses do not change the original assessment or recommendation.

Support

The following grounds of support were made;

- The airport offers a catalyst for the regeneration of East London.
- Additional jobs will be created
- London as host city for the Olympics should not be restrained
- The airport is conveniently located for local usage

Officer Comments:

The economic and regeneration benefits of the proposal were previously stated by other consultees on the application, and these were considered in the overall assessment as set out in the original report and addendum report.

An updated table has been provided which sets out all the responses received;

	Original Application	1st amendment to Environmental Statement	1st amendment to Environmental Statement	Reps. received Since 30 July 2008	Total
Number of Letters Sent	10,000+	3021	1228	0	
Number of responses Received	1109	71	59	94	1333
Number in Support	308	26	4	5	343
Number of Objections	801	45	55	89	990

## 2. L.B. Hackney

Comments were received from the London Borough Of Hackney. They considered that a good mode share for access to the airport had been achieved since the opening of the DLR extension to the airport. Hackney does not consider that there will be an impact on their borough in terms of traffic and transport. On noise it is noted that Hackney is well outside the 57db contour even with the increase in air traffic. However, they are unsure if this will change with any possible changes in air routes being proposed by NATS. Concerns are therefore raised whether this would affect the amenity of future residents.

### Officer Comments:

On the issue of noise and changes in air routes, it is considered unlikely that there will be any significant change to the air contours affecting Hackney. Any properties affected by the 57dB contour will qualify for mitigation measures for improved noise insulation through the proposed S106.

**Item:** 6, 7 and 8

**Application:** 08/90211/REMODA, 08/90212/REMODA and 08/90213/REMODA

**Application Site:** Plot N06, Plot N07 and N08, Zone 5 Stratford City

**Proposed Development:**

**Item 6:** 08/90211/REMODA: Approval of reserved matters for 308 residential units and 568sqm of retail floorspace with associated car- parking and the on plot landscaping pursuant to conditions B1 and B8 of Outline Planning Permission 07/90023/VARODA being details of layout scale appearance access and landscaping

**Item 7:** 08/90212/REMODA: Application for the approval of reserved matters for 325 residential units, 526 sqm of retail floorspace (A1-A5) with associated car parking and landscaping within a part 10, part 11 and 12 storey (set back) building, with associated car parking at basement level and means of access pursuant to conditions B1 and B2 of outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA, being details of layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping together with approval in writing to permit development that exceeds the height parameters indicated within the Masterplan for zones 3-6 and Parameter plan (7), pursuant to conditions A4 and D9 of the Outline Planning Permission.

**Item 8:** 08/90213/REMODA: Application for the approval of reserved matters for 412 residential units, 1,437sqm of retail floorspace (A1-A5) and 1,748 sqm of leisure floorspace (Class D2) arranged over two x 32 storey residential towers. Seven storey podium or residential development over ground floor retail uses and four storey retail/leisure building with associated car parking in two level basement and means of access pursuant to conditions B1 and B2 of outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA, being details of layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping, together with approval in writing to permit development that exceeds the plot boundary indicated within the Masterplan for Zones 3-6 and the development height parameter plan (7), pursuant to conditions A4 and D9 of the outline planning permission.

This addendum concerns the following:

1. Comments received from ODA Design Review Panel

The ODA Design Review Panel had three areas of concern for all 3 of the applications:

The 4.00m strip – The strip of land that separates the ground floor units from the roadway / pavement is somewhat undefined. The DRP response is to recommend that the ground floor block edge strip should be treated in a consistent manner across all blocks. Different solutions and the range of opportunities for different levels of management could adversely affect the setting of the Village. This matter should be passed back to the developers and be subject of a detailed review by the DRP looking at each block in turn.

All entrances - The entrances to the blocks all require more detailed design development. The drawings presented are not clear about what is being proposed for different functional elements associated with the entrances: bin stores, bike stores, security, concierge, CCTV, fire compliance and access to car parking. The DRP feel it is essential for the long term validation

of the quality of the design that these movements should be consistently thought through at this stage and that robust and durable solutions are proposed that will endure through the life of the building.

Plan review – The potential for adaptation to the tastes and the demands of later generations will ensure that the proposed mansion block approach will maintain its appropriateness for 100 years. This will require the ability to change fit outs – requiring straightforward access to servicing ducts etc. This review is required across all blocks to demonstrate the longevity and design integrity of the developer’s proposals and to protect their longer term utility and value.

It is considered that the issues raised by ODA Design Review Panel need to be addressed.

This page is intentionally left blank