The London Borough of Tower Hamlets Compulsory Purchase Order 2025 (APP/PCU/CPOP/E5900/3365599)

Summary Proof of Evidence of Victoria Coelho

dated **18 November 2025**

Contents

1 INTRODUCTION 1
2 PLANNING HISTORY 1
3 PLANNING POLICY 1
4 RESPONSE TO OBJECTORS 2
5 CONCLUSION 2

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 I, Victoria Coelho, am a Principal Planning Officer for the London Borough of Tower Hamlets (the **Council**). I have been in this role since 2018. In my role, I am responsible for providing high quality, specialised development management specialist expertise and technical assessment including the delivery of the Council's statutory responsibilities for the determination of planning applications. I have experience in planning development management and estate regeneration and have worked in this industry for approximately 11 years.

1.2 This summary proof of evidence is made in support of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets (Harriott, Apsley and Pattison Houses) Compulsory Purchase Order 2025 (the **Order**) **[CD 1.1]**. The Order is required to facilitate the regeneration of the estate which contains Harriott House, Apsley House and Pattison House and the Redcoat Community Centre and Mosque (the **Estate**). The regeneration of the Estate is referred to in this proof of evidence as the **Scheme**.

1.3 Until being asked to give evidence on behalf of the Council, I had not had any prior involvement with the Scheme.

2 PLANNING HISTORY

2.1 In Section 3 of my Proof, I set out the Estate's planning history as well as the procedural details of the Planning Permission **[CD 4.2]** which is intended to be implemented, as well as the legislation and policy that the planning application was assessed against.

2.2 I cover the consultation carried out in association with the Planning Permission, as well as the public benefits that are considered to arise as a result as secured through planning conditions and obligations.

2.3 I outline the planning conditions and obligations to which the Planning Permission is subject and conclude that there are currently no impediments to the discharge of the planning conditions when applications for the approval of the relevant details are made and the conditions are not unusual in the context of a development of this type**.**

2.4 I conclude that I do not consider there to be any planning impediments to delivery of the Scheme.

3 PLANNING POLICY

3.1 In Section 4 of my Proof, I address at a high level the compliance of the Development with policy at a national, regional and local level, as this also supports the Council's overall compelling case.

3.1.1 I confirm that the Scheme will increase the level of housing, both market and affordable, on an existing residential site consistent with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework **[CD 3.1]** in terms of housing supply and brownfield land.

3.1.2 Appendix 1 to my Proof sets out my analysis of compliance of the Development with the London Plan (2021) (the **London Plan**) **[CD 3.2]**.

3.1.3 Appendix 2 to my Proof sets out my analysis of compliance of the Development with the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (2020) (the **Local Plan**) **[CD 3.3]**.

3.2 I conclude that the application for the Planning Permission (the **Planning Application**) has been considered against the development plan policies within the Local Plan, the London Plan, against the National Planning Policy Framework and all other material considerations. In my professional opinion, the Planning Application was correctly recommended for approval on the following bases:

3.2.1 53.3% of the proposed habitable rooms would be affordable. All proposed homes would meet the London Plan's minimum space standard and would have private amenity space provision that meets minimum standards;

3.2.2 The proposed land use is strongly supported and would assist the Council in meeting its housing targets. In particular, the overall provision of 175 affordable homes, including the reprovision, would serve the needs of local residents;

3.2.3 The scale, form, detailed design and materiality of the development would respond appropriately to the character and appearance of the surrounding streets; and

3.2.4 The proposal would have an acceptable impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

4 RESPONSE TO OBJECTORS

4.1 In Section 5 of my Proof, I respond to objections which raise planning related issues, being:

4.1.1 Objector 1: Grounds 2, 3 and 5 **[CD 8.2]**;

4.1.2 Objector 2a and 2b: Grounds 1 and 2 **[CD 8.3 and 8.4]**; and

4.1.3 Objector 3: Grounds 7 and 9 **[CD 8.5 and 8.6]** .

5 CONCLUSION

5.1 Although I have not previously worked on the Scheme, I have considered the Planning Permission (including the Officers' Report and recommendation) and I am of the professional opinion that the Development accords with national policy and the Development Plan and was correctly supported.

5.2 In my professional opinion, I am satisfied that the Scheme will provide much needed homes, community facilities and improved public realm and connectivity and promote all of the objectives of the planning policy I have noted above.

5.3 I am further satisfied that there will be no planning impediment to the delivery of the Scheme.