

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 18 April 2018 at 7.00 p.m.

Council Chamber, 1st Floor, Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove
Crescent, London, E14 2BG

UPDATE REPORT

This meeting is open to the public to attend.

Contact for further enquiries:

Zoe Folley, Democratic Services
1st Floor, Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove Crescent, E14 2BG
Tel: 020 7364 4877
E-mail: zoe.folley@towerhamlets.gov.uk
Web: <http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/committee>

Scan this code for
an electronic
agenda:



For further information including the Membership of this body and public information, see the main agenda.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6

ADDENDUM REPORT, DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE. 18TH APRIL 2018

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.1	PA/17/02781	Entrance To Claire Place Between 46 And 48, Tiller Road, London	Installation of automated vehicular and pedestrian entrance gates at the vehicular entrance to Claire Place.

1.0 ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATION

- 1.1 The Council has received an additional representation regarding parking arrangements with an existing development at Byng Street where vehicular gates have been installed.
- 1.2 The issue of highways safety has already been addressed within the committee report.
- 1.3 Since the publication of the committee report, the Council has continued the progression of the new local plan, the next stage being 'regulation 19'. This means that the document is as we would wish to submit to the Secretary of State for examination. As the Regulation 19 version is still subject to public comment on its legal compliance and soundness and has not been considered by an Inspector, its weight remains limited.
- 1.4 In response, it is important to note, that the gates installed within the development on Byng Street do not allow for two vehicles to wait without queuing on public highway. Notwithstanding the change in polices during this time, each application must be taken on its own merits and it is not considered that this application would set a precedent for potentially unsafe and dangerous impact to pedestrian and vehicles.
- 1.5 The Committee is invited to take additional representations into account in their determination of the application

2 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 Officer recommendation remains that planning permission should be REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report.

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.2	PA/17/02470 and PA/17/02471	Bishops Square, Market Street and Lamb Street, London, E1 6AD	The removal of the canopy on Market Street; physical alterations to the existing retail units on the northern side of Market Street, including new shopfronts and extensions to the front and rear of the units, involving the change of use of part of the ground floor from Class B1 to Class A1; the change of use of part of the ground floor from Class B1 to Class A1/A3 on the southern side of Lamb Street, together with new shopfronts; the construction of a new two storey building (flexible Class A1/D2 gym) over the existing vehicle ramp on the northern side of Lamb Street and new hard and soft landscaping.

1.0 ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Updated LBTH Design and Conservation Comments:

- 1.1. Design officers originally raised concerns regarding the rear elevation to the two storey building on Lamb Street, as set out in paragraph 8.7. They have now reviewed the amended rear elevation and consider that the revised design addressed their concerns.

Representations from the public

- 1.2. Since the publication of the officer's report, the Council has received additional representations. This includes 2 new objections, 1 new letter of support and additional representations from previously registered objectors.
- 1.3. The following concerns raised are points concerns not already addressed in the officers' report:
- a) An A3 restaurant unit on Lamb Street would not be acceptable from a land use and noise impact (associated with deliveries) perspective.
 - b) The industrial appearance of proposed ramp clashes with flats in 32 and 40 Folgate Street to the north of Elder Garden; the front of those flats had to reflect the Georgian style of the Elder Street Conservation Area.
 - c) In relation to the western canopy:
 - It is very close to balconies of the flats in 27 Spital Square; it will destroy the view of those of the southernmost side of the building for no obvious benefit to the structure.
 - There is a strong possibility of being overlooked from the upper level inside the retail unit.
 - The narrowing of Lamb Street will force cycle delivery couriers to use the narrow pedestrian path to the north of the structure. The western

end of the canopy will allow less visibility and increase likelihood of pedestrian and cyclist collision.

- d) The proposal negatively impacts the attractiveness of the area for Tech companies; better infrastructure and more temporary office space is required. Tech workers are drawn to the market because it is not a high street intervention.
- 1.4. In relation to objection (a), the proposal seeks the conversion of the southern side Lamb Street unit from use class B1 to flexible A1/A3 uses. The officer's report considers the acceptability of the proposed uses from a land use and impact perspective. It considers both A1 and A3 to be acceptable land uses in this location, subject to the planning conditions proposed. For example, delivery and servicing arrangements.
- 1.5. Objection (b) compares the industrial design of the proposed Lamb Street building with a development on Fournier Street. Particular reference is made to the requirement for this nearby development to reflect the character and appearance of the Elder Street Conservation Area. Officers have had regard to the acceptability of the proposed building design within the officer's report. It is concluded that the proposed architectural approach is acceptable in the context of its surroundings.
- 1.6. Objection (c) has regard to the impact of the western canopy of the proposed Lamb Street building. Concerns have been raised that the proximity of the canopy to the adjacent residential building (27 Spital Square) would result in unacceptable impact to visual amenity, including loss of outlook, privacy and light.
- 1.7. The officers' report has regard to the impacts of the proposed building upon the surrounding residential buildings generally. The impact of the proposed upon the residential units at 27 Spital Square specifically will however be further discussed here.
- 1.8. When measured diagonally, the main part of the building would be approximately 10.6m from the residential building at 27 Spital Square. The canopy structure would however sit closer, with a separation distance of approximately 5.7m. On this basis, it is considered that the proposal would result in a change of outlook and oblique views from the residential units at the southernmost end of the building, especially at first and second floor level. However, given the oblique relationship and the largely transparent nature of the canopy, the impact is not considered to be significant.
- 1.9. As the western part of the building is a double height entrance space, the potential for overlooking associated with this part of the building is lessened. The separation distance together with the oblique relationship is considered to mitigate this impact to a large extent. Officers therefore raise no concerns in this regard.
- 1.10. It is further suggested that the narrowing of Lamb Street would result in the increased usage of the route to the north of the proposed Lamb Street building by cycle delivery couriers. The objection raises concerns that the western end of the canopy would result in less visibility and increase the likelihood of pedestrian and cyclist collision at this point.

- 1.11. The officer's report has had regard to the impact of the street narrowing upon pedestrian and cyclist movement throughout Lamb Street. The amendments to the proposal, which include the removal of street furniture and planters, are considered to maximise the width of the street available for safe movement of both cyclists and pedestrians. Rumble strips have also been designed into the pavement to emphasise the shared nature of the space and encourage cyclists to slow down.
- 1.12. On this basis, it is not envisaged that cyclists would need to find an alternative route. It is also noted that the width of the route to the rear of the Lamb Street building would be reduced as a result of the proposals. It is considered that this has the potential to deter cyclists from taking this route.
- 1.13. Furthermore, objection (d) suggests that the proposals would make the area less attractive for tech companies. The area is considered to be attractive to tech companies due to the market character in comparison to the proposed high street intervention. In the officer's report, regard was had to the compatibility of the proposed development with the existing office environment, given the POL designation. The officers' report concludes that the proposed uses are compatible with the major office function of the locality and the placemaking vision for Spitalfields.

2.0 CLARIFICATIONS AND CORRECTIONS

- 2.1. The consultation map included within the officers' report excludes 280 Bishopsgate. This is a mistake on the map. 280 Bishopsgate was consulted on 12th October 2017.
- 2.2. Paragraph 10.80 should state that the application was amended to include *head height lighting*.

3.0 FURTHER INFORMATION

- 3.1. A Transport Statement Addendum has been submitted by the applicant and uploaded to the Council's website following publication of the officers' report.
- 3.2. This document provides an update to the originally submitted Transport Statement following the amendments made to the scheme. This includes changes to Appendix 1 to insert the final layout plan, Appendix 6 to provide a breakdown of the proposed cycle parking in response to TfL comments and tweaks to the main body of the report to reflect the loss of the cantilever. It is not considered that the document introduces any new information that requires further or additional consideration.

4.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1. The officer's recommendation to grant planning permission and listed building consent remains unchanged.