



Meeting of the

STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Thursday, 16 September 2010 at 7.00 p.m.

UPDATE REPORT

If you require any further information relating to this meeting, would like to request a large print, Braille or audio version of this document, or would like to discuss access arrangements or any other special requirements, please contact:

Zoe Folley, Democratic Services

Tel: 020 7364 4877, E-mail: zoe.folley@towerhamlets.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

16TH September 2010 at 7:00 pm

UPDATE REPORT OF HEAD OF PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL

INDEX

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal
7.1	PA/07/03290	375 Cable Street, London, E1	Change of Use from Retail (Class A1) to Hot Food Take-away (Class A5).
7.2	PA/10/01049	40 Marsh Wall	Demolition of existing office building and erection of a 38 storey building (equivalent of 39 storeys on Manilla Street) with a three-level basement, comprising a 305 bedroom hotel (Use Class C1) with associated ancillary hotel facilities including restaurants (Use Class A3), leisure facilities (Use Class D2) and conference facilities (Use Class D1); serviced offices (Use Class B1); public open space, together with the formation of a coach and taxi drop-off point on Marsh Wall.
7.3	PA/10/01481	60 Commercial Road	Demolition of existing building and erection of a 19 storey building plus basement to provide plant room; 200 sqm retail/commercial /community unit (class A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1) at ground floor and student accommodation on upper floors (comprising 383 units) and ancillary uses; associated servicing and landscaping.

Agenda Item number:	7.1
Reference number:	PA/07/03290
Location:	375 Cable Street, London, E1
Proposal:	Change of Use from Retail (Class A1) to Hot Food Take-away (Class A5).

1. ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

- 1.1 The Council has received two additional letters of representation since the committee report was completed.
- 1.2 One further letter of objection has been received from Bishop Challoner Catholic Collegiate School, reiterating their objection to the proposal. No additional issues have been raised in this letter, which have not already been addressed within the committee report.
- 1.3 An e-mail has also been received which raised issues in respect of the neighbour notification letter dated 27th July 2010 sent by the Council asking for further comments on this application after the JR decision. They considered that it was misleading in that the letter sent gave a final date for the receipt of comments and that it was not explicit in stating that letters received after this date would be taken into account. It also noted that, given the consultation period ran over the school holidays, this made it difficult to collect signatures to object to the scheme and they could have continued to collect objection letters up to the date of Committee.
- 1.4 **Officer Comment:**
The letter is a standard letter based on the model consultation letter suggested in legislation. It clearly states that *“all comments received will be taken into account before (the Council) make a decision”* (i.e. before the Committee makes its decision). As such, Officers consider that the contents of the letter are clear and in line with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement: the document that outlines the Council’s planning consultation process.
- 1.5 Unfortunately, planning legislation does not allow an extension of consultation times over any period of time (i.e. school holidays), Bank Holidays or religious holidays (i.e. Easter / Christmas / Ramadan etc).
- 1.6 It should also be noted that the Council was under no legal obligation to reconsult on this application after the JR decision, but choose to fully consult in view of the considerable public interest in this application and the strong opinions held by supporters and objectors to it.
- 1.7 Following the receipt of additional representations the total number of representations received during the post JR consultation is as follows:
- 1.8 No of individual responses: Objecting: 324 Supporting: 402

2. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 2.1 For the avoidance of doubt, whilst the Inspector at the Waltham Forest case at 262-268 High Road, Leytonstone E11 3HS (Refs: APP/U5930/C/09/2105005+2105431 & A/09/2112069) stated clearly that the:

“direct association between food brought in hot food takeaways and unhealthy / imbalanced diets in individuals is difficult to sustain as an unvarying principle”

he did eventually refuse the take-away use in question on over-concentration of use

grounds and its subsequent cumulative impact on the neighbourhood.

3. RECOMMENDATION

3.1 The officer's recommendation remains unchanged.

Agenda Item number:	40 Marsh Wall
Reference number:	PA/10/01049
Location:	40 Marsh Wall, London E14
Proposal:	Demolition of existing office building and erection of a 38 storey building (equivalent of 39 storeys on Manilla Street) with a three-level basement, comprising a 305 bedroom hotel (Use Class C1) with associated ancillary hotel facilities including restaurants (Use Class A3), leisure facilities (Use Class D2) and conference facilities (Use Class D1); serviced offices (Use Class B1); public open space, together with the formation of a coach and taxi drop-off point on Marsh Wall.

1. ADDITIONAL DRAWING NUMBER

- 1.2 Drawing number 1065A-PL098 (first, second and third floor level basement plans) was missing from the original report.

2. REPORT CORRECTION

- 2.1 The reasons for refusal upon the previous application (reference PA/09/01220) are stated incorrectly at paragraph 4.13 of the officer report. Reason no.2 should read as follows:

2. The proposed development would result in unacceptable traffic and parking impacts and as such is contrary to Policies 2A.1, 3A.7, 3C.1, 3C.2, 3C.19, 3C.20 of The London Plan (Consolidated 2008), PPS1, PPG13, Policy ST25, ST28, ST30, T16, T18, T19, T21 of the LBTH UDP 1998, Policies DEV17, DEV18, DEV19 of the LBTH IPG 2007 which seek to ensure the proposal does not impact on the local road system.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 The officer's recommendation remains unchanged.

Agenda Item number:	7.3
Reference number:	PA/10/1481
Location:	Jobcentre Plus, 60 Commercial Road, London E1 1LP
Proposal:	Demolition of existing building and erection of a 19 storey building plus basement to provide plant room; 200 sqm retail/commercial /community unit (class A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1) at ground floor and student accommodation on upper floors (comprising 383 units) and ancillary uses; associated servicing and landscaping.

1. ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

1.1 Since the publication of the committee report, 15 letters of support were received. The following comments were made in the representations received:

- The current building is unattractive, of poor design quality and not in keeping with the surrounding area
- The proposed development is well designed and will contribute positively to the area.
- The height of the building is in keeping with the prevailing character of the immediate area.
- The proposal will provide suitable regeneration of the site which would benefit of the community
- The site is suitable located for student accommodation and would address the under supply of student accommodation in London Borough of Tower Hamlets
- The proposed commercial floorspace on the ground floor is a positive enhancement to the site.
- The proposal makes provision for commercial facilities on the ground floor which be of benefit to the local community.

2. RE PROVISION OF JOB CENTRE

2.1 Following the publication of the committee report, the applicant has written to the Council stating that they have offered the new floorspace at 122 Back Church Road (PA/09/1199) as relocation for the job centre to the agent acting on behalf of the Job Centre.

3. HARRY GOSLING PRIMARY SCHOOL

3.1 Since the publication of the committee report, Harry Gosling Primary School has not provided comments to the Council regarding the application. However, the applicant has recently met with the Headteacher of Harry Gosling Primary School to present the application proposals and discuss ways in which the pupils at the school could be involved with the application proposals. The applicant has suggested the potential to silkscreen children's paintings onto the hoardings around the site once redevelopment commences, should members consider this to be appropriate.

4. RECOMMENDATION

4.1 The officer's recommendation remains unchanged.

This page is intentionally left blank