

# DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 16 June 2015 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.

PAGE WARD(S) NUMBER(S) AFFECTED 1 - 6

8. UPDATE REPORT



# Agenda Item 8

#### LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

#### **DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

16<sup>th</sup> June 2015

#### UPDATE REPORT OF HEAD OF PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL

#### **INDEX**

Agenda Item number:	5.1
Reference numbers:	PA/14/02753 & PA/14/02754
Location:	The Forge, 397 & 411 Westferry Road, London, E14 3AE
Proposal:	Planning permission and Listed Buildign Consent is sought for change of use of part of The Forge from office (Use Class B1) to convenience retail food store (Use Class A1) with gross internal floor area of 394 sq m and net sales area (gross internal) of 277 sq m; and change of use of the remainder of The Forge (Use Class B1) to interchangeable uses for either or financial and professional services, restaurants and cafes, drinking establishments, business, non-residential institutions (nursery, clinic, art gallery, or museum), or assembly and leisure (gym), namely change of use to uses classes A2, A3, A4, B1(a), D1 and D2; with 297.17 sq m GFA of new floor space created at 1st floor level for business (Use Class B1(a)) and internal and external changes and maintenance to The Forge to facilitate the change of use to retail convenience store including new customer access to the north elevation, internal partitions, works to the roof to facilitate new plant equipment and satellite dish; making good to walls (internal and external), maintenance to internal cranes and general building maintenance; Demolition of external walls to facilitate access to The Forge and rebuilding of one wall, repositioning of lighting column, and cycle parking.

#### 1.0 ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 1.1 Further representation from Greater London Industrial Archaeology Society (GLIAS) and made the comments which are summarised below.
  - a) Due to separate entrances there is a need for interpretation board in more than one part of the building. GLIAS would like to contribute their knowledge and overview to content of these.
  - b) There is no basis for the applicant to claim that the building was compartmentalised when in industrial use. There are interior photographs taken in 1986 which show the building still in one occupancy and spatially undivided, with just corrugated-steel partition to head height, along part of the length.
  - c) The original designers in 1860 minimised obstructions within this large space with columns widely spaced and double that spacing in the bays at each end.
  - d) Whilst the applicant has suggested the proposed changes may be considered merely as events in the building continued evolution, the purpose of listing is to identify features of special value that cannot be replaced.
  - e) The 14<sup>th</sup> May report recommends extra condition for submission of additional details where historic fabric may be affected however that cannot alter the proposed scheme itself.
  - f) The Update report for 11<sup>th</sup> March 2015, recommends additional condition for moving the longitudinal wall slightly, as suggested by GLIAS, thus altering the scheme, but this was not carried forward into the list of conditions.
  - g) The proposal has too much accommodation and the areas of flexible uses had been reduced to the size to the degree that there would be no longer be room to provide toilets, kitchen and other facilities that the use such as a restaurant might require, without further damaging intrusion into the open area. Whilst the officers

addressed this point raised previously by suggesting that this would be a matter for a listed building application in the future, however there would be no scope to rectify this issue.

- 1.2 A resident wrote to object to the application on the grounds of:
  - a) This is a listed building, and there are not many remaining amongst the new developments and remaining ones should not be dominated by Tesco or any other convenience stores.
  - b) There are already Tesco Sores at either end of Westferry Road
  - c) It would be much better to encourage a range of high street shop styled in keeping with a historical building, such as greengrocers or bakers which there does not seem to be any on Isle of Dogs and Westferry Road.
- 1.3 The applicant wrote to Members of Committee and the officers also copied into their representation. Summary of their representation is as follows:
  - a) The Forge building has been laid vacant since 2007 and it has been marketed since 2007 and the proposal would provide the community with a valuable new retail offer. The Council's own review of the Retail Report agrees that 'the proposals would not have a significant adverse impact on the defined centres of Westferry Road, Manchester Road, Cross Harbour or Canary Wharf'.
  - b) Putting the proposal together we have worked closely with the Council's heritage officers to ensure that the plans respect the nature of the building.
  - c) The Forge would be accessible to the public for the first time.
  - d) Conditions to ensure that details of the opening to be submitted for approval is encouraged.

#### Officer Comments

1.6 Majority of the points raised have already been addressed in the previous main report, update report and previous deferral report.

#### 2.0 ADDITIONAL CONDITION TO THE LISTED BUILDING CONSENT

- 2.1 The amended recommendation in the 14<sup>th</sup> May deferral report does not include the condition suggested by GLIAS which was addressed in the officer's Update report for 11<sup>th</sup> March Committee. For clarity, the following condition (appropriately worded) would be attached, if the Committee were mined to grant listed building consent.
  - a) Amended plans showing details of the central longitudinal wall repositioned.

#### 3.0 RECOMMENDATION

3.1 Officers' original recommendation to GRANT planning permission and listed building consent remains unchanged.

Agenda Item number:	6.2
Reference number:	PA/15/00096
Location:	Passageway to the south of 18 Cleveland Way, London, E1
Proposal:	Erect a 2.4m high gate across the passage way

# 1.0 AMENDMENT TO COMMITTEE REPORT

- 1.1 There was an error in the report in paragraph 7.2.
- 1.2 Paragraph 7.2 of the report should read as follows:

No of individual responses:

Objecting: 34

Supporting: 19

Petition with signatures:

Objecting: 1x Petition with 374 Signatures

Supporting: 0

#### 2.0 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 Officers' original recommendation to REFUSE planning permission remains unchanged.

Agenda Item number:	
Reference number:	_
Location:	_
Proposal:	_

## 2.0 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 Officers' original recommendation to GRANT planning permission remains unchanged.