



Meeting of the

# DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

---

Tuesday, 14 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](mailto:zoe.folley@towerhamlets.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

**BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

## **DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**14<sup>TH</sup> September 2010 at 7:00 pm**

---

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

---

### **INDEX**

<b>Agenda item no</b>	<b>Reference no</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
6.1	PA/10/00037	Rochelle School, Arnold Circus, London, E2 7ES	Continued use of Rochelle Canteen (Use Class A3), independent of the Rochelle Centre with ancillary off - site catering operation.
6.2	PA/10/00742	71A Fairfield Road, London	Retention and alteration of existing part 3 part 5 storey building which contains 8 residential units.

---

---

<b>Agenda Item number:</b>	6.1
<b>Reference number:</b>	PA/10/00037
<b>Location:</b>	Rochelle School, Arnold Circus, London, E2 7ES
<b>Proposal:</b>	Continued use of Rochelle Canteen (use class A3), independent of the Rochelle Centre, with an ancillary off - site catering operation.

## 1.0 Point of clarification.

- 1.1 Further to the Committee report, the Council has received an enquiry from a local resident. The enquiry centred on the distance from the canteen to the local residential buildings.
- 1.2 In order to be clear, the following table has been created to outline the separation distances from the edge of the canteen and the centre of the outdoor area to the surrounding residential buildings.

Block	Approximate distance from Canteen building (metres)	Approximate Distance from the centre of outdoor area (metres)	UDP "safe" distance (metres)	Conforms with UDP Building/ Outdoors
Cookham House	26	41	18	YES/YES
Walton House	30	55	18	YES/YES
Clifton House	37	30	18	YES/YES
Sandford House	37	25	18	YES/YES
Culham House	41	54	18	YES/YES
Hurley House	50	43	18	YES/YES
Sonning House	50	75	18	YES/YES
Mosely House	63	53	18	YES/YES

- 1.3 All the residential buildings remain further away than the 18m distance, outlined in the Unitary Development Plan where overlooking could be a problem.

## 2.0 Additional information received.

- 2.1 Anthony Bennett, the Director of Development of the A Foundation, submitted further information for the consideration of Members in an e-mail dated 13<sup>th</sup> September 2010. In summary, he stated that the proposal would not have any impact because:

### 2.2 Re: Amenity considerations

- The situation at the canteen will remain as existing if this permission is granted.
- The Rochelle Canteen is very small operation (30sqm, 36 seats, weekday daytime operating hours with a lunchtime food service offer) and is a canteen not a fully fledged restaurant (which would typically sell alcohol, have evening operation, serve food all day).
- Environmental Health has made no objection to the proposal.
- The canteen does not abut any residential properties.
- This permission will mean the canteen is subject to a Management Plan, something it is not at present.

### 2.3 Re: Highways considerations

- No more vehicle movements, parking or traffic will be generated by the application.
- Highways Officers have raised no objection and recognise that servicing / delivery arrangements are low-key.
- The proposals do not propose an increase in off-street car parking spaces (currently there are 4).
- The surrounding streets remain controlled during the hours of operation of these premises.
- Their parking survey reveals the majority of clientele are local to the area and traffic generation is minimal.
- Deliveries and food collection is kept to a minimum.

### 2.4 Re: Impact on the character of the Conservation Area

- The proposal does not escalate or intensify the activity at the canteen or result in a change in the appearance of the Conservation Area. It seeks to regularise an existing situation. It therefore does not cause any new harm or intensify a use in it.
- The canteen and off-site catering use is compatible with the mixed use character of the Conservation Area (made up of 20 blocks of 5 storey flats, 2 schools, workshops and commercial shops all built around a central circus).

### 2.5 Re: Overlooking

The proposal would not have any impact because:

- Overlooking is not exacerbated as the canteen building is existing and use of the site is established.
- This was not raised as a concern on previous applications.

### 2.6 Re: Comments

- More weight should be given to the individual support letters as opposed to the *"identical template objection letters"*.  
(Officer Comment: The number of letters either for or against the scheme is not a consideration. Their contents are).

## 2 **RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 The officer's recommendation remains unchanged.

Agenda Item number:	6.2
Reference number:	PA/10/00742
Location:	71A Fairfield Road, London
Proposal:	Retention and alteration of existing part 3 part 5 storey building which contains 8 residential units.

## **1. ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS**

- 1.1 Further to the committee report, the Council received two additional letters of support. The letters outline that it is considered that this area of Fairfield Road has been improved by the introduction of this building. Prior to the building the site had been used as a dumping ground for rubbish. There disappointment at the Committee's decision is noted.

## **2. Summary of Material Planning Considerations**

- 2.1 Officers have amended the summary of reasons to refuse this application, to more accurately reflect the reasons provided by the members at the 18<sup>th</sup> August Development Committee. Officers also consider that a further reason should be added to those proposed by the Committee Members. This reason centres on the standard of accommodation provided.

- 2.2 The reasons for refusal are now as follows:

The proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site and this is identified by the following:

- a) The proposed development, by virtue of its increased height and excess bulk and mass at third and fourth floor level, would appear out of character with the surrounding area and the host building. The proposed building fails to relate to the scale of the adjacent building to the east at 71 and 73 Fairfield Road. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policy DEV1 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (1998), SP10 of the Core Strategy Submission Version December 2009 and policy DEV2 of the Interim Planning Guidance (2007). These policies seek to ensure appropriate design of buildings within the Borough that respect local context.
- b) The proposed development, by virtue of it's proximity to the adjacent properties to the east at 71 and 73 Fairfield Road, would result in an unacceptable outlook, increased sense of enclosure and loss of privacy for existing residents. This is compounded by the height of the proposed development and its higher gradient which looks down on to and into these properties. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policy DEV2 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (1998), policy DEV1 of the Interim Planning Guidance (2007) and policy SP10 of the Core Strategy Submission Version December 2009. These policies seek to protect the amenity of residents of the Borough.
- c) The proposal would result in a poor standard of accommodation for future occupants, by virtue of it's small internal floor areas (Flat 1, 6, 7 & 8), poor outlook (Flat 4, 6 & 8) and lack of external amenity space (Flats 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8). The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policies DEV2, HSG13 and HSG16 of the adopted UDP (1998) and Policy HSG7 of the Interim Planning Guidance (2007). These policies seek to ensure developments provide sufficient amenity, internal space standards, and high quality useable amenity space for future residential occupiers.

## **3. RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 The officer's recommendation remains unchanged.