

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 13 MARCH 2013

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, 1ST FLOOR, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE
CRESCENT, LONDON, E14 2BG**

Members Present:

Councillor Helal Abbas (Chair)
Councillor Kosru Uddin
Councillor Craig Aston
Councillor Md. Maium Miah (Items 7.1-
8.2)
Councillor Khaled Uddin Ahmed
(Substitute for Councillor Shiria Khatun)
(Items 7.1-8.2)

Other Councillors Present:

None.

Officers Present:

Jerry Bell	– (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Megan Nugent	– (Legal Services Team Leader, Planning, Chief Executive's)
Elaine Bailey	– (Principal Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Nasser Farooq	– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Zoe Folley	– (Committee Officer, Democratic Services Chief Executive's)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors Anwar Khan and Shiria Khatun for who Councillor Khaled Uddin Ahmed was deputising.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests (DPIs) were made.

However Councillor Md.Maium Miah declared that he had received correspondence regarding item 7.1 (Land in Saunders Ness Road, at rear of 1 Glenaffric Avenue E14 (PA/12/03288)).

3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 13th February 2013 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee **RESOLVED** that:

- 1) In the event of changes being made to recommendations by the Committee, the task of formalising the wording of those changes is delegated to the Corporate Director, Development and Renewal along the broad lines indicated at the meeting; and
- 2) In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/informatives/planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Corporate Director, Development and Renewal is delegated authority to do so, provided always that the Corporate Director does not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision

5. PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS

The Committee noted the procedure for hearing objections, together with details of persons who had registered to speak at the meeting.

6. DEFERRED ITEMS

6.1 Club Row Building, (Rochelle Centre) Rochelle School, Arnold Circus, London, E2 7ES (PA/12/02317 & PA/12/02318)

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) introduced the report regarding Club Row Building, (Rochelle Centre) Rochelle School, Arnold Circus, London, E2 7ES (PA/12/02317 & PA/12/02318).

Elaine Bailey (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal) presented the report. At the last meeting of the committee in February, the Committee were minded to refuse the application for two reasons. These were: loss of heritage value in respect of the roof and former roof top play space and overall impact on the uniqueness of the building. Officers considered that the two areas of concern were closely intertwined and they were best expressed

in a single reason as set out in paragraph 4.1 of the report. Officers considered that the suggested reason could be defended at appeal as the original recommendation was finely balanced. Officers also highlighted the options open to the applicant in terms of this decision.

Councillor Craig Aston proposed an amendment to the reasons for refusal. He stated that he had received correspondence that the application could cause significant harm to the building. Accordingly, he proposed that the following be added to the suggested reason for refusal 'and the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and the principles of Planning Policy Statement 5 Practice Guide'.

This was seconded by Councillor Kosru Uddin and agreed by the Committee on a vote.

On a vote of 3 in favour and 0 against, the Committee **RESOLVED**:

That listed building consent and planning permission (PA/12/02317 & PA/12/02318) at Club Row Building, (Rochelle Centre) Rochelle School, Arnold Circus, London, E2 7ES be **REFUSED** for change of use from D1 (Non-residential institution) to mixed A1 (Shop), B1 (Business) and D1 (Non-residential institution) with the construction of an extension to rear, internal alterations (including installation of mezzanine floor space and new staircases), external alterations (including new doorways & windows & roof parapet raising & roof replacement) and alterations to Club Row boundary wall for the following reason:

The proposal, by reason of the loss of the original roof and other alterations resulting in loss of historic fabric, would detract from the unique historical importance of the building. The proposed roof and other alterations do not relate sufficiently well to the host building and fail to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting and features of special architectural or historic interest. On balance, the benefits of renovating parts of the building are not sufficient to outweigh the harm caused by the proposal.

The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policy DEV37 of the Unitary Development Plan (1998), adopted policy SP10 of the Core Strategy (2010) and policies DM24 and DM27 of the Development Management DPD (Submission Version 2012 with post EiP Modifications) AND the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and the principles of Planning Policy Statement 5 Practice Guide.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

7.1 Land in Saunders Ness Road, at rear of 1 Glenaffric Avenue, E14 (PA/12/03288)

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) introduced the report regarding Land in Saunders Ness Road, at rear of 1 Glenaffric Avenue, E14 (PA/12/03288)

There were no registered speakers.

Nasser Farooq (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal) presented the detailed report. He explained the site within a conservation area and the nearby listed buildings. He explained the outcome of the local consultation resulting in 12 representations in support, 6 against and a petition against with 33 signatures. He addressed the main planning issues. It was considered that the land use was acceptable. The scheme would make best use of the site and supply additional housing.

He referred to the previously refused scheme in 2004. The scheme was refused due to: impact on the listed public house and highway safety. He referred to the issues with the 2012 scheme that was also refused. The current application sought to overcome the concerns with changes to the design and the submission of adequate information. Mr Farooq explained the new design, the materials and layout of the building. The new scheme was in line with the surrounding area and would preserve the public house.

The plans had been amended to remove a parking bay in view of concerns from the Highways service (regarding poor visibility from the western bay). There were also measures to mitigate the impact on the highway under a s278 agreement. This included signage before the bend. Officers were now satisfied with the scheme in terms of highway safety.

Officers were recommending that the application be granted.

In response, Members asked questions/made comments on the following issues:

- the consultation with residents and how this had been taken on board.
- the disruption from the construction work.
- highway safety in view of the proposed trees and bend in Saunders Ness Road.
- the scope for an additional parking bay.
- the improvements on the refused schemes.

In response, Mr Farooq addressed the points. The application had been advertised in the East End Life newspaper with letters to 23 households in the vicinity and site notices. He explained the objections received covering the felling of trees. This matter had already been dealt with by separate

enforcement action. The applicant would also be required to plant additional trees.

A further area of concern was the car parking. In response, Officers had sought additional comments from highways. As a result, the scheme had been amended as explained above with the removal of the parking bay. Another issue was the design. However, this has also been amended and was now in line with the surrounding area.

The application would be subject to a condition to manage the construction impact (a Construction Logistics and Management Plan). There would also be restrictions on construction hours. This was acceptable to the Council's Environmental Health service. There were controls to prevent further parking bays outside the development. This included a condition removing permitted development rights.

The impact on the highway had been fully considered. It was found that the sightlines were acceptable with full visibility for reversing vehicles from the proposed bays.

The 2004 application sought to provide 7 parking spaces with no housing. However there was a lack of information on highway safety. This current application provided this information which had been reviewed and approved by the Council's Highways officers.

On a unanimous vote, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission (PA/12/03288) at Land in Saunders Ness Road, at rear of 1 Glenaffric Avenue, E14 be **GRANTED** for the erection of three and four storey development to provide 4 x 4 bedroom terrace houses (use class C3) with provision of landscaping and off-street car parking spaces on vacant site.
2. That the Corporate Director of Development & Renewal is delegated power to impose conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the matters set out in the committee report.

8. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

8.1 Trinity Centre, Key Close, London, E1 4HG (PA/12/02410)

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) introduced the report regarding Trinity Centre, Key Close, London, E1 4HG (PA/12/02410)

On a unanimous vote, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That application (PA/12/02410) at Trinity Centre, Key Close, London, E1 4HG for listed building consent to carry out repairs to roof, roof access and bell

tower to prevent water ingress to internal ceilings be **REFERRED** to the Government Office for West Midlands with the recommendation that the Council would be minded to grant Listed Building Consent subject to conditions set out in the report.

8.2 APPEAL REPORT

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) presented the report and highlighted the key points.

On a unanimous vote the Committee **RESOLVED**

That the details and outcomes as set out in the report be noted.

The meeting ended at 7.25 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Helal Abbas
Development Committee