

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

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

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

Members Present:

Councillor Helal Abbas (Chair)
Councillor Shiria Khatun (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Kosru Uddin
Councillor Craig Aston
Councillor Anwar Khan

Other Councillors Present:

None.

Officers Present:

Jerry Bell	– (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Elaine Bailey	– (Principal Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Mary O'Shaughnessy	– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Benson Olaseni	– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Fleur Brunton	– (Senior Lawyer - Planning Chief Executive's)
Andrew Hargreaves	– (Borough Conservation Officer, Development and Renewal)
Zoe Folley	– (Committee Officer, Democratic Services Chief Executive's)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillor Maium Miah and for lateness by Councillor Anwar Khan.

2. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

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

Councillor Helal Abbas declared a non DPI in agenda item 7.1 (Club Row Building, (Rochelle Centre) Rochelle School, Arnold Circus, London, E2 7ES (PA/12/02317 & PA/12/02318)). This was on the grounds that he had received

correspondence and had spoken to objectors. However he had not expressed an opinion.

3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 16th January 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

Nil Items.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

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

Update report tabled.

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

The Chair invited the registered speakers to address the meeting.

Aulad Miah spoke in objection. He stated that he lived in the ward and was an

employee of the adjacent service. The site was located in the Conservation Area, was mainly residential and outside the Central Activities Zone (CAZ). Therefore, it was unsuitable for retail use. There would also be a loss of arts. The plans, including the roof extension, would spoil the character of the area. The roof would be very visible from the street. It should follow the current design. The plans conflicted with policy that sought to protect heritage assets.

In reply to Members, he considered that the applicant carried out very little consultation. The initial feedback was negative and following this, there were few meetings with restricted access. The proposal would attract anti social behaviour (asb) by making the building more prominent. The change of use to retail and loss of education uses would also increase asb. The Police reports indicated that there were significant issues with asb in the area.

Jason Caffrey spoke in objection. He stressed the importance of the centre in terms of historic value. The proposals would cause irreversible harm to the key features that made it so unique. For example, it would spoil the roof which covered the former play space, remove the classrooms, the original windows and doors. He drew attention to the concerns of the Greater London Archaeology Society. He disputed the accuracy of the report in terms of the building's history and the heritage assessment. Furthermore, English Heritage were in the process of reviewing the building's listed status. The Committee should defer its decision until the outcome of this review was known.

Hatty Buchanan spoke in support of the application. She was an employee of the centre. She referred to the works to a similar building to upgrade it. It was planned to use the same successful methods here. It was proposed to host a range of services should the centre be restored. This included education lessons for children and community projects. The building was in a poor state now with an uncertain income base. It urgently needed the repair work. The income generated by the new building would cover the costs. If left, the building could be placed on the List of Buildings at Risk Register.

In reply to Members, she explained the consultation process. There had been extensive pre-application discussions over 18 months with many meetings and initiatives with residents. The plans had been amended in light of the concerns with the retention of the original boundary wall. The roof was badly in need of repair. The leaking was harming the structure. As a result, the upper floor could not fully be used. (Officers showed photograph's of the roof in their presentation). It was necessary to repair the roof to bring the centre back to full use and generate the income needed for the restoration.

Kevin Watson (Applicant's agent) spoke in support. The plans would prevent the buildings on-going deterioration and provide a host of benefits. This included the repair of the centre, new jobs, business units for the local economy, a good design and improved energy efficiency. Only a small part of the centre would be used for retail use. There was nothing of serious harm. The building was Grade II group listed, being the lowest value listing. So the repair works to save it, in this context, were acceptable.

Elaine Bailey (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report and the update. The site was within the Boundary Estate Conservation area and the CAZ area. Therefore, in terms of land use, the proposal was acceptable. She described the change in use including the A1 retail use. She explained the key alterations. It was confirmed that the roof would be raised by between 900cm- 1 metre in height, but was also set back.

Ms Bailey explained the outcome of the consultation including representations for and against. The scheme had been amended to address the objections with the preservation of internal partitions, reduction of the mezzanine and restrictions on retail use.

Officers did not consider that the plans would harm the value of the building. The scheme would restore the building and ensure its survival. Overall, given the benefits, the scheme should be granted.

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

- The loss of the roof and the former play space. It was questioned whether Officers were now satisfied with this given the concerns in the report.
- The loss of historic features and the policy support for this. It was questioned whether the benefits of the scheme outweighed this.
- The design and colour in relation to the surrounding area.
- The alternative options explored.
- The roof materials and waste storage plans.

In response, Officers addressed the points.

Officers had fully assessed the impact on the building. The plans were necessary to ensure the building's longevity. The applicant had submitted an economic assessment showing that the scheme was viable. It would be funded by the increased income from the new building. It was intended that the centre would primarily be used for the arts and culture with complementary uses.

English Heritage had not made any objections. The Council's specialists were satisfied with the scheme. The concerns in the report, (expressed at pre application stage) had generally been addressed.

The Council's Conservation Officer, Andrew Hargreaves, was present to support the findings. He reported on the many other options looked at but none had proven viable or practical. The roof would be made of zinc, a more modern version of the present material and would be in keeping with the area.

The refuse and waste arrangements would remain separate from St Hilda's as stated in the update. The details would be secured by condition.

Councillor Anwar Khan did not vote on this item as he had arrived after the start of the item.

On a vote of 3 in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That the Officers recommendation to grant 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 **NOT BE ACCEPTED** 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.

Members were minded not to accept the application due to concerns over:

- Loss of heritage value in respect of the roof and former roof top play space.
- Overall impact on the uniqueness of the building.

In accordance with Development Procedural Rules, the application was **DEFERRED** to enable Officers to prepare a supplementary report to a future meeting of the Committee setting out proposed detailed reasons for refusal and the implications of the decision.

(The Members that voted on this item were Councillors Helal Abbas, Shiria Khatun, Craig Aston and Kosru Uddin)

7.2 Land at North East Corner of Butley Court, Ford Street, London, E3 (PA/12/0285)

Update report tabled.

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader) introduced the report regarding Land at North East Corner of Butley Court, Ford Street, London, E3 (PA/12/0285).

The Chair invited the registered speakers to address the meeting.

Anthony Stock spoke in objection. He stated that he lived at Jossiline Court. He objected to the loss of the drying rooms. They were much needed as residents didn't have anywhere else to dry their laundry. He expressed concern at the impact on the residents from the construction work. Many were elderly and would have to suffer this for three years. It would cause them a lot of harm. In reply to Members, he agreed that the plans could worsen anti social behaviour (asb) by darkening the estate. Residents were having to dry their laundry internally that caused damp and mould in flats.

Officers clarified that the issues around housing management (service

charges and subletting) were not a planning consideration and should have no impact on the decision.

Andrew Black spoke in support. The proposal sought to redevelop the under used drying rooms. It would provide 100% affordable housing. He reported on the extensive consultation carried out with the residents who were mainly supportive of the proposal. The residents consulted were not concerned about the loss of drying rooms. No objections had been received from the statutory consultees. In reply to Members, he stated that the drying rooms were locked as were underused and therefore attracted asb. The applicant was happy to accept a condition on security and lighting to address any concerns in this area.

Benson Olaseni (Planning Officer) presented the report and the update. He described the main issues including: the site and surrounds, the layout and the outcome of the consultation. The units would be for the over 50s. The drying rooms had been vacant for some time. So its regeneration was welcomed and would help meet the housing targets. It was considered that the impact on amenity was acceptable with no impact on day light or sunlight. The scheme complied with policy and should be granted.

In reply, Members discussed the safety and security issues. In particular, the problems with asb on the site due to the levels of darkness. There was a risk that this further development could add to this problem by darkening the area further. To prevent this, Councillor Anwar Khan proposed an additional condition that was seconded by Councillor Craig Aston. This was agreed by the committee.

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

That planning permission (PA/12/0285) at Land at North East Corner of Butley Court, Ford Street, London, E3 be **GRANTED** for the demolition of existing drying rooms and erection of four storey infill block comprising of 4 x one bedroom apartments SUBJECT to the conditions and informative set out in the report AND the additional condition agreed by the Committee that:

- Details of the safety and security plans be submitted and approved by Officers including the possibility of installing CCTV.

7.3 Land at North East Corner of Jossiline Court, London (PA/12/02860)

Update report tabled.

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader) introduced the report regarding Land at North East Corner of Jossiline Court, London (PA/12/02860).

The Chair invited the registered speakers to address the meeting.

George Beckwith spoke in objection. He stated that he lived in Jossiline Court. The proposed bins would be right next to his flat. He suggested changes to the layout of the scheme to address this.

Anthony Stock spoke in objection. He stressed the importance of the drying room to residents and their wish for them to be brought back in use. The owners had locked them up. That's the reason why they were not used.

Andrew Black spoke in support. He stressed the merits of the scheme in terms of the affordable housing and improvements to the area. If granted, the scheme would be secure by design. In reply to Members, he considered that the refuse plans were acceptable. The issues raised by Mr Beckwith (about the bins) had been taken up with the applicant and they were happy that there were no issues.

Benson Olaseni (Planning Officer) introduced the proposal.

In reply, Members discussed the safety and security issues. Accordingly, Councillor Anwar Khan proposed an additional condition to address such issues that was seconded by Councillor Craig Aston. This was agreed by the committee. (The reasons are set out in minute 7.2)

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

That planning permission (PA/12/02860) at Land at North East Corner of Jossiline Court, London be **GRANTED** for the demolition of existing drying rooms and erection of four storey infill block comprising of 4 x one bedroom apartments SUBJECT to the conditions and informative set out in the report AND the additional condition agreed by the Committee that:

- Details of the safety and security plans be submitted and approved by Officers including the possibility of installing CCTV.

7.4 55 Poplar High Street, London, E14 0DJ (PA/11/03216)

Update Report tabled.

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader) introduced the report 55 Poplar High Street, London, E14 0DJ (PA/11/03216).

There were no speakers registered.

Mary O'Shaughnessy (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report and the update. She explained the site location and planning history. It was considered that the change of use was acceptable as it would bring a vacant building back into use with no adverse impacts. The plans were supported in policy. She explained the outcome of the consultation and the objections raised regarding anti-social behaviour (asb) and need for the use. There was no evidence linking internet café use with asb and no major problems of this type in the area (as shown by the crime statistics). There were conditions to

protect amenity. There were no symptoms of overconcentration given the limited number of such uses in the area.

Members raised a number of questions. In response, Officers referred to the comments of the Crime Officer and Police. They considered that there were no incidences that justified an objection based on the statistics.

It was considered that a 10pm closing time (11pm on Saturday) was appropriate to protect residents. The premises would be selling hot and cold drinks. There would be no hot food for sale.

Councillor Craig Aston proposed to shorten the closing hours to prevent any late night nuisance from the proposal. This amendment fell.

On a vote of 4 in favour 0 against and 1 abstention, the Committee **RESOLVED**:

1. That planning permission (PA/11/03216) at 55 Poplar High Street, London, E14 0DJ be **GRANTED** for change of use from minicab office (sui generis) to internet café and ancillary office space (Use Class A1/A2)
2. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to impose conditions on the planning permission to secure the matters set out in the report.

8. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

8.1 Bromley Public Hall, Bow Road, London, E3 (PA/12/02618)

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader) introduced the report Bromley Public Hall, Bow Road, London, E3 (PA/12/02618)

Mary O'Shaughnessy (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report and the update.

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

That application (PA/12/02618) at Bromley Public Hall, Bow Road, London, E3 for the installation of two (2) black contrasting colour nosings (anti-slip) to external concrete stairs and installation of two (2) handrails to external walls above concrete stairs at the front entrance of Bromley Public Hall be **REFERRED** to the National Casework Unit with the recommendation that the Council would be minded to grant Listed Building Consent subject to conditions set out in the report.

8.2 Block E, Professional Development Centre, English Street, London, E3 4TA (PA/12/03099)

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader) introduced the report Block E, Professional Development Centre, English Street, London, E3 4TA (PA/12/03099)

Mary O'Shaughnessy (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report and the update.

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

That application (PA/12/03099) at Block E, Professional Development Centre, English Street, London, E3 4TA for repair and refurbishment of redundant and derelict toilet block into external playground store including a new roof be **REFERRED** to the National Casework Unit with the recommendation that the Council would be minded to grant Listed Building Consent subject to conditions set out in the report.

8.3 Planning Appeals Report

Jerry Bell 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 9.10 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Helal Abbas
Development Committee