

UPDATE REPORT

Agenda Item number:	6.2
Reference number:	PA/15/01832
Location:	55 Brierly Gardens, London E2 0TF
Proposal:	Erection of rear extension and demolition of existing ramp to be replaced with a new ramped

1.0 AMENDMENTS TO COMMITTEE REPORT

Drawings and Documents:

- 3.2 The list of Drawings and Documents report in paragraph 1 are superseded as further revised drawings have been received. The following drawings and documents are 'current' and are considered for the purposes of this application:

Location Plan, PL 220, PL 222, PL 223, Roof Plan; 45 Degree Elevations and Sections; Design and Access Statement.

2.0 CONSULTATION

Since publication of the Officer report a number of additional representations have been received.

- 2.1 Paragraphs 2.3 and 5.12. It is reported that the application has received a total of 6 letters of representation and 1 petition containing 35 signatories in objection. However, 3 of the representations of the written objections also signed the petition.

- 2.2 The following additional points of objection have been raised:

- 2.3 The proposed extensions will set precedence within the estate causing a change in the appearance of Brierly Gardens.

[Officer Comment: The proposal will be assessed with respect to material planning considerations and overall impacts in terms of its design and impacts on amenity. Should there be future planning applications, due planning process assessing the proposal as above will be undertaken.]

- 2.4 Lack of inclusive consultation undertaken by Tower Hamlets Homes.

[Officer Comment: This consultation was undertaken independent of this planning application. Public consultation as part of the planning application has been undertaken by Council.]

- 2.5 Private lease owners are likely to benefit more from the scheme than overcrowded or vulnerably tenants.

[Officer Comment: This is not a material planning consideration.]

- 2.6 The submitted design and access statement is misleading.

[Officer Comment: The discrepancies within the submitted design and access statement highlighted by the representees do not have any implications on the material planning considerations of the proposal.]

2.7 Loss of light.

[Officer Comment: This has been addressed in the material planning considerations section of the officer report under 'amenity'.]

2.8 Loss of privacy and security.

[Officer Comment: This has been addressed in the material planning considerations section of the officer report under 'design' and 'amenity'.]

2.9 Increased crime in the surrounding area.

[Officer Comment: Relevant security design measures in accordance with secure by design standards will be secured via condition.]

2.10 Cost of structural /maintenance considerations.

[Officer Comment: Financial arrangements are not normally considered as material planning considerations. However, maintenance of the proposal will need to be negotiated with Tower Hamlets Homes.]

2.11 Adverse appearance and design of the proposed extensions.

[Officer Comment: This is addressed under the material planning consideration section of the report under 'design'.]

2.12 Adverse appearance and design of the proposed extensions.

[Officer Comment: This is addressed under the material planning consideration section of the report under 'design'.]

2.13 'Materials to match' the existing does not guarantee this outcome based on similar sites within borough comprising of similar rear extensions

[Officer Comment: Amended condition to include 'material samples' has been implemented to ensure that the proposed brick match the existing.]

2.14 Clarification is required for what is considered to be useable garden space.

[Officer Comment: The submitted figures have been calculated as net garden space excluding space taken by ramp and gaps between fence-line.]

2.15 The proposed flat roof design will require frequent maintenance works.

[Officer Comment: Maintenance works will be undertaken by Tower Hamlets Homes and is therefore not considered as material planning considered in this instance.]

2.16 Inadequate consultation undertaken by Council.

[Officer Comment: public consultation for this application has been undertaken in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act requirements.]

UPDATE REPORT

Agenda item number:	6.3
Reference number:	PA/15/00701
Location:	80 Back Church Lane, London, E1 1LX
Proposal:	<p>Demolition of existing three-storey educational building and erection of a six-storey building comprising educational use (Use Class D1) at basement level and part ground floor level, with 59 residential units (27no. one-bedroom, 23no. two-bedroom, 8no. three-bedroom and 1no. four-bedroom) at ground to fifth floor level.</p> <p>Application for Variation of Condition 2 (approved plans) to planning permission reference PA/14/00215, dated 13/05/2014, for a minor material amendment to the approved scheme.</p>

1.0 CURRENT ENFORCEMENT CASE

- 1.1 An enforcement complaint was received on 22nd July 2015 from a local resident stating that hammer driven piling has regularly been undertaken before 10am on Monday to Fridays and on Saturdays, which would be in breach of Condition 4 of the planning permission (PA/14/00215). The resident also questioned whether the development was being carried out in accordance with the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) as required by Condition 8 of the planning permission (PA/14/00215).
- 1.2 The issues raised by this resident were put to the applicant who responded confirming that no breach of this condition had taken place, and that they were taking every measure to ensure that the site works are being undertaken considerately and with sensitivity to the local neighbourhood. The applicant also subsequently sent a letter to local residents to reassure them that the works are being undertaken in line with an approved CEMP, and that the site was registered with the Considerate Constructors Scheme (CCS) who are making regular visits to the site.
- 1.3 In light of the above no further action has been taken by the Council's enforcement team.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

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