

**DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE 21 MARCH 2022
UPDATE REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL**

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
4.1	PA/20/01442/A1	Walker House, 6-8 Boundary Street, London	Change of use of first floor office use (use class B1a) to 4no residential units (Use class C3). Construction of a two-storey building to the rear to provide office space (use class B1a). Amendments to residential entrance at junction of Boundary Street and Calvert Avenue

1.0 SITE VISIT

1.1 Committee Members undertook a site visit on Monday 14th March.

2.0 NEW REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 4 additional representations have been received from previous objectors since the publication of the committee report. The only new/additional points of objection which have been raised are:

- If the scheme is dependent on screening by vegetation in order to be acceptable then the scheme is fundamentally flawed;
- Queries as regards enforceability of conditions relating to the protection of ivy and the light pollution mitigation, particularly as residents have recently requested that the Ivy be cut back;
- Further representations in relation to conflict between commercial use and residential use (i.e. by noise disturbance through day and night activities, after-office gatherings and parties and occupants using the carpark for breaks);
- Concerns that residents of the new proposed flats will climb onto the green roof; and
- Proximity to Wargrave House is below the 18m guideline and openable nature of windows facing onto Wargrave House renders the obscure glazing insufficient to address overlooking/onlooking to/from Wargrave House below the policy guide separation distances.

2.2 One objector also provided imagery which they had put together which shows the effect of the proposals (i) in views from windows at Wargrave House and (ii) in views from the Shiplake House courtyard should the Ivy growth be completely removed.

2.3 The retention of the ivy, and any replacement planting, is seen as a significant public, and environmental, benefit and assists in the reduction of the level of harm introduced to the conservation area and the surrounding listed buildings. Conditions are recommended to ensure the ivy survives and is ratine dot replaced. However, the officers opinion is that the increased visibility of the proposed development would not be unacceptable if the vegetation were removed, rather that it is one of a number of public benefits/elements of mitigation of harm which would need to be considered in any public benefits balance assessment in line with paragraph 202 of the NPPF.

2.4 Officers would propose to also add a condition to require that the windows facing Wargrave House are unopenable to deal with those additional concerns.

3.0 ISSUES RAISED AT SITE VISIT

3.1 Members queried whether further measures could be taken to protect the existing vegetation within the carpark. Officers are proposing that a root protection plan for the existing vegetation be secured by a pre-commencement planning condition in order to ensure that the vegetation will be appropriately protected throughout the development.

4.0 RECOMMENDATION

4.1 Officer recommendation remains that planning permission should be GRANTED for the reasons set out in previous reports and with application of all the planning obligations and planning conditions set out therein, plus the following additional conditions:

- Windows on the south elevation to be both obscure glazed and unopenable; and
- Submission and approval of a root protection plan for the existing vegetation prior to commencement of works.

5.2	PA/21/02703	Land comprising Harriott, Apsley & Pattison Houses and the Redcoat Centre & Redcoat Community Centres, Stepney Green, London, E1	Redevelopment of the site comprising demolition of existing buildings (including Harriott House, Apsley House, Pattison House, The Redcoat Centre and Redcoat Community Centre) to provide 412 residential units (Class C3) and 1,192m2 GIA of community use (Class E (e-f), Class F1 (e-f), Class F.2 (b)) provided across buildings ranging in height from 4-8 storeys, together with associated landscaped communal amenity space, accessible car parking, secure cycle parking spaces and refuse/recycling storage facilities.
-----	-------------	--	--

1. Site Visit

1.1 Committee Members undertook a site visit on Monday 14th March.

2. Additional points and clarifications

2.1 Under Paragraph 2.2, the description of the proposed site should refer to 13-interlinked blocks, rather than the 14 interlinked blocks quoted in the report.

2.2 Paragraph 2.7 should read as 34 disabled persons car parking spaces and 33 spaces within the ground floor level car park.

2.3 Paragraph 7.147 says that the community space is on the '*south eastern corner of the site*', this should read as the '*north eastern corner*'.

2.4 Paragraph 7.148 states that the construction programme is anticipated to start in '*November 2022*'. This should read as '*July 2023*'.

2.5 Paragraph 7.188 should read as 27 trees, rather than 28 trees.

2.6 Under Appendix 1 'List of Applications and Drawings for Approval', Proposed first floor plan - CER-PRP-MP-01-DR-A-02211 P1 should read as 'Proposed first floor plan - CER-PRP-MP-01-DR-A-02211 P2'.

3 RECOMMENDATION

3.1 Officer recommendation remains that planning permission should be GRANTED for the reasons set out in the main report.