

Untitled

From: Cllr Tyne <John.Tyne@redbridge.gov.uk>  
To: Helen Zammett <h\_zammett@yahoo.co.uk>  
Sent: Sat, 27 February, 2010 16:34:01  
Subject: RE: Wording of the Regulatory Committee's rejection of the latest planning application re: Chepstow

Dear Helen

Thank you for your letter and e-mail, and please accept my apologies for not replying earlier as I wanted to be 100% sure of my facts.

As you will recall, Telford's application was refused for the following reason: -

Design of building: The design of the proposed development, particularly Blocks B and C, is out of keeping with the Wanstead Grove Conservation Area. The design and height of Blocks B and C would be harmful to the character of the Locally Listed Arts and Crafts Cottages and Wanstead Grove Conservation Area. Thereby the character of the area fails to be preserved or enhanced and the proposal is contrary to Policies E3 and BD1 of the Council's Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document and Policy SP3 of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

There was no mention of the Gloucester Road and Leicester Road frontages in the reason for refusal, as the Committee did not have any objection to either, however under planning legislation it is not possible to grant planning permission for part(s) of any scheme.

I know you were concerned that the reason for refusal did not reflect the discussion. I have checked the notes taken at the meeting which show that most Members felt that the design was not in keeping with the adjoining locally listed buildings and that the height was inappropriate. In addition, Councillor Goody commented that he agreed with the Conservation Officer assessment, which was included in the report, that the scheme was out of keeping with the Wanstead Grove Conservation Area, particularly Blocks B and C.

As height, bulk and size are integral to the design I am convinced that the reason for refusal is therefore appropriate.

I understand that you fear that in rejecting this application an appeal on an earlier application might be granted. However the reasons for rejecting the Nutter Lane blocks have remained consistent in Committees attempt to provide the best possible development on a site which I think would be much better with a lower intensity of development

Regards  
John Tyne  
Chair  
LBR Regulatory Committee