

## **PLANNING APPLICATION PUBLIC COMMENT**

Application number: PP/17/01637  
Site Address: Site A (Portobello Green Arcade), Site C (Acklam Car Park) and Site D (Acklam Village), LONDON, W10 5TZ  
Proposal: Mixed use development under and next to the Westway flyover to provide new arts, culture, enterprise, retail and affordable housing development, including:  
Site A - refurbishment (including demolition) at for shops use Classes A1 and A3, and/or Class B1 business use; demolition of building accommodating market storage and outdoor advertising board,  
Site C - erection of 4 storey building for Class A1 shops use and 13 x Class C3 dwelling houses, including change of use of private car park;  
Site D - for Class A1 shops and/or Class B1 business use, and/or Class D1 non-residential institutions use; Class A4 drinking establishments and/or Class D1 non-residential institutions use, market facilities and associated new access from Acklam Road; public realm works, including demolition of existing planters and hoarding; retained use of public realm for market stalls and tables and chairs; new cycle parking; and other associated works (Major Development)

**Comment received:** Dear Sirs,

Planning Application PP/17/01637 Land under and adjacent to Westway

I am retired former architect who has lived in the area since the late 70s.

In the early 80s I worked with the Franklyn Stafford Partnership on the project for NKAT, as it was then known, to develop the area beneath and adjacent to the Westway known as 'Portobello Bays'. This is what is now the arcade, the tent and adjacent areas.

The scheme received a Civic Trust Design Award on completion.

I am happy that the proposals now retain the canopy, 'the tent', which I think has become iconic and recognised as such.

My comments on the current proposals are as follows;

### 1.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY PP/80/1572

I attach a copy of the approved drawing for the arcade which clearly shows that the approval was not for a retail arcade but for an arcade of workshops with retail facilities opening onto the Arcade. This was prior to the introduction of the present classification system but I would presume A1/B1 would be the equivalent in today's system. The current applications classify the existing use of these as A1 units which is not what the Trust gained permission for. Thus over exaggerating the extent of existing retail use.

The planners at the time were extremely concerned about additional pure retail in the area. Retail frontage had to be restricted to the

arcade, the planners primary concern being about creating jobs and not competing with local retailers.

## 2.0 CURRENT PROPOSAL FOR THE ARCADE

I find it difficult to understand the viability of the current proposals of a market hall.

The costs to the trust of demolition and rebuilding coupled with loss of income for up to 2 years would take years to recoup .

The idea that the proposed use would be successful is extremely speculative. Portobello is not a 7 day a week market it is a traditional London street market.

The question is why is a charitable organisation embarking on such a speculative project providing the bare minimal community facilities?

## 3.0 PROPOSAL FOR FLEXABILITY OF RETAIL USE

Within section 6 of the planning application report by Turley considerable emphasis is placed on the need to grant flexibility of use.

The application requests an extension beyond ten years of any flexibility of use.

Section 6.20 proposes that the council absolves the trust of any requirement to provide a 'Retail Impact Assessment'.

These are all conditions, it would appear to me, that would facilitate the trust in letting the 'Market Hall' to a major retailer if their current proposals were unsuccessful!

The proposals are extremely speculative and the council should consider carefully how much of this development is based on a sound financial footing. The extent of true community use is minimal and the extensive requests for flexibility use should sound warning bells to whole community as to the true sub-text behind this proposal.

1.0 Should the council grant permission it must ensure that flexibility of use is kept to a minimum without the requirement for CURRENT PROPOSAL FOR THE ARCADE

I find it difficult to understand the viability of the current proposals a market hall.

The costs to the trust of demolition and rebuilding coupled with loss of income for up to 2 years would take years to recoup .

The idea that the proposed use would be successful is extremely speculative.

The question is why is a charitable organisation embarking on such a speculative project providing the bare minimal community facilities?

an additional planning application and re-referral to the community.

Yours faithfully

David Colley

Sent by: David Colley  
212 Westbourne Park Road  
London

Date of Comment: W11 1EP  
13/04/2017 15:47:16  
Comment type: Objection