

LIST OF LAND NOMINATED BY UNSUCCESSFUL COMMUNITY NOMINATIONS

SITE	DATE OF NOMINATION	DATE OF DECISION	REASON FOR NOT LISTING
<p>Former Kingsland Fire Station 333 Kingsland Road London E8 4DR ACV/DEBE/14/02</p>	<p>16 April 2014</p>	<p>5 June 2014</p>	<p>The use of the building as a fire station, being its actual use in the recent past, has not furthered the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community as required by the Act. It also does not meet the criteria of Schedule 1 Regulation 3: Land which is not of community value (and therefore may not be listed) as the land is operational land.</p>
<p>Unit A Paradise Park 142 Lea Bridge Road London E5 9UB (also known as 146a Lea Bridge Road London E5 9RB) ACV/LEAB/16/02</p>	<p>1 April 2016</p>	<p>24 May 2016</p>	<p>The Authorised Officer did not consider that an actual use of the building furthered the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community and for the purposes of Section 88(1) (a) and Section 88(1) (b) and, having carefully considered the nomination documents and the advice of the Panel, it is unrealistic to think that there is a time in the next five years that a main use of the building could further the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community. This view takes account of the building's derelict state, ongoing occupation by squatters, planning permission granted in January 2016 for residential use, doubt as to whether planning permission could be secured for the nominee's proposed extension to the Grade II listed structure as set out in the Nomination documents, the considerable anticipated cost of this work and the absence of any outline business plan for the subsequent operation and maintenance of the property.</p>

<p>Main Yard Wallis Road London E9 5LN</p> <p>ACV/HACKW/17/01</p>	<p>24 August 2017</p>	<p>17 October 2017</p>	<p>Having taken account of the community nomination the Authorised Officer noted that Main Yard comprised a number of separate units accommodating various businesses in different ownerships and that taken as a whole the land and buildings nominated did not meet the criteria set out in Section 88 (1)(a) and (b) of the Act. In view of this the Authorised Officer did not consider that for the purposes of Section 88(1) the land and buildings were land and buildings of community value and an actual use of all the land and buildings within the land nominated furthered the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community. Thus the nominated land and buildings were not land of community value for the purposes of the Act. The Authorised Officer considered that the land and buildings within the area identified had for some considerable time been in industrial and employment use with the exception of those uses operating in bar and restaurant uses. The Authorised Officer was satisfied from the information contained in the community nomination that, taken cumulatively and as outlined in the nomination there was insufficient evidence that as a whole this was an actual use which had furthered the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community for the purposes of the Act. Accordingly the Authorised Officer considered that the requirements of Section 88(2) (a) and (b) were not satisfied.</p>
<p>The Congregational Church, 76 Shrubland Road London E8 4NH ACV/LONF/18/02</p>	<p>28.11.18</p>	<p>10.01.19</p>	<p>Having taken account of the community nomination the Authorised Officer noted that the nominated property was a church which had closed 28 October 2018. In view of this the Authorised Officer did not consider that an actual use of the building and land furthered the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community and for the purposes of Section 88(1) (a) and Section 88 (1) (b) of the Localism Act 2011 the building and land was not land of community value. The Authorised Officer considered that for the purposes of this nomination, the period preceding the 28 October 2018 was</p>

			<p>the 'recent past' during which the building and land had been used as a private church for the Owners and Occupier and occasional hire to media companies for filming purposes. The Authorised Officer was satisfied from the information contained in the community nomination and Owners and Occupier's representations that this was an actual use which had not furthered the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community. Accordingly, the Authorised Officer considered that the requirements of Section 88(2) (a) were not satisfied. The Authorised Officer's view was that, having carefully considered the nomination documents and the Owner's statement that the church would continue to be a private church for the use of the Owners and Occupier, with no access allowed to the Nominating Group, it was unrealistic to think that there is a time in the next five years that a main use of the building could further the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community. Accordingly, the Authorised Officer considered that the requirements of Section 88(2) (b) were not satisfied.</p>


