



# GLIAS

Vice-President: Malcolm Tucker

Company No. 5664688 England  
Charity No. 1113162

Greater

London Industrial Archæology Society

Please reply to : MT Tucker, 9 Blythwood Road, London N4 4EU, tel 020 7272 7160

Nicholas Jehan  
Planning Department  
London Borough of Tower Hamlets  
Mulberry Place  
5 Clove Crescent  
London E14 2BG

13 Sept 2022

BY EMAIL to [Nicholas.Jehan@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:Nicholas.Jehan@towerhamlets.gov.uk)

Dear Mr Jehan

**PA/22/00951, Site at Hatton House, Queen Mary University – Objection to details of refurbishment of No. 357 Mile End Road, E1**

1) Thank you for notifying GLIAS of this new application for the site of Hatton House. While we are relieved that No.357 has now been spared from demolition, we are concerned at damaging aspects of its proposed external treatment.

2) In our objection of 5 Nov 2019 to the previous scheme, we pointed out that this simple but handsome Georgian house was built very soon after the opening of the Regent's Canal in 1820, to be the centre of operations for the Gardner company, one of the earliest and most important operators of barges on the Canal. It is one of the very few early buildings remaining on the Regent's Canal, so is of regional historical importance as well as a locally listed asset. It is essential that it remains recognisable as a building of that period and not a remodelling.

3) We would much prefer that an extra storey was not being added, although we understand the University desires a more imposing and commodious building here, right next to its entrance. Distant and satellite views show that behind the characteristically plain, late-Georgian parapets there is a hipped roof in two ranges, apparently clad with red tiles, so very much of the period. We ask that a historic buildings record be made of the whole building before alterations are made.

4) In place of the present, simple coping stones, the proposals show the brickwork capped by a projecting stucco string course, unconvincingly aping the string course at the first floor. This intrusion is quite

unnecessary and damaging to the building's archaeology - it should be scrapped.

5) There are references to previously altered fenestration in the canal-facing facade that suggest these are blemishes that should be eliminated. On the contrary, these reflect the building's earlier history and impart character. They should be tactfully expressed in the repointing.

6) None of the above considerations appear to have been considered or discussed in the application's DAS or other documentation. A change of approach is needed and the details altered.

Yours sincerely

Malcolm T Tucker

Vice President  
for the Greater London Industrial Archaeology Society

cc Adam Single, Historic England GLAAS  
cc Clare Brady, Historic England