

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

**MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT
COMMITTEE**

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 15 MARCH 2012

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, 1ST FLOOR, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE
CRESCENT, LONDON, E14 2BG**

Members Present:

Councillor Helal Abbas (Chair)

Councillor Khaled Uddin Ahmed
Councillor Dr. Emma Jones
Councillor Bill Turner (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Judith Gardiner

Councillor Denise Jones

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Peter Golds

Officers Present:

Megan Nugent	– (Legal Services Team Leader, Planning, Chief Executive's)
Owen Whalley	– (Service Head Planning and Building Control, Development & Renewal)
Jen Pepper	– (Affordable Housing Programme Manager, Development and Renewal)
Mary O'Shaughnessy	– (Planning Officer)
Simon Ryan	– (Deputy Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Amy Thompson	– (Strategic Applications Planner)
Margaret Cooper	– (Section Head Transportation & Highways, Public Realm, Communities Localities & Culture)
Niall McGowan	– (Regeneration Manager)
Pete Smith	– (Development Control Manager, Development & Renewal)
Jo Dowle	– (Development Officer, Housing Strategy & Development)
Alan Ingram	– (Democratic Services)

COUNCILLOR HELAL ABBAS (CHAIR) – IN THE CHAIR

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Carlo Gibbs, for whom Councillor Denise Jones deputised.

Change of Order of Business

The Chair indicated that the order of business on the agenda would be varied so as to consider item 6.1 first, in view of the large public attendance in connection with the application. However, for ease of reference, the minutes are set out in the original agenda order.

The Chair further commented that Councillor Judith Gardiner would not be eligible to vote on agenda item 5.1, as she had not been present at the meeting on 6th March 2012, when the item had been deferred.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members declared interests in items on the agenda for the meeting as set out below:-

Councillor	Item(s)	Type of interest	Reason
Bill Turner	5.1, 6.1, 6.2	Personal	Had received emails and phone calls for and against the applications, some from persons known to him, but had not expressed an opinion.
Khales Uddin Ahmed	5.1, 6.1, 6.2	Personal	Had received emails and phone calls for and against the applications but had not expressed an opinion.
Dr Emma Jones	5.1, 6.1, 6.2	Personal	Had received emails and phone calls for and against the applications but had not expressed an opinion.
Denise Jones	5.1, 6.1, 6.2	Personal	Had received emails and phone calls for and against the

			applications but had not expressed an opinion.
Helal Abbas	5.1, 6.1, 6.2	Personal	Had received emails and phone calls for and against the applications but had not expressed an opinion.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee **RESOLVED** that:

- 1) In the event of changes being made to recommendations by the Committee, the task of formalising the wording of those changes is delegated to the Corporate Director, Development and Renewal along the broad lines indicated at the meeting; and
- 2) In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/informatives/planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Corporate Director, Development and Renewal is delegated authority to do so, provided always that the Corporate Director does not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision

4. PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS

The Committee noted the procedure for hearing objections, together with details of persons who had registered for speaking rights at the meeting.

The Chair indicated that he had used his discretion to grant speaking rights to Councillor Peter Golds, who wished to speak in support of agenda item 6.1 in his capacity as a Ward Councillor. He added that additional time would be consequently made available to the two objectors who had registered to speak on the item.

5. DEFERRED ITEMS

5.1 Former Goodmans Fields, 74 Alie Street and Land North of Hooper Street and East of 99 Leman Street, Hooper Street, London E1(PA/11/03587)

At the request of the Chair, Mr Pete Smith, Development Control Manager, presented the circulated report and tabled update and referred to the reasons

given by Members at the last meeting as to being minded to refuse the application, along with implications of a refusal. Mr Smith indicated that, since the last meeting, the applicant now proposed a mix of 48% social rent, 26% affordable rent (pod levels) and 26% intermediate. This meant more family units at a social rent, leading to a significant change of family sized, socially rented units in that part of the Borough.

Ms Mary O'Shaughnessy, Planning Officer, added that child playspace had now been increased from 1322 sq.m to 2900 sq.m which met the policy requirement. This had been achieved by reducing the amount of communal amenity space, which still accorded with policy requirement. Ms O'Shaughnessy continued that the developer had now provided further information on proposed biodiversity enhancements across the site which were much more consolidated and were considered acceptable.

Mr Smith indicated that a further offer had been made to commit to providing 80 apprenticeships during the construction programme and to encourage engagement with the local community. He referred to a letter appended to the update report received from Whitbread Plc in which agreement was given to enter into a social compact to ensure that local residents had the best possible opportunity to enter into hotel work and related training.

Members then put questions to Officers with regard to:

- Changes in the applicant's offer regarding housing provision.
- Formal conditions to ensure the employment provisions and training centre.
- Further implications of a decision to refuse the application and the likelihood of appeal.

Officers' responses included information that:

- The viability of the scheme had been robustly examined and the applicant had offered additional levels of housing provision that now affected the viability or profitability of the scheme.
- Employment provisions and the training centre were being factored into the scheme through the S106 agreement. The developer would build and fit out the training centre, which would be leased to the Council at a peppercorn rent on a 15 year basis. The facility would be run by a Trust established jointly by the Council and developer and linked to the hotel.
- It was now considered that the offers made since the last meeting meant that the previous reasons for possible refusal would not be sustainable on appeal. Should the applicant go to appeal, any S106 arrangements would be determined by the Planning Inspector and, after 1st April 2012, the development would become subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy, which would impact both on the viability of the scheme and the amount of S106 benefits to the Council.

In considering the application, the Committee instructed that the following point be formally noted and recorded in the minutes:

- The Strategic Development Committee are to be kept informed of the progress in implementing the S106 agreement at the appropriate stages of the development.

On a vote of 4 for and 1 against, the Committee **RESOLVED**

(1) That planning permission be **GRANTED** for the hybrid planning application at Former Goodmans Fields, 74 Alie Street and Land North of Hooper Street and east of 99 Leman Street, Hooper Street, London, E1 for residential-led redevelopment of the site comprising:

(a) Outline Application - All matters reserved (except for access)

- § Development of North East (NE) and South East (SE) quadrants of the site to provide:
- § Podium blocks of between 7 - 10 storeys (max 46.075m AOD) with two towers on each podium block of between 19-23 storeys (max 85.425m AOD) and dwellings fronting Gower's Walk;
- § Up to 700 residential units (Use Class C3);
- § Up to 6,709 square metres (GIA) of flexible commercial and leisure floor space (Use Classes A1 - A5, B1a, D1 and D2) at ground floor level including a health centre (up to 1,581 square metres GIA);
- § Associated vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access;
- § At least 9,380 square metres of Public Open Space; and
- § Related infrastructure and engineering works.

(b) Full details

- § Development of the North West (NW) quadrant of the site to provide:
- § Podium block between 6-10 storeys (max 46.075 AOD) and two towers up to 19 Storeys (max 76.17m AOD) and 21 storeys (max 85.4m AOD);
- § 250 bedroom hotel (Use Class C1) including a restaurant (Use Class C3) at ground to sixth floor level;
- § 164 residential units (Use Class C3);
- § 841 square metre (GIA) ancillary gym and swimming pool at ground and first floor level for residents use;
- § 1,713 square metre (GIA) flexible commercial / leisure floorspace (Use Class A1 - A5, B1a and D2) at ground floor level;
- § 17,778 square metre (GIA) basement level across the site to provide 253 car parking spaces, 35 motor cycle spaces, 50 electric car charge points, 1358 cycle parking spaces and ancillary facilities for storage, management facilities and plant;
- § Public Open Space to form part of the wider outline public open space strategy; and
- § Associated access, landscaping, surface car parking and cycle parking and related infrastructure and engineering works.

- (2) That such planning permission be subject to any direction by the Mayor of London; the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure planning obligations and to the planning conditions and informatives as set out in the circulated report and amended by the update report **Tabled** at the meeting.
- (3) That the Corporate Director Development and Renewal be delegated power to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above.
- (4) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated power to impose planning conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the matters listed in the circulated report.
- (5) That, if within three months of the date of this Committee the legal agreement indicated in resolution (2) above has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated power to refuse planning permission.
- (6) That in the event of any responses being received relating to the outstanding Environmental Statement Consultation prior to the decision being issued, the Corporate Director Development and Renewal be delegated authority to assess if any such response raises issues which substantively exceed the nature of the Committee's decision, subject to this not being the case the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated authority to issue the decision.

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

6.1 The Robin Hood Gardens Estate together with land south of Poplar High Street and Naval Row, Woolmore School and land north of Woolmore Street bounded by Cotton Street, East India Dock Road and Bullivant Street (PA/12/00001 and PA/12/00002)

At the request of the Chair, Mr Owen Whalley, Head of Planning and Building Control, introduced the planning application regarding redevelopment of the Robin Hood Gardens Estate (PA/12/00001) and application for conservation area consent (PA/12/00002) for the demolition of building adjacent to and on east side of Steamship public house, Naval Row.

The Chair then invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Mr Tom Ridge, speaking in objection to the proposal, referred to the intention to expand Woolmore School from 1 Form Entry. Whilst he had no objections to this in principle, the drawings showed that a large four storey extension would be provided on the existing site. The circulated report made reference to Officers' views that the overall benefits of the scheme outweighed the loss of the building, implying demolition. However, Woolmore School was one of only 30+ schools built by the former LCC around 1916, when designs of such non-Georgian elementary schools were at their best. Officers had also

referred to a detailed heritage appraisal, however, he had made two objections by letter, which were not mentioned and the Officers' remarks comprised only unjustified assertions. He had visited all such schools and could assure the Committee that all were different, as evidenced by the differences between the Woolmore, Osmani and Bow Boys' Schools in the Borough. Later examples were less well designed. The report stated that the school had been heavily altered, but he disagreed with that opinion. The north east part of the building had suffered war damage but it was the most original of the schools in the Borough. It was, therefore, premature to consider demolition of the school and this should be avoided.

In response to Members' questions, Mr Ridge stated that the application seemed to have rubbished the school and Officers considered demolition was acceptable to achieve benefits. He was concerned that the tabled update report still referred to demolition of the existing building. He had sent letters in this regard to Lead Members, Officers, the School Headteacher and Chair of the Governors and Sister Christine Frost had indicated that she was prepared to take up the matter with the Governors. Although no formal response had been received from the school, the only structural criticism related to a long internal central corridor that lacked natural light. However, the classrooms were spacious and in perfect condition. Mr Ridge agreed that the school needed extending on an enlarged site for the 3 Form Entry but adaptations could be made very easily without demolition.

Mr Darren Pauling, speaking in objection to the proposal, stated that he was a resident of Robin Hood gardens and Chair of the Millennium Green Trust. He felt that the entire consultation process had been a betrayal of what residents wanted. It was wrong to say that 80% of residents favoured demolition of Robin Hood gardens and he had raised a petition showing that 92% preferred refurbishment. The current site had a strong sense of community and provided a peaceful green area and an excellent central heating system. The consultation process had been scandalous and residents had been cajoled into accepting the inevitable. Their views had not been held in regard and were sidelined – they had only been told what was going to happen and there was deep resentment, with a feeling that they could not fight city hall. Residents felt that Councillors were not listening to them, their rights had been trampled on and vulnerable people had been ignored. He considered that the estate deserved refurbishment, not just demolition. Leaseholders were in a poor position and needed a breakdown of proposed service charges. The whole scheme should be put on hold until residents' views had been properly presented. At a time when household buildings were increasing, the proposals would be even more damaging to residents. The Millennium Green Trust had not been consulted at all, with three impromptu meetings having been held. Residents had been left feeling despair and had been told there were only two options, agree the plans or be subject to compulsory purchase. The proposals would destroy the peaceful nature of Robin Hood Gardens, where children could play near their homes and residents deserved extensive consultation.

In response to members' questions, Mr Pauling stated that a petition undertaken by him a few years ago, with interpreters provided, found that 120 out of 130 households supported refurbishments. This would not be a minor scheme, as the building had been neglected and under-funded for 20 years. The Millennium Trust had held responsibility for the green space in the middle of Robin Hood Gardens for many years but there had been only three consultation meetings in three years, two of which had been held in the last couple of months.

At this point the Chair responded to comments from the public gallery and indicated that speakers in favour of the application would now be heard.

Mr Julian Carter, Planning Adviser (GVA Grimley Ltd.), speaking in support of the proposal, made the point that the scheme would provide 1575 new homes built to the latest standards and 52% would be affordable housing across the site. The Woolmore School would have many additional pupil places and the scheme would also provide retail, office space, faith amenities and a bus interchange. The applicant had amended the scheme in response to residents' comments and had reduced the scale of buildings from 22 to 15 storeys. Residents had been given undertakings about transfer terms and Council tenants would preserve the option to remain on site. The applicant had also indicated that parents and children would be involved in proposals for Woolmore School. Over £14.5m would be made available to make extensive contributions to the public realm.

In response to a Members' question, Mr Carter stated that there had actually been a very full public consultation exercise on the scheme, led by Council Officers.

Mr Mohammed Yousuf, speaking in support of the proposal, indicated that he was Chair of Robin Hood Gardens Tenants' and Residents' Association, who had been involved in the consultative process since 2007. In general the majority of TRA members supported regeneration. He had attended most consultation meetings and more recently been involved with the Millennium Green. He wanted the TRA to continue working with the Council and developers to ensure that promises were kept, to redress 20 years of neglect in the area, which had very few facilities. The proposed community facilities and faith building were very much needed and only a few individuals opposed the scheme, rather than numerous residents. He looked forward to further extensive design consultation and felt that the proposal was a great opportunity for residents to be given a better life.

In response to a Member's query, Mr Yousuf commented that residents were sick of housing problems on the estate that occurred daily, with overcrowding and repairs needed. The Architect's view was that refurbishment was not suitable for the estate, which could not be brought up to current standards.

Councillor Peter Golds a Blackwall and Cubitt Town Ward Member, spoke in support of the proposal, stating that he had known of the situation at Robin Hood Gardens for 10 years and the idea that something must be done had

persisted through the terms of two governments, six Ministers of Housing, two mayors of London and four Leaders of LBTH. There were serious concerns relating to some aspects of the consultation exercise and some residents may have felt excluded. In addition, some of the buildings over the site should be preserved. However, most attention was needed with regard to Robin Hood Gardens and Anderson House – these buildings had been neglected and in some cases turning on central heating resulted in raw sewage discharge into homes. In order to provide new premises, it was necessary to demolish in a systematic way to let people live in Poplar in proper homes. The proposed level of affordable housing was much needed and was a remarkable achievement. However, it was also essential to give leaseholders a choice. Councillor Golds felt that the Committee should look favourably on the application to obtain new homes but also ensure that residents and the wider community were more involved than they had been in the past.

At the request of the Chair, Mr Simon Ryan, Deputy Team Leader, Planning Services, made a detailed presentation as contained in the Circulated report and table update, including plans and a slideshow. He referred to concerns expressed regarding the potential loss of the existing school premises but commented that the Children, Families & Schools Directorate would ensure that retention of the building would receive further consideration at the reserved matters stage, when deciding on the exact methods of expanding the school. He added that the reduction of the height of buildings to 15 storeys had addressed the English heritage and other concerns relating to views of All Saints Church. Tall buildings to the south of the site were considered acceptable in the context of the Canary Wharf estate. Following a very detailed presentation, Mr Ryan added that green space provision would be substantially larger than the Millennium Green and indicated that the concerns of the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation relating to height of buildings, daylight/sunlight and other matters had now been addressed as contained in the tabled update. The scheme was commended so as to achieve the regeneration of the area and provision of substantial amounts of new housing.

Members then put questions to Officers with regard to:

- Why the proposed number of new homes had been reduced from 1700 to 1575.
- Under-provision of one-bed housing.
- Education plans for the future of Woolmore School and its position as a reserved matter.
- What would be done to ensure that community facilities were accessible to all residents?
- Whether the relocated faith centre would be accessible to all residents – was this a relocation of the existing mosque?

Officers' responses included information that:

- The overall reduction in housing units had come about due to issues raised about heritage impact because of proposals for building on sensitive parts of the site. The figure of 1700 had been the maximum

parameter and had resulted due to concerns raised by the GLA and English Heritage owing to the proposed heights of buildings having an effect on views of All Saints Church. Also raised had been the intensity of development and resulting effects on public open space. It was felt that the balance of housing development was now right.

- The difference in housing unit figures had arisen because the initial numbers had been only an indicative mix that would be fully decided when the full planning application was made. When units had needed to be reduced, it had been felt best to retain larger family units on the rented side.
- No details were currently available on how the school facility would be delivered. This was a reserved matter that would be decided after the outline planning stage. The Committee would be able to give a view when reserved matters were being determined and Members were assured that their views on the matter would be sought.
- The design code required open spaces to be publicly accessible, so would be open to all. The GLC had not requested contributions to Idea Stores but significant contributions were being made to sports facilities.
- The faith centre related to replacement of the existing mosque and the other community centre would relate to other amenities.

In considering the application, the Committee instructed that the following points be formally noted and recorded in the minutes:

- The Strategic Development Committee are to be kept informed of the progress in implementing the S106 agreement at the appropriate stages of the development.
- The replacement mosque building must be kept separate from the other community facilities proposed.
- Notwithstanding the comments of Officers, Members' strong sense of discomfort be noted regarding the reduction in the number of housing units arising from GLA comments.

Councillor Bill Turner **moved** and Councillor Khales Uddin Ahmed **seconded** an amendment which, on being put to the vote, was **agreed** 5 for and nil against, and is shown as resolution (3) below.

NOTE: Councillor Denise Jones did not vote on the application as she had arrived at the meeting after commencement of consideration of the matter.

The substantive motion was put to the vote and, on a vote of 5 for and nil against, the Committee **RESOLVED**

- (1) That planning permission be **GRANTED** at the Robin Hood Gardens Estate, together with land south of Poplar High Street and Naval Row, Woolmore School and land north of Woolmore School bounded by Cotton Street, east India Dock Road and Bullivant Street, for:

PA/12/00001 (Outline Planning Permission)

Outline application for alterations to and demolition of existing buildings, site clearance and ground works and redevelopment to provide:

- Up to 1,575 residential units (up to 191,510 sq.m GEA - Use Class C3);
- Up to 1,710 sq.m (GEA) of retail floorspace (Use Class A1-A5);
- Up to 900 sq.m of office floorspace (Use Class B1);
- Up to 500 sq. m community floorspace (Use Class D1);
- Replacement school (up to 4,500 sq.m GEA - Use Class D1);
- Replacement faith building (up to 1,200 sq.m - Use Class D1)

The application also proposes an energy centre (up to 750 sq.m GEA); associated plant and servicing; provision of open space, landscaping works and ancillary drainage; car parking (up to 340 spaces in designated surface, podium, semi-basement and basement areas plus on-street); and alterations to and creation of new vehicular and pedestrian access routes.

All matters associated with details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale and (save for the matters of detail submitted in respect of certain highway routes, works and/or improvements for the use by vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians as set out in the Development Specification and Details of Access Report) access are reserved for future determination and within the parameters set out in the Parameter Plans and Parameter Statements.

(a) Outline Application - All matters reserved (except for access)

- § Development of North East (NE) and South East (SE) quadrants of the site to provide:
- § Podium blocks of between 7 - 10 storeys (max 46.075m AOD) with two towers on each podium block of between 19-23 storeys (max 85.425m AOD) and dwellings fronting Gower's Walk;
- § Up to 700 residential units (Use Class C3);
- § Up to 6,709 square metres (GIA) of flexible commercial and leisure floor space (Use Classes A1 - A5, B1a, D1 and D2) at ground floor level including a health centre (up to 1,581 square metres GIA);
- § Associated vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access;
- § At least 9,380 square metres of Public Open Space; and
- § Related infrastructure and engineering works.

(b) Full details

- § Development of the North West (NW) quadrant of the site to provide:
- § Podium block between 6-10 storeys (max 46.075 AOD) and two

- towers up to 19 Storeys (max 76.17m AOD) and 21 storeys (max 85.4m AOD);
 - § 250 bedroom hotel (Use Class C1) including a restaurant (Use Class C3) at ground to sixth floor level;
 - § 164 residential units (Use Class C3);
 - § 841 square metre (GIA) ancillary gym and swimming pool at ground and first floor level for residents use;
 - § 1,713 square metre (GIA) flexible commercial / leisure floorspace (Use Class A1 - A5, B1a and D2) at ground floor level;
 - § 17, 778 square metre (GIA) basement level across the site to provide 253 car parking spaces, 35 motor cycle spaces, 50 electric car charge points, 1358 cycle parking spaces and ancillary facilities for storage, management facilities and plant;
 - § Public Open Space to form part of the wider outline public open space strategy; and
 - § Associated access, landscaping, surface car parking and cycle parking and related infrastructure and engineering works.
- (2) That such planning permission be subject to any direction by the Mayor of London; the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure planning obligations and to the planning conditions and informatives as set out in the circulated report and as amended and augmented by the update report **Tabled** at the meeting.
 - (3) That a further condition be added: "That any proposal for demolition of Woolmore School be referred to the Strategic Development Committee."
 - (4) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated power to engage with London Thames Gateway Development Corporation and the applicant to negotiate the legal agreement indicated in resolution (2) above acting within normal delegated authority.
 - (5) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated power to impose planning conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the matters listed in the circulated report, as amended by the update report **Tabled** at the meeting.
 - (6) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated power to impose such further conditions and informatives as may be considered necessary.
 - (7) That the application for conservation area consent with regard to the demolition of building adjacent to and on east side of Steamship Public House, Naval Row, (PA/12/00002) be referred to the Secretary of State with the recommendation that the Council would be minded to grant conservation area consent, subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in the circulated report and to any other conditions or informatives considered necessary by the Corporate Director Development & Renewal.

- (8) That, if within three months of the date of this Committee the legal agreement indicated in resolution (2) above has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated power to refuse planning permission.

At 8.40 p.m. the Chair indicated that there would be a brief adjournment to allow members of the public who had attended for this item of business to leave the public gallery. The meeting reconvened at 8.45 p.m.

6.2 Former Blessed John Roche Secondary School, Upper North Street, London E14 6ER (PA/11/3765)

At the request of the Chair, Mr Owen Whalley, introduced the application (PA/11/3765) regarding the construction of an additional 12 residential units at the site of the Former Blessed John Roche Secondary School, Upper North Street, London, E14 6ER.

At the request of the Chair, Mr Pete Smith, Development Control Manager, made a presentation of the scheme and indicated that this sought 12 additional housing units for the development previously granted planning permission on 21st September 2010 (PA/10/161).

On a vote of 5 for and nil against, the Committee **RESOLVED**

- (1) That planning permission be **GRANTED** at Former Blessed John Roche Secondary School, Upper North Street, London, E14 6ER, (PA/11/3765) for construction of 239 dwellings within two buildings extending to between five and ten storeys with landscaping and 92 car parking spaces, being a revision of Blocks C and D as approved within planning permission dated 21st September 2010 (PA/10/161) and comprising an additional 12 residential units upon the 27 previously approved within these blocks.
- (2) That such planning permission be subject to the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the additional planning obligations and to the planning conditions and informatives as set out in the circulated report.
- (3) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above.
- (4) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated power to impose planning conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the matters listed in the circulated report.
- (5) That, if within three months of the date of this Committee meeting the legal agreement has not been completed to the satisfaction of the Chief Legal Officer, the Head of development Decisions be delegated power to refuse the planning permission.

The meeting ended at 9.35 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Helal Abbas
Strategic Development Committee