

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 10 MAY 2012

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

Members Present:

Councillor Helal Abbas (Chair)

Councillor Shiria Khatun (Vice-Chair) (Items 7.2-8.2)

Councillor Craig Aston (Items 7.6 & 8.2)

Councillor Kosru Uddin

Councillor Md. Maium Miah

Councillor Helal Uddin

Councillor Marc Francis (Item 7.1 only)

Councillor Peter Golds

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Dr. Emma Jones

Officers Present:

Jerry Bell	– (Applications Manager, Development and Renewal)
Richard Murrell	– (Deputy Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Fleur Brunton	– (Senior Lawyer - Planning Chief Executive's)
Benson Olaseni	– (Deputy Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Mandip Dhillon	– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Duncan Brown	– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Adam Williams	– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Zoe Folley	– (Committee Officer, Democratic Services Chief Executive's)
	–

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for lateness were submitted on behalf of Councillor Shiria Khatun. It was also reported that Councillor Peter Golds would be substituting for Councillor Craig Aston (except for items 7.6 and 8.2 for which Councillor Aston would be sitting on the Committee).

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor	Item(s)	Type of interest	Reason
Marc Francis (Left meeting after item 7.1)	7.1 & 7.5	Personal	Had received representations concerning the applications.
Md. Maium Miah	7.6	Personal	Had attended a consultation event at the site.
Peter Golds	7.1& 7.2	Personal	Had received emails concerning the applications but had not read them.
	7.6	Personal Prejudicial	Former resident of Wood Wharf, the application site.
Helal Uddin	7.5	Personal Prejudicial	Close working relationship with Poplar HARCA
Kosru Uddin	7.2	Personal	Lived in ward concerned. Had received representations concerning the applications.
	7.5	Personal Prejudicial	Member of Poplar HARCA Board.
Helal Abbas	7.3`	Personal	Ward Member
Shiria Khatun (declared following arrival at the meeting at the start of item 7.2)	7.5	Personal Prejudicial	Member of Poplar HARCA Board.

3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 5th April 2012 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. 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

5. PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS

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

6. DEFERRED ITEMS

Nil items.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

7.1 136-140 Wapping High Street, London, E1W 3PA (PA/12/00051 & PA/12/00052)

Update Report Tabled.

Councillor Shiria Khatun did not vote on this application as she had arrived at the meeting after commencement of consideration of the matter.

Jerry Bell, (Applications Team Leader) introduced the application regarding 136-140 Wapping High Street, London, E1W 3PA.

Shona Conacher spoke in objection to the scheme. She stated that she was speaking on behalf of the residents of Gun Wharf. Whilst supportive of development of the site in principle, she was opposed to this particular scheme. Specifically, the height and size of the scheme. She considered that the current building parameters should be retained to protect amenity. She

referred to the previous application and the Council's concerns and recommendations around the size and bulk of the proposal as set out in a letter. The letter had suggested that the previous development needed to be reduced in height by a floor. However the developers had ignored these in preparing the application scheme. English Heritage had stated that this represented a key opportunity to enhance the area. However this failed to do this. There were day light and sunlight issues and the daylight report contained inaccuracies and had been described by a QC as full of errors. The scheme would degrade privacy due to its prominence, cause a loss of light and overlooking to habitable rooms.

Tony Roome spoke in objection. He referred to the Council's recommendations regarding the previous scheme. Despite this, the development still retained features that were inappropriate for the location. The irregular roof line was out of keeping with the area given Gun Wharf was a listed building. The Officers report stated that it would lead to overdevelopment if expanded by 3 stories. How would this be addressed?

He also expressed concern at the impact on Wapping High Street from the car free agreement. There would also be a significant increase in deliveries. However the application failed to take the full impact of this into account only focusing on the commercial units. Especially, the obstruction to the bus stop and the traffic flow. The affordable housing element was inadequate. The tool kit showed that 50% was possible. In reply to Members, Mr Roome considered that his key concern was the additional 3 floors. This would place significant pressure on the area given the impact from deliveries and the car free agreement.

Councillor Emma Jones spoke in objection. She expressed concern at the impact on infrastructure and the adequacy of the contributions to accommodate this. She disputed that the design issues had been addressed in accordance with English Heritages recommendations. Furthermore, TFL had expressed concerns around the adequacy of the crane design which she explained. Residents of the area already had to rely on water pumps for showers as recognised by the water company. The development would exacerbate this. How would this be addressed? In reply to questions about recent changes to public transport nodes, she stated that the scheme would hamper the traffic flow given the narrow width of the road along the site and the proximity of the bus stop.

Paula Carney (Applicant's Agent) spoke in support of the application. She stated that it replaced a disused building with a high quality scheme. The applicant had worked hard with Officers and residents to mitigate the impact on the neighbours. After speaking to them, they had made changes to the size and design. The separation distances complied with policy. The impact from servicing from the residential units had been taken into account. The scheme was considered acceptable by Officers. The developers were looking for an occupier for the commercial unit. In response to Members, she confirmed that the problem with the previous scheme was that it was too large and modern for the area. The focus of the conservation area was on the traditional warehouses and the vertical and horizontal aspects. The

developers had accepted this and as a result had altered the plans including the use of more traditional materials and changes to the roof line, balconies and vertical and horizontal aspects so that it was more in keeping with the area. She also confirmed that the materials still included copper.

Richard Murrell (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report assisted by a power point presentation. He addressed the main planning issues. The change to residential use complied with policy given the oversupply of office space in the area. The affordable housing offer exceeded policy. He detailed the changes to the design and bulk of the building including the introduction of the cut backs to the roof tops to overcome the previous issues. Officers had carefully considered the amenity impact including the impact on Gun Wharf. On balance it was considered that the impact was acceptable in terms loss of light overlooking and privacy. The separation distances exceeded the policy requirements. LBTH Highways had no major objections given the lack of major impact on traffic flow and buses and the servicing requirements for the residential element would be low.

The Committee then raised a number of questions and comments regarding the following issues:

- The ability of future occupiers of the scheme to bring their existing parking permits with them under the Council's Permit Transfer Scheme. The impact of this on parking.
- The use of copper in the design and the compatibility of it with the traditional buildings. It was feared that this might compromise the character of this important area and be out of keeping.
- The impact of the set backs to the roof storeys on the area.
- The Council's response to the initial application. Whether Officers were now satisfied with the scheme in light of the previous officer comments about the necessary reduction in height.
- Whether the objectors from the previous scheme had made any further representations to this application.
- The acceptability of the PTAL rating and the density range that exceeded guidance.
- Further information about the contents of English Heritage's letter.

Officers responded to each point raised as set out below:

- Officers were satisfied with the design especially the set backs to the roof storey which would lessen visibility. The current application had to be considered on its merits.
- Officers were satisfied that the massing was acceptable and would sit comfortably in the location given the bulk was pulled back from the street frontages.
- The design with the cut backs would sit well with the surrounding buildings of similar height and design and would complement rather than detract from the area.
- The copper cladding finish would be of high quality in keeping with the historic character of the area. It was required that the details of the

materials would be submitted for approval to ensure they were appropriate.

- The scheme was car free subject to the Council's Permit Transfer Scheme and the blue badge parking scheme. However, the former only applied to the residents of family sized social housing units. As such only a very small number of occupants would be entitled to permits.
- In considering density, it was necessary to take into account the overall impact of the scheme. Officers considered that the density range proposed was acceptable.
- Further information on the response from English Heritage was given and the letter from English Heritage was circulated at the request of a member.

On a vote of 4 in favour and 2 against the Committee **RESOLVED**

1. That planning permission (PA/12/00051) be **GRANTED** at 136-140 Wapping High Street, London, E1W 3PA subject to:

The prior completion of a **legal agreement** to secure the planning obligations set out in the report:

2. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above.
3. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to impose conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the matters set out in the report.
4. That, if within 3-months of the date of this committee the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to refuse planning permission.
5. That conservation area consent (PA/12/00052) be **GRANTED** at 136-140 Wapping High Street, London, E1W 3PA subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Note: Councillor Marc Francis left the meeting following the consideration of this item.

7.2 Site at land adjacent to railway viaduct, Gill Street, E14 (PA/10/01826)

Update Report Tabled.

Jerry Bell, (Applications Team Leader) introduced the application regarding Site at land adjacent to railway viaduct, Gill Street, E14.

Margret Bradley spoke in objection. She was opposed to the locating of a place of worship in a residential area. She disputed the accuracy of the projected visitor numbers. They were too low and would far outnumber this. There were already major plans for a large hotel in the area. There would be

dust and dirt from the construction and residents had already had to suffer two years of this. The portacabin was donated to the community over 20 years ago and they had happily used it. The previous scheme for a two storey mosque was more favourable as it left the portacabin in place.

She expressed serious concern that the applicant hadn't spoken to residents about the application prior to the application being submitted to the committee again.

In reply to Members, she reported that she didn't initiate contact with the applicant about the application and she expected them to contact residents. The mosque was currently facing away from residential properties in a less noise sensitive area. The application and lack of consultation had caused much ill feeling amongst residents. There were worries over its availability to the community.

Robert Leech also spoke in objection. He stated that he was a resident of the estate. He feared that it would cause overcrowding on the estate by bringing people into the area. It would result in additional noise, pollution, vehicles, litter, congregations around the children's play area that was already run down. It would be dangerous for children at the nearby school. The portacabin was a valuable community facility open to everyone. He feared that in future it might not be available to non Muslim groups. He asked about the measures to prevent the applicant from keeping the current mosque as well as this new one which could mean many more extra worshippers than predicted.

In reply to Members, he felt that the scheme would place additional pressures on Council services to maintain the area. There was a real risk of conflict between religious and non religious celebrations. In terms of notification, he merely received a letter from planning in October 2010 and only received an e-mail less than a week ago that it was going to the Committee. There was nothing in the East End Life newspaper.

Mr Aun Qurashi (Applicant) spoke in support of the application. He outlined the planning history of the scheme. Since the last meeting in January 2011, where the application was deferred, the applicant had formulated a management plan addressing the outstanding issues. At which time, the developer also arranged a meeting with residents that was then rescheduled at their request to June 2011 to allow them to see the management plan. At that meeting, residents questioned the enforceability of the plan and how this would be done. They also requested that two groups be given preferential treatment in using the community facility. The applicant agreed to this. Following this meeting, the lines of communications with residents were kept open for a period of time, but nothing more from them was forthcoming. The applicant had also consulted with a number of key residents groups. The views of residents would be incorporated into the detailed management plan. Therefore they had undertaken extensive consultation.

In reply to Members questions regarding whether the consumption of alcohol and food would be permitted, he assured members that the applicant was bound by equalities legislation and would permit that the community hall could

be used by all groups and all for lawful activities. All current activities and events hosted in the existing facilities would be permitted in the new community facility. Whilst the applicant would endeavour to facilitate community cohesion, they hadn't considered actively promoting this. According to the travel survey, conducted during the busiest times, it was evident that most worshippers would walk to the facility. Few would arrive in car and there was sufficient parking in the area to accommodate this.

Benson Olaseni (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report assisted by a power point presentation. He described the site location, the planning history including the reason why the Committee deferred the application in January 2011. He also described the consultation undertaken. Both for the original consultation and that for this application that had generated one objection. He addressed the key planning matters. He confirmed the results of the travel survey undertaken by the applicant predicting few car trips to the facility. There were conditions requiring the submission of a highways plan and to protect residential amenity.

In terms of land use, one of the key concerns was the loss of the portacabin as a community facility. However it was reported that the proposed community space complied with policy and exceeded the size of the portacabin. Mr Olaseni described the key objectives of the management plan regarding how it would be made available to the community.

In response, Members expressed some concern over the loss of the portacabin as a community facility. To this end, a Member queried the need for a specific condition ensuring that all community activities permitted at the existing facility be permitted in the new facility (including the consumption of alcohol, dancing, bringing food and drink onto the premises).

In reply, Officers explained the difficulties in placing very specific conditions in the management plan. In any event, the term lawful activity as stated in the management plan covered a wide range of activities, (including those mentioned by the Councillor). Members were reminded that in making a decision on the application it was necessary to have due regard to the duties set out in the Equalities Act 2010 further details of which were set out in agenda item 7. It was also required that full details of the Management Plan be submitted to ensure inclusive use.

Councillor Md Maium Miah proposed an amendment to condition 14 of the application seconded by Councillor Kosru Uddin that the closing hours during the Ramadan period be extended from 23:30 to 00:30. On a vote of 5 in favour, 0 against, and 1 abstention, this was Agreed.

On a vote of 5 in favour and 1 against the Committee **RESOLVED**

1. That planning permission (PA/10/01826) be **GRANTED** at Site at land adjacent to railway viaduct, Gill Street, E14.
2. That the Corporate Director Development and Renewal is delegated power to impose conditions and informatives on the planning

permission to secure the matters set out in the report subject to the amendment agreed by the Committee to condition 14 that the closing hours during the Ramadan period be extended from 23:30 to 00:30.

Councillor Golds requested that his vote against the application be recorded. His reasons being that he did not believe that the proposal adequately addressed the issues around community cohesion.

7.3 4 Wilkes Street, London E1 1QF (PA/11/02495)

Update Report Tabled.

Jerry Bell, (Applications Team Leader) introduced the application regarding 4 Wilkes Street, London E1 1QF.

David Gadd spoke in objection. He stated that he lived near the proposed terrace and that it would directly affect the nearby properties amenity. It gave priority to the office workers at the expense of residents. There was no policy support for roof terraces for office workers. There was already large ground floor gardens. Therefore the roof terrace was not needed. It was also feared that it could be turned into a bar area. Boards had been displayed on the premises advertising the space as such. The applicant proposed screening, but his neighbours feared this would impact on their light. If granted, there would be difficulties in controlling use of the terrace for such activities as barbeques. In response to Members, he clarified that hoarding had been put up suggesting it could be a roof top bar. Therefore he expressed unease about the true purpose of the application.

Jason Zeloof (Applicant) spoke in support. He disputed that the roof terrace was a new development. In relation to the fire door, he considered that it was an unauthorised development. The applicant had consulted residents and had as a result made changes to the design and size. There was screening to protect overlooking and conditions protecting amenity. No amplified music would be permitted on the terrace. Office uses tended to be quiet. The sunlight report was considered acceptable as stated in the report. It would regenerate a disused building, create employment and provide a high quality amenity space for staff. In response to Members, he envisaged that the terrace would act as a break out area for employees - for eating lunches and smoking etc. This was better than people standing on the street to smoke that would cause more pollution at street level. It was planned that the building would be multiple occupancy and each would have their own amenity area. The office space was currently empty but there was a lot of demand for office space in the area. He was satisfied that the proposed conditions could be enforced by the Council and they would be included in any lease granted. It was noted that they could use the existing building for offices without planning permission being required.

Richard Murrell (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report assisted by a power point presentation. He described the site location and details of the scheme. Overall it was considered that the proposal would fit in with the area and the surrounding mansard roofs. Officers had carried out an in depth

assessment of the impact on amenity and light levels. It was considered that the impact from use of the terrace to the neighbouring properties was acceptable. There was also measures to prevent overlooking.

A key issue was the impact on the adjacent fire door of 6 Wilkes Street. Officers had carefully considered this and had visited the property. Whilst the impact on light through the door was significant, (as the door was its primary source of light), the use of the room (as a type of dressing room) had to be considered,) the house had a number of other sources of light, and as a result it would receive adequate light. Therefore, on balance officers felt this did not warrant refusal.

Members then raised a series of questions and concerns regarding:

- The loss of light to 6-10 Princelet Street and the garden of 6 Wilkes Street. Members requested further details of this.
- The reasons why the 2007 application had been withdrawn.

Mr Murrell reported that the impact on 6-10 Princelet Street had been carefully considered. The analysis showed that the impact complied with policy with minimal loss of light (A maximum of 8%). The gardens of 6 Wilkes Street were already relatively enclosed due to the high walls. Therefore light levels were already restricted. The addition of the mansard roof in this context would not have a major additional impact. The 2007 scheme generated a number of objections. It lacked appropriate screening and was much larger than the application scheme. As a result, the applicant decided to withdraw it. Officers were satisfied that the application overcame these issues.

On a vote of 2 in favour 0 against and 4 abstentions the Committee **RESOLVED**:

That the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission at 4 Wilkes Street, London E1 1QF (PA/11/02495) be **NOT ACCEPTED**.

The Committee indicated that they were minded to refuse the planning permission because of Members' concerns over

- Loss of light to the surrounding neighbours (In particularly 6-10 Princelet Street and the garden of 6 Wilkes Street).
- The cumulative impact on residents in terms of overlooking and the lack of environmental benefits.

In accordance with Development Procedural Rules, the application was **DEFERRED** to enable Officers to prepare a supplementary report to a future meeting of the Committee setting out proposed detailed reasons for refusal and the implications of the decision.

CHANGE IN ORDER OF BUSINESS

The Chair moved and it was unanimously agreed that Agenda item 8.1 (Legacy Community Scheme Outline Planning Application (PA/11/03186)) be the next item of business.

8. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

8.1 Legacy Community Scheme Outline Planning Application (PA/11/03186)

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader) introduced the proposal regarding the Legacy Community Scheme Outline Planning Application.

Duncan Brown (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report and the power point presentation. The Committee were asked to endorse the recommendations to the ODA Planning decision team as set out in the report.

He explained the scheme specifically the plans for the Tower Hamlets area(Planning Delivery Zone 4). He described the affordable housing offer that would help address housing need in the Borough. Officers were proposing that the housing mix be revised to provide additional 1 and 2 bedroom affordable units (in addition the 3 bedroom units), as set out in the report. He also outlined the education, the transport and highways provision, for Tower Hamlets alongside the other key issues in the report.

On a unanimous vote the Committee **RESOLVED**

1. That the officers views on the outline planning application be **AGREED** based on the recommendations set out in the report.
2. That the ODA Planning Decisions Team should also consider the views, issues and further recommendations of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets as set out in the report.
2. That the Corporate Director of Development and Renewal be given delegated powers to make further observations and/or recommendations to the ODA.

7.4 254 Hackney Road, London, E2 7SJ (PA/12/00072)

Update report tabled.

Jerry Bell, (Applications Team Leader) introduced the application regarding 254 Hackney Road, London, E2 7SJ (PA/12/00072)

Gary Hedgecock (Applicant) spoke in support of the application as the landlord of the premises. He outlined the major concerns and considered that the applicant had taken steps to address these and would continue to work with planning to do so. Hackney Road carried around 2000 vehicles at peak hours per day. The noise levels from the proposal could be restricted to less than rush hour levels. The licensing regime would also regulate activity and

could place additional conditions on the application to allay the concerns. The premises had an excellent track record with licensing. He referred to a similar scheme that worked well. In summary, the applicant would work with planning and licensing to overcome the concerns.

Adam Williams (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report supported by a power point presentation. He explained in detail the scheme. He explained the site history and the previous reasons for refusal. It was considered that the scheme failed to overcome these issues. He explained the main issues for consideration. The proposed glazed screen would be clearly visible from the highway. Therefore failed to protect the Conservation Area. There were also concerns around the use of the first floor flat for outdoor seating adding to the visual impact. Planning Services had limited powers to enforce this. The consultation had generated 3 objections. The terrace was located in close proximity to neighbours and was considered that its use would have an undue impact on amenity.

On a unanimous vote the Committee **RESOLVED**

That planning permission (PA/12/00072) be **REFUSED** at 254 Hackney Road, London, E2 7SJ for the reasons cited in paragraphs 2.2 and 2.3 of the report.

7.5 Brownfield Estate, Infill Sites 1 and 2 located on Brownfield Street and Infill Site 3 located at the junction of Lodore Street and Adderley Street (PA/11/02257)

Update Report Tabled.

Councillors Shiria Khatun, Kosru Uddin and Helal Uddin left the meeting for the consideration of this item in accordance with their declarations of interest.

Extension to time

At this stage of the meeting (9:55 p.m.) the Chair Councillor Helal Abbas proposed and it was

RESOLVED that, in accordance with Procedural Rule 9.1, the meeting be extended for one hour to enable consideration of the remaining business on the agenda.

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader) introduced the proposal.

Mandip Dhillon (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report assisted by a power point presentation. She explained the 3 main elements of the scheme and the key issues for consideration. She addressed the concerns over the loss of car parking. However it was considered that there was sufficient parking in the area to accommodate the scheme given the car free plans and the results of the parking survey. In terms of the housing mix, it was proposed that 100% be affordable units. All of which complied with POD levels.

She also explained the s106 agreement. The scheme lacked the ability to provide full mitigation due to the 100% affordable housing offer as shown by the viability assessment. However on balance this was considered acceptable. At the request of Members, Officers outlined the S106 allocation process.

On a unanimous vote the Committee **RESOLVED**

1. That planning permission (PA/11/02257) be **GRANTED** at Brownfield Estate, Infill Sites 1 and 2 located on Brownfield Street and Infill Site 3 located at the junction of Lodore Street and Adderley Street subject to:

The prior completion of a **legal agreement** to secure the planning obligations set out in the report.

2. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above.
3. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to impose conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the matters set out in the report:
4. That, if six weeks from the date of the committee meeting, the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to refuse planning permission.

7.6 Wood Wharf, Preston's Road E14 (PA/12/00430)

Update report tabled.

Councillor Peter Golds left the meeting for the remaining items of business.

Councillor Craig Aston subsequently replaced Councillor Golds for the consideration and voting on the remaining items.(Items 7.6 and 8.2)

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader) introduced the proposal regarding Wood Wharf, Preston's Road E14. The scheme sought to extend the hours of operation for plots A-D up to 00.00 during the Olympic period only.

The application was previously agreed by the Committee in August 2011. The proposed extension related to one part of the site situated furthest away from noise sensitive areas for the Olympic period only. Environmental Health had no objections and no representations had been received from residents. Furthermore there were conditions to safeguard amenity including noise levels at night. Therefore, Officers considered that the scheme was acceptable.

On a unanimous vote the Committee **RESOLVED**

1. That planning permission (PA/12/00430) be **GRANTED** at Wood Wharf, Preston's Road E14 subject to the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the obligations at paragraph 3.4 and the conditions and informatives set out in the report.
2. That the Corporate Director of Development & Renewal is delegated power to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above.

(The agenda order subsequently reverted to the order on the agenda)

8. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

8.2 Planning Appeals Report

Jerry Bell, (Applications Team Leader) introduced the report which provided details of appeals, decisions and new appeals lodged against the Authority's Planning decisions.

RESOLVED

That that details and outcomes of the appeals as set out in the report be noted.

On a unanimous vote the Committee **RESOLVED**

That the details and outcomes as set out in the report be noted.

The meeting ended at 10.10 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Helal Abbas
Development Committee