

STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 5 JULY 2012

DECISIONS ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors Dr Emma Jones and Helal Uddin, for whom Councillors Peter Golds and Denise Jones deputised respectively.

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
Helal Abbas	8.1	Personal	Ward Councillor.
	7.1, 7.2, 8.2,8.3	Personal	Had received representations from interested parties for and against the applications but had not responded to them.
Judith Gardiner	7.1, 7.2, 8.1 & 8.2	Personal	Had received representations for and against the applications from interested parties but had not responded to them
	7.1, 7.2	Personal	Had formerly been a member of the Poplar HARCA Board.
Denise Jones	7.1, 7.2, 8.1 & 8.2	Personal	Had received representations from interested parties relating to the applications but had not responded

	8.2	Personal	to them. Was a Trustee of Trinity Buoy Wharf Board and was a Council representative on the Lower Lea Valley Board.
Carlo Gibbs	7.1, 7.2, 8.1 & 8.2	Personal	Had received representations for and against the applications from interested parties but had not responded to them.
Bill Turner	7.1, 7.2,	Personal	Had received representations for and against the applications from interested parties and from people he knew, including Members of Poplar HARCA Board, but was not predetermined on these matters.
	8.1, 8.2, 8.3	Personal	Had received many representations for and against the matters but had not responded to them.
Zara Davis	7.1, 7.2, 8.1 & 8.2	Personal	Had received many representations for and against the applications but had not responded to them.
Peter Golds	7.1, 7.2	Personal	Had received many representations for and against the applications but had not responded to them. A number of

	8.1	Personal	personal contacts had been made to him but he had not expressed an opinion.
	8.2	Personal	Ward Councillor.
	8.2, 8.3	Personal	Had received many representations for and against the matters but had not responded to them.
Stephanie Eaton	7.1, 7.2, 8.1 & 8.2	Personal	Had received representations for and against the applications but had not responded to them.

3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 31st May 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 Stroudley Walk Market, Stroudley Walk, London, E3 3EW - Outline Application (PA/10/00373)

Update Report tabled.

On a vote of 3 for and 5 against, the Committee **RESOLVED**

That the Officer recommendation to refuse outline planning permission (PA/10/00373) at Stroudley Walk Market, Stroudley Walk, London, E3 3EW, be **NOT ACCEPTED** for the following reasons:

- (1) The need to carry out improvements to the existing housing stock on the estate is paramount for the benefit of residents.
- (2) Whilst current market conditions are not ideal to ensure viable education and health provision, the applicant has indicated a willingness to accept the financial risks involved in completing the scheme and the other benefits associated with the scheme outweigh the failure to meet the planning obligation requirements associated with the development.
- (3) The overall gain in social housing provision that will accrue from this particular proposal, taking account of viability considerations, is enough to help address the current housing problems in the Borough.
- (4) The Committee takes the view that weight should be afforded to other non-financial considerations the development can bring as mitigating factors and is prepared to accept the current S106 offer accordingly.
- (5) The Committee accepts that it must be mindful of its responsibilities to ensure that proposed development is sustainable but considers that maintaining current housing conditions associated with this particular estate is not sustainable and neither is it sustainable for existing residents if the site is left undeveloped.

NOTE: The Committee further agreed that a condition should be added to the proposed scheme requiring retail units to be retained in the current format of several smaller units, rather than amalgamating them into one large unit.

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 approval, S106 details and conditions, along with the implications of the decision.

7.2 Stroudley Walk Market, Stroudley Walk, London, E3 3EW - Full Planning Application (PA/10/00374)

Update Report tabled.

On a vote of 3 for and 6 against, the Committee **RESOLVED**

That the Officer recommendation to refuse full planning permission (PA/10/00374) at Stroudley Walk Market, Stroudley Walk, London, E3 3EW, be **NOT ACCEPTED** for the following reasons:

- (1) The need to carry out improvements to the existing housing stock on the estate is paramount for the benefit of residents.
- (2) Whilst current market conditions are not ideal to ensure viable education and health provision, the applicant has indicated a willingness to accept the financial risks involved in completing the scheme and the other benefits associated with the scheme outweigh the failure to meet the planning obligation requirements associated with the development.
- (3) The overall gain in social housing provision that will accrue from this particular proposal, taking account of viability considerations, is enough to help address the current housing problems in the Borough.
- (4) The Committee takes the view that weight should be afforded to other non-financial considerations the development can bring as mitigating factors and is prepared to accept the current S106 offer accordingly.
- (5) The Committee accepts that it must be mindful of its responsibilities to ensure that proposed development is sustainable but considers that maintaining current housing conditions associated with this particular estate is not sustainable and neither is it sustainable for existing residents if the site is left undeveloped.

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 approval, S106 details and conditions, along with the implications of the decision.

Adjournment

At this point (10.05 p.m.) the Chair proposed and it was

RESOLVED that the proceedings be adjourned for a five minute break.

(N.B. Councillor Stephanie Eaton left the meeting at this juncture owing to existing commitments.)

8. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

- 8.1 London Fruit & Wool Exchange (LFWE), Brushfield St, 99-101 Commercial Street, 54 Brushfield St & Whites Row Car Park, London (PA/11/02220 and PA/11/02221)**

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

Extension to time

At this stage of the meeting (10.10 p.m.) the Chair proposed and it was

RESOLVED

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

- 8.2 Orchard Wharf, Orchard Place, London (PA/11/03824)**

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

- 8.3 Tower House, 38-40 Trinity Square, London EC3N 4DJ (PA/11/00163)**

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

(Please note that the wording in this document may not reflect the final wording used in the minutes.)