

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 6.30 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 23 AUGUST 2018

DECISIONS ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

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

Councillor Helal Uddin declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of item 5.1 in that he was on the Board of Tower Hamlets Homes and employed at the Bromley-by-Bow Centre. He absented himself from the meeting during the discussion and decision of this application.

Councillor Mukit declared a personal non pecuniary interest in respect of item 5.3 in that Mr Sundor Miah, a resident who spoke in favour of the proposal to redevelop the public house, was a Member of the Labour Party and was known to him.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meetings held on 20th June and 19th July be approved as a correct record of proceedings.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS AND MEETING GUIDANCE

The Committee **RESOLVED** that:

1. The procedure for hearing objections and meeting guidance be noted.
2. In the event of changes being made to recommendations by the Committee, the task of formalising the wording of those changes be delegated to the Corporate Director, Place along the broad lines indicated at the meeting; and
3. 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, Place be delegated authority to do so, provided always that the Corporate Director does not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision

4. DEFERRED ITEMS

4.1 Lamb Court, 69 Narrow Street, London, E14 8EJ. (PA/18/00074)

It was noted that Councillor Mufeedah Bustin had not participated in this decision and therefore she absented herself from the meeting during the consideration of the item.

The Committee reviewed its reasons for refusal of the application in the context of pertinent planning matters.

The Committee **RESOLVED**

1. In respect of officer recommendation 6.1, on a vote of 5 against the officer recommendation and 1 abstention, Members voted that REFUSAL of the application be upheld.
2. In respect of officer recommendation 6.2. that refusal be based on the suggested reasons for refusal as set out in paragraph 4.2. Members resolved to adopt all reasons for refusal outlined in paragraph 4.2 of the report.

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

5.1 Jolles House, Bromley High Street, Blue Anchor Public House, 67 Bromley High Street and 67A Bromley High Street, London, E3. (PA/17/03015)

It was noted that Councillor Helal Uddin did not participate in this decision.

An update report was tabled.

Councillor Pierce proposed, Councillor Ruhul Amin seconded and on a vote of 6 in favour and 0 against it was

RESOLVED

That the application for the Demolition of existing Jolles House and vacant Blue Anchor public house and Affordable housing led redevelopment comprising two linked 6 storey residential buildings comprising x64 affordable units and x6 private units; with associated landscaping and play provision enhancements **BE GRANTED** subject to the obligations and conditions set out in the report.

5.2 Raine House, 16 Raine Street, London, E1W 3RL (PA/18/01477 and PA/18/01478)

An update report was tabled.

Councillor Pierce proposed and Councillor Helal Uddin seconded that the application be deferred.

Accordingly, on a unanimous vote in favour of the proposal, it was

RESOLVED

That the application **BE DEFERRED** for a site visit.

The Committee were minded to undertake a site visit because of heritage issues raised during the discussion.

5.3 Dean Swift Public House, 2-6 Deancross Street, London, E1 2QA (PA/18/00472)

The Chair proposed and, on a vote of 5 in favour of and 1 vote against officers' recommendation to refuse the application for the demolition and redevelopment of the site, it was

RESOLVED

That planning permission be **REFUSED**. The Committee was minded to refuse the application for the following reasons; loss of the community asset, design, standard of accommodation and impact on neighbouring amenity.

WILL TUCKLEY, CHIEF EXECUTIVE

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