

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON TUESDAY, 15 DECEMBER 2009

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

Members Present:

Councillor Shafiqul Haque (Chair)
Councillor Shahed Ali
Councillor Alibor Choudhury
Councillor Stephanie Eaton
Councillor Rupert Eckhardt
Councillor Marc Francis (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Dulal Uddin

Councillor Helal Abbas
Councillor Sirajul Islam

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Ahmed Hussain
Councillor Rachel Saunders
Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman

Officers Present:

Jerry Bell	– (Strategic Applications Manager)
Paul Buckenham	– (Principal Planner)
Megan Crowe	– (Legal Services Team Leader, Planning)
Stephen Irvine	– (Development Control Manager)
Simon Ryan	– (Senior Planning Officer)
Jason Traves	– (Planning Officer)
Owen Whalley	– (Service Head Major Projects, Development & Renewal)
Alan Ingram	– (Democratic Services)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Rania Khan and Shiria Khatun, on behalf of whom Councillors Sirajul Islam and Helal Abbas 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
Shafiqul Haque	6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5	Personal	Correspondence received from concerned parties. He was a member of a Gym located in the Britannia Hotel, adjacent to the site that was the subject of the application. He was a Ward Member for the site.
	7.2	Personal	
	7.3	Personal	
Helal Abbas	7.1	Personal	Correspondence received from concerned parties.
Sirajul Islam	7.1	Personal	Correspondence received from concerned parties.
Alibor Choudhury	6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5	Personal	Correspondence received from concerned parties.
Marc Francis	6.1, 7.1, 7.5	Personal	Correspondence received from concerned parties
Rupert Eckhardt	7.1, 7.2	Personal	Correspondence received from concerned parties. He was a Ward Member for the area of the application.
	7.2	Personal	
Stephanie Eaton	7.1, 7.3, 7.4	Personal	Correspondence received from concerned parties
Dulal Uddin	6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5	Personal	Correspondence received from concerned parties
Shahed Ali	6.1, 7.3, 7.5	Personal	He was a Ward Member for the area of the applications. Correspondence received from concerned parties.
	7.3	Personal	

3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

RESOLVED that the unrestricted minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2009 be confirmed as a correct record of the proceedings.

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 and those who had registered to speak at the meeting.

6. DEFERRED ITEMS

6.1 Job Centre Plus, 60 Commercial Road, London E1 1LP

Mr Owen Whalley, Head of Planning & Building Control, introduced the report regarding the application for planning permission concerning the premises at Jobcentre Plus, 60 Commercial Road, London, E1 1LP, which had been deferred at the meeting of the Committee held on 10 November, 2009.

Mr Jerry Bell, Interim Strategic Applications Manager, presented details of the suggested reasons for refusal of the planning application, based on concerns voiced by Members at that meeting. He indicated that, despite a revised S106 application having been put forward by the applicant (as set out in the report) the other substantive issues raised by Members had not been properly addressed.

Members confirmed that the report adequately reflected the matters raised and, on a vote of three for and nil against, it was -

RESOLVED that planning permission for the demolition of the existing building at 60 Commercial Road, London, E1 1LP and erection of a 21 storey building plus basement to provide retail/commercial/community unit (Use Class A1/A2/A3/A4B1/D1) at ground floor and student accommodation and ancillary uses together with associated servicing, landscaping and other incidental works be **REFUSED**, subject to any direction from the Mayor of London, for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its excessive height and bulk, would appear out of character with the surrounding area. The proposal fails to relate to the scale of nearby buildings on Commercial Road and to the rear of the site on Back Church Lane. As a result, it is considered that the proposal would be out of keeping with the existing urban form. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 4B.1, 4B.8, 4B.9, and 4B.10 of The London Plan 2008, policies DEV1, DEV2 and DEV3 of the Unitary Development Plan 1998 and policies CP48, DEV1, DEV2 and CON2 of the Council's Interim Planning Guidance 2007 which seek to ensure development is of appropriate design.
2. The proposed development would result in unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight to nearby residential properties and as such is contrary to saved policies DEV1 and DEV2 of the adopted Tower Hamlets Unitary Development Plan 1998 and policies DEV1 and DEV2 of Council's Interim Planning Guidance (2007): Core Strategy and Development Control, which seek to ensure development does not have an adverse impact on neighbouring amenity.
3. The planning obligations are considered inadequate to mitigate against the impact of the development on community infrastructure and transport. As such, the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of Policy DEV4 of the adopted Tower Hamlets Unitary Development Plan 1998 which seeks to secure appropriate planning obligations which are reasonably related to the scale and nature of the proposed development and are necessary for the development to proceed.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

7.1 Eric and Treby Estates, Mile End, Treby Street, London

Mr Owen Whalley, Head of Planning & Building Control, introduced the report regarding the application for planning permission for the regeneration of Eric and Treby Estate.

The Chair then invited representations from persons who had registered for speaking rights in accordance with the procedures for hearing objections, as set out in the Council's Constitution.

Mr Mark Taylor, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application, expressing the view that:

- The consultation exercise undertaken by East End Homes had been very poor, with no reference made relating to sites 11, 2a or 2b and had comprised two one-day events that had been largely unknown by most residents.
- The consultation questionnaire that had been issued was biased and had not been sent out until after the statutory deadline for consultations.
- Despite East End Homes having statutory responsibility for ensuring the safety of residents in their homes, fire hazards still remained and the plans had not been signed off by the London Fire Authority.
- Refuse could not be properly collected from Ennerdale House and bins would have to be dragged for 25 m, which was in excess of the 10 m maximum stipulated by Health and Safety regulations.
- Crime prevention measures had not been adequately addressed in the design plans: escape routes for perpetrators of crime remained and there were areas where victims could be trapped. No Police or Safe Neighbourhood Team reports had been provided.
- Provision of public open spaces had not been given proper consideration and the proposed East End Homes office site would effectively remove the area used by children as a football kick-about area.

Ms Katherine Taylor, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application, stating that:

- She was in favour of social housing, especially for large families, but the application was not family friendly and would result in children from Mile End being bussed to schools all over the Borough. This would also have an impact on Council Tax charges.
- S106 monies should be utilised possibly for the provision of a primary school in Mile End.
- Children in Brokesley Street would have no play space and this created concerns for their safety.
- The demolition of properties in Brokesley Street had not been carried out by East End Homes in accordance with agreed procedures and there would be loss of light to existing properties when new build was completed.

Mr Steve Inkpen, speaking for the applicant, stated that there would be an overall increase in open space in the estates and the position regarding parking had been reviewed. He added that:

- There would be some £20m. of investment in the estates, including £12m improvement works and £7m in grants from the Homes and Communities Agency. The new build properties would replace bedsits

with efficient homes, built to Lifestyle standards and including wheelchair access.

- More secure street frontage would be provided aimed at reducing anti-social behaviour, with a safer environment in general and more secure windows, etc.
- There would be six new play areas, including a kick-about space, and a new housing centre on which there would be further consultation about community use.
- The application met key objectives of LBTH strategies and would provide 5 bed homes, which were valuable in Bow, an area of overcrowding.
- There had been extensive consultation since 2003 and plans had been amended to meet residents' concerns over such issues as height of buildings. Door to door consultation had meant that every home had been visited at least once and this had shown a majority of residents in favour of the proposals, including a new local housing office and community facility.

At this point, the Chair warned that, if disruption from the public gallery did not cease, he would have the gallery cleared or adjourn the meeting.

Councillor Ahmed Hussain, a Ward Councillor, stated that the proposed high density of housing would lead to future ghettos and, if the application was granted, there would be problems over many years to come. Children would have to be bussed to schools and their education would be hindered. Playspace was urgently required. The results of East End Homes consultations were outweighed by the residents' own survey which showed dissatisfaction with the proposals. This was the third occasion the application had been submitted and it was still not favoured by residents, who felt that there would be overcrowding. Other Councillors had concerns and the scheme should be rejected. He expressed the view that Labour Members were under the party whip to support the application.

The Chair stated that Councillor Hussain should improve his conduct, as such comments were unacceptable.

Councillor Rachael Saunders declared a personal interest in the item by reason of being an East End Homes Board member. She added that, as Chief Whip of the Labour Group she could state that the party whip was not an issue. She added that she stood with the residents and supported their voice on the future of the estates. At East End Homes Board meetings, she had been committed to obtaining proper resident consultation but this had not been done. The role of the Board was to make residents' voices heard but this had not happened and the Committee should approve the application only if Members were sure that residents' questions had been properly answered.

Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman declared a personal interest in the item by reason of being an East End Homes Board member. He indicated that he also wished to raise concerns on behalf of residents. Regeneration of the area in question was important, as was provision of play areas and improvements to security

and the environment. However, it was essential to ensure that local residents who experienced that environment were part of the whole process of the scheme.

At the request of the Chair, Mr Jerry Bell, Strategic Applications Manager, gave a very detailed description of the differences between the current scheme and previous proposals, as contained in the circulated report, referring to increases in public open space; increase in number of affordable housing units; amendments to elevation treatments of buildings; amendments to commercial/residential units; provision of a new community use building; increase in number of parking spaces; reduction in overall number of units.

He commented further on sections of the report that gave details of extensive consultation that had been undertaken with local residents and appropriate agencies. Mr Bell also referred to concerns relating to:-

- Fire risk: the London Fire Authority was generally happy with the scheme.
- Waste collection was an issue to be resolved but there was a condition for a service management strategy which had to be approved before the scheme could be implemented.
- The Police had been consulted on crime prevention measures and were satisfied overall.
- The proposed playspace met Borough requirements (although short of the GLA standard) and was considered acceptable.
- Demolition of Brokesley Street properties had resulted in the site being left in a safe condition.
- There would be a S106 contribution of £320,892 for education uses in the locality.

Summarising the additional benefits of the scheme, as set out in the report, Mr Bell stated that the application was recommended for approval.

The Chair then invited questions from Members.

Councillor Stephanie Eaton raised questions which were answered by Mr Bell in connection with the difference between bedsits and studio flats; calculations used for defining public open space; S106 funding used as mitigation of educational impacts.

Councillor Shahed Ali, who had entered the meeting late, declared personal interests in agenda items 6.1, 7.3 and 7.5 as a Ward Councillor and item 7.2 as a member of an organisation adjacent to the site. He commented that no Member of the Committee had been whipped into a decision. They would come to a decision based on the information before them. Councillor Ali then asked questions, which were answered by Mr Bell, on the nature and enforcement of the service management strategy; the ability of the developer to meet any shortfall in funding for the scheme.

The Chair pointed out that Members should not make party political statements while the meeting was in progress.

Councillor Marc Francis asked if Councillor Hussain wished to put his allegation into writing, to be referred to the Standards Board. He then asked questions, which were answered by Mr Bell, relating to possible overlooking and daylight issues between Site 1 and Ennerdale House; the possible impact on daylight for the East London Tabernacle. Ms Alison Thomas, Private Sector & Affordable Housing Manager, answered a further question from Councillor Francis, confirming that 19 studio units were for market sale.

The Chair then called for a vote on the application, pointing out that Councillor Shahed Ali was not eligible to do so as he had arrived late.

On a vote of four for and three against, it was –

RESOLVED:

- (1) That planning permission be GRANTED for the regeneration of Eric and Treby Estate, comprising the refurbishment of existing buildings, the demolition of 14 bed-sit units at 1-14 Brokesley Street and the erection of buildings between 1 and 7 storeys to provide 179 residential units (comprising: 19 x studio, 61 x 1 bed, 52 x 2 bed, 38 x 3 bed and 9 x 5 bed), two new community buildings of 310 sq.m and 150 sq.m, a new housing management office of 365 sq.m and 251 sq.m of commercial space and the introduction of an estate wide landscape improvement scheme, subject to:-
 - (a) Any direction by the Mayor of London;
 - (b) The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations listed in paragraph 3.3B of the Officer's report, as amended by paragraph 3.2 of the Officer's update report so as to include the following non-financial planning obligation:
 - The bus stop outside site 8 shall be relocated to an alternative location (to be agreed in consultation with Transport for London), or suitable alternative access arrangements agreed.
- (2) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated power to negotiate the legal agreement above.
- (3) That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated authority to impose conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the matters listed at paragraph 3.5 of the Officer's report.

- (4) That Conservation Area Consent be GRANTED for the demolition of 1-14 Brookesley Street, subject to the conditions listed at paragraph 3.6 of the Officer's report.
- (5) That, if by 30 April 2010 the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal be delegated power to refuse planning permission.

NOTE: At this point the Chair indicated that the order of business on the agenda would be varied in order to consider item 7.4 next, in view of the fact that speakers were registered and a large number of the public were present. However, the agenda items are recorded in their original order for ease of reference.

At 8.07 p.m., the Chair indicated that the meeting would adjourn briefly. The meeting reconvened at 8.15 p.m.

7.2 40 Marsh Wall, London E14 9TP

Mr Owen Whalley, Head of Planning and Building Control, introduced the application for demolition of the existing office building at 40 Marsh Wall and erection of a 39 storey building comprising a hotel and restaurant, leisure, conference and office facilities and ancillary developments.

Mr Stephen Irvine, Development Control Manager, made a detailed presentation of the application, as contained in the circulated report, together with the reasons why planning permission was recommended for approval.

The Chair then invited questions from Members.

Councillor Shahed Ali put queries which were answered by Mr Irvine relating to any significant differences between the proposed boutique hotel and others nearby; ownership of the steps between 30-40 Marsh Wall; increase in traffic and pedestrian levels; high density development in the locality; the effect of queuing taxis and coaches arriving at the development; the need for servicing and refuse vehicles also to access the hotel.

Councillor Marc Francis asked questions which were answered by Mr Irvine concerning the objections raised regarding the impact on views from Greenwich Park; the use of S106 funds on the provision of york stone and granite sets; adverse effects of a 40 storey development on residential developments to the south of the site.

On a vote of one for and four against, it was –

RESOLVED

That the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission for demolition of the existing building at 40 Marsh Wall and erection of a 39 storey building (equivalent of 40 storeys on Manila Street) with three-level basement,

comprising a 305 bedroom hotel (Use Class C1) with associated ancillary hotel facilities including restaurants (Use Class A3), leisure facilities (Use Class A3), leisure facilities (Use Class D2) and conference facilities (Use Class D1), serviced offices (Use Class B1); together with rooftop plant and associated landscaping and the formation of a taxi drop-off point on Marsh Wall be NOT ACCEPTED.

The Committee indicated that they were minded to refuse the planning application because of serious concerns over:

- The issue of impact on views from the south of the site.
- The allocation of S106 funding towards urban realmworks.
- Public transport issues.
- Inadequacy of coach and other vehicular parking facilities.
- The height, density, bulk and mass of the proposed building.

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.

7.3 Former Beagle House, Braham Street, London E1 8EP

Mr Owen Whalley, Head of Planning and Building Control, introduced the application for demolition of the existing building at Former Beagle House, Braham Street, London, E1 8EP and erection of a 17 storey building comprising retail units, office use and ancillary developments.

Mr Stephen Irvine, Development Control Manager, made a detailed presentation of the application, as contained in the circulated report, together with the reasons why planning permission was recommended for approval.

The Chair then invited questions from Members.

Councillor Shahed Ali put forward questions, which were answered by Mr Irvine, relating to the purpose of S106 funds relating to small medium enterprise and small local projects; the need for further proposals to enable local people to make better use of public open space.

Councillor Stephanie Eaton raised queries that were answered by Mr Irvine regarding improvements to pedestrian access and concerns raised by English Heritage on the impact of the proposed development on nearby listed buildings.

Councillor Marc Francis asked questions that were answered by Mr Irvine concerning potential impact of the development on views of the Tower of London; consideration of tall building projects in the context of surrounding streets; the density of the proposed scheme and its impact on the immediate area; inadequate improvements to the local transport infrastructure;

oversupply of office accommodation and limited local training/employment opportunities.

The Chair then called for a vote on the application and, on a vote of three for and four against, it was –

RESOLVED

That the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission for the demolition of the existing building at Former Beagle House, Barham Street, London, E1 8EP and the erection of a 17 storey building comprising two ground floor retail units (Class A1, A2, A3, or A4), 1st – 17th floor office use (Class B1) and two basement levels plus associated servicing, landscaping, plant accommodation, parking, access and any other works incidental to the application be NOT ACCEPTED.

The Committee indicated that they were minded to refuse the planning application because of serious concerns over:

- The physical impact of the scheme on the surrounding area in terms of the bulk and massing of the proposed building.
- Inadequate financial contributions towards the local transport infrastructure.
- Inadequate financial contributions towards local employment and training.

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.

7.4 Site at 438-490 Mile End Road, London E1 4PE

Mr Owen Whalley, Head of Planning and Building Control, introduced the report regarding the application to demolish the existing structures at 438-490 Mile End Road, London, E1 and provide a new educational facility.

The Chair then invited representations from persons who had registered for speaking rights in accordance with the procedures for hearing objections, as set out in the Council's Constitution.

Ms Brenda Daley, a local resident, stated that a petition against the proposal had been signed by 152 residents of the Ocean Estate, who objected to the extension of the Queen Mary University Knowledge Hut beyond the boundary of the existing site. Concern was also expressed over the ongoing loss of work sites in Mile End to ever-increasing student accommodation. There was a consequent loss of family accommodation and community facilities for local people, with a growing student township and an increase in bars. This should be prevented by the Council as local infrastructure was approaching breaking point. Height reductions in the proposed scheme were also being sought, so

that it would complement existing listed properties. There would be a material detriment to residents from the use of roof terraces and Toby Lane residents would be particularly affected.

On behalf of speakers in support of the application, Mr Charles Moran commented that the provision of student accommodation meant that there would be less pressure on local housing stock. He added that there would be 24 hour site management and no detriment to the local community. Significant local benefits would include the creation of 180 jobs associated with the running of the site as all non-teaching jobs would be recruited locally. The site along Mile End Road would not be suitable for family housing and the proposed scheme would allow the establishment of a firmer line for the site boundary. There had been significant changes in the height of the development, with amendments to its appearance and the removal of roof terraces. Consultation had been undertaken with local residents to ensure the maximum benefit to them and local groups were keen to use the community facility. The scheme was a fully funded and deliverable project.

Mr Imran Khan, a local student, stated that there was currently a lack of space for students and hardly any local community facilities. The scheme would result in employment benefits and allow access to courses that could be used by local people.

Mr Stephen Irvine, Development Control Manager, presented the report and indicated that changes to the design of the application had resulted in a reduction of the gross internal floorspace; a reduction of bedspaces from 631 to 583; reduction in the maximum height from 11 to 9 storeys (mainly 7 storeys) and deletion of the roof terrace. Mr Irvine added that the application was supported by Officers for the reasons detailed in the circulated report.

The Chair then invited questions from Members.

Councillor Marc Francis put questions that were answered by Mr Irvine concerning the agreement to ensure employment of local people and how this might be enforced; the design changes and how these related to the height and scale of proposed structures.

Councillor Stephanie Eaton asked questions, which were answered by Mr Irvine, with regard to student numbers and the affordable housing policy; how to enforce the agreement whereby student accommodation should only be occupied for the predominant part of the year by students attending the educational facility.

The Chair then called for a vote on the application and, on a vote of nil for and six against, it was –

RESOLVED

That the officer recommendation to grant planning permission for the demolition of existing structures at 438-490 Mile End Road, London, E1, and

erection of a new building ranging from 3 to 9 storeys to provide a new education facility comprising teaching accommodation and associated facilities, student housing, cycle and car-parking, refuse and recycling facilities be NOT ACCEPTED.

The Committee indicated that they were minded to refuse the planning application because of serious concerns over:

- The physical impact of the scheme on the surrounding area in terms of the height, bulk and massing of the proposed building.
- Inadequate affordable housing contribution, which contravenes the Mayor's draft plan policy.
- The requirement for the development to encourage a mixed community.

In accordance with the 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.

7.5 Former Goodmans Fields, 74 Alie Street & Land North of Hooper Street and East of 99 Leman Street, Hooper Street, London

Mr Owen Whalley, Head of Planning and Building Control, introduced the application for redevelopment of Former Goodmans Fields, 74 Alie Street (land north of Hooper Street and east of 99 Leman Street), London, to provide four courtyard buildings of 5-10 storeys, six buildings of 19-23 storeys, erection of a 4 storey terrace along Gowers Wharf, change of use to residential and construction of an additional storey to 75 Leman Street, and ancillary developments.

Mr Jerry Bell, Strategic Applications Manager, made a detailed presentation of the application, as contained in the circulated report, together with the reasons why planning permission was recommended for approval.

The Chair then invited questions from Members.

Councillor Stephanie Eaton raised a query, which was answered by Mr Bell, regarding the need for a condition to ensure the replacement of mature street trees.

Councillor Marc Francis put forward questions, which were answered by Mr Bell, concerning the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding historic streets; why the proposed level of density in development was considered appropriate; mitigating factors regarding the impact on historic buildings; possible additional S106 funding contributions to healthcare and the continuation of a health facility; justification for proposed student accommodation; potential overdevelopment of the site and the impact of its height, bulk and mass on surrounding properties.

Councillor Shahed Ali asked questions, which were answered by Mr Bell, relating to potential problems arising from proposed additional student accommodation in the Whitechapel area; the need for additional housing for sale; possible reductions in the height of the development.

The Chair then called for a vote on the application and, on a vote of two for and four against, it was –

RESOLVED

That the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission for redevelopment of Former Goodmans Fields, 74 Alie Street (Land north of Hooper Street and east of 99 Lemn Street, Hooper Street), London, to provide four courtyard buildings of 19-23 storeys, erection of a 4 storey terrace along Gower's Walk, change of use to residential (Class C3) and construction of an additional storey to 75 Lemn Street: the overall scheme comprising 772 residential units (Class Class C3), 650 bedroom student accommodation (sui generis), 351 bedroom hotel (Class C1), primary care centre (Class D1), commercial uses (Class A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1 and D2), public open space, landscaping, servicing, plant accommodation, car parking and access and associated works be NOT ACCEPTED.

The Committee indicated that they were minded to refuse the planning application because of serious concerns over:

- The overdevelopment of the site as manifested particularly in the number of towers and the height of the proposed buildings.
- Excessive massing of the perimeter buildings and their impact on surrounding properties.

In accordance with the 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.

The meeting ended at 10.00 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Shafiqul Haque
Strategic Development Committee