

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 9 OCTOBER 2013**

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

**Members Present:**

Councillor Helal Abbas (Chair)  
Councillor Anwar Khan (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Tim Archer  
Councillor Judith Gardiner  
Councillor Gulam Robbani  
Councillor Harun Miah

**Other Councillors Present:**

Councillor Joshua Peck  
Councillor Abdal Ullah

**Officers Present:**

Jerry Bell	– (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Fleur Brunton	– (Senior Lawyer - Planning Chief Executive's)
Paul Buckenham	– (Team Leader Pre-applications, Planning & Building Control, Development & Renewal)
Shay Bugler	– (Strategic Applications Planner, Development and Renewal)
Adrian Walker	– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Adam Williams	– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Kamlesh Harris	– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Ann Sutcliffe	– (Service Head Strategic Property, Development and Renewal)
Mark Hutton	– (Team Leader, Development Design & Conservation, Development & Renewal)
Zoe Folley	– (Committee Officer, Democratic Services Chief Executive's)

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Kosru Uddin.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made.

Councillor Judith Gardiner declared an interest in agenda item 6.2, Dame Colet and Haileybury Centre, Ben Jonson Road, London E1 3NN (PA/13/01433). This was on the basis that the Councillor was a ward Councillor and had been lobbied on the application.

Councillors Helal Abbas and Gulam Robbani declared an interest in agenda item 6.4, Shoreditch Station, Pedley Street, London E1 (PA/12/02661 and PA/12/03383). This was on the basis that the Councillors had received correspondence and had spoken to interested parties for and against the application, but had not expressed an opinion.

### **3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES**

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 12<sup>th</sup> September 2013 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. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION**

#### **6.1 65 Tredegar Square, London, E3 (PA/13/633 & PA/123/634)**

Update Report tabled.

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) introduced the item at 65 Tredegar Square, London for the erection of 8 no self contained houses with 2 on site car parking spaces (Full planning permission) and

demolition of existing warehouse (Conservation Area Consent).

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Greg Campbell speaking in objection to the application expressed his support for the Planning Officers recommendation for refusal. He reported that he lived near the development in Tredegar Square. He considered that the future occupants of the development would have poor outlooks and poor quality amenity space. There would be cramped housing that would lead to overdevelopment.

The proposal would also have an invasive impact on neighbours due to the close proximity to their boundary, especially from opening and closing the windows. This would spoil the occupants enjoyment of their properties. The proposal would also result in a loss of amenity space and overlooking at the south side of Tredegar Square.

In reply to questions, he reported that the proposed light well windows would be right next to the boundary. When open, the windows would have an intrusive impact on the neighbours and result in direct overlooking to the neighbours. He also expressed concerns about the construction process and security given the proximity to the boundary and the plans to lower the wall that would make access easier.

Mr Campbell highlighted the quality of the square including pleasant gardens, the traditional wall with plants and charming old brickwork. The scheme was very crowded for the site. Given this, his overriding concern was the impact of the scheme on the Square. Any development of this site should be in keeping with this 'Georgian gem'.

Councillor Josh Peck spoke in support. The scheme would meet the need for quality family housing with gardens at market levels in the ward. He drew attention to the Council policies that promoted family housing with gardens. He considered that this policy should be given more weight in this case than the shortfall of one bed units given the need for family sized housing. Councillor Peck referred to similar mews developments that were much poorer in terms of amenity space, outlook etc. However these were still desirable places to live. The proposed wall would be the same height as the current wall and the materials would be similar.

Jonathan Freegard (Applicant's agent) spoke in support. He stated that local residents strongly supported the proposal. The policy requirement for 50% one bed units was not in place when the proposal was submitted so should be given less weight. The scheme would improve access to the site and provide better quality amenity space compared to the present warehouse site. There would be good levels of sunlight/day light as stated in the submitted impact assessment. In response to Members, he reported that the materials would appear very similar to the existing warehouse. There would be a slate roof, replacing asbestos that would match the surrounding area. This would be a major improvement. The Police were satisfied with the proposals given the robust security plans. Access to the site would generally remain the same

as would the height of the wall, maintenance of the gutters would be improved by three small indents which would make it easier for the downpipes to be accessed.

Shay Bugler (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report. He explained the site location that fell within the Tredegar Square Conservation Area. He explained the key features of the Conservation Area and that the site had good transport links. The application was acceptable on land use terms and there would be no undue impact on amenity. However, the scheme was deficient in a number of key areas due to the site constraints combined with the number of dwellings. Mr Bugler explained these issues to the Committee. The amenity space would be of poor quality due to the overlooking and the proximity to bin and cycles stores. As a result the space would feel cramped and overshadowed.

He also highlighted the other key shortcoming including: the lack of one bed units contrary to policy; the mono aspect flats; the poor quality outlooks due to the proximity to a wall and surrounding properties, the contrived design features such as internal light wells that was out of keeping with the Tredegar Square Conservation Area. As a result, the scheme showed symptoms of overdevelopment. Officers were recommending that the scheme should be refused.

In response to questions, it was confirmed that some of the units would have poor outlooks at the upper floors as they would be facing 1-3 Lyn Mews and 66 Tredegar Square. Officers would seek to condition the fencing, if approved, to mitigate the impact on the footpath to protect light levels. Officers had held pre-applications with the applicant where better alternatives to this scheme for the site were discussed. Officers explained some alternatives that could overcome the issues given the site constraints. There were no exceptional circumstances to justify the non provision of one bed units given the 50% requirement in policy for market sales. Whilst the density range complied with the London Plan guidance, it clearly presented symptoms of overdevelopment as explained above. Officers also referred to a similar scheme that on appeal the Inspector concluded would lead to an unacceptable impact. Elements of the scheme would be noticeable from 55-56 Tredegar Square and Mile End Road.

In response, Members considered that the objections to this scheme were common to most developments in the Borough, such as the mono aspect units, quality of the amenity space etc. Any residential scheme on the site would face similar problems due to the site constraints (such as the wall). There was also no objection to the land use in principle.

It was also considered that the properties around Tredegar Square were of mixed design and there was no particular character. Therefore the proposal would be in keeping with the area and also had an innovative design. Furthermore, the expectation that the scheme could incorporate some of the design features of the Conservation Area was unrealistic given the size of the development.

Members also questioned the concerns around the lack of one bed units given this could increase overdevelopment further.

The scheme would also provide much needed family sized housing with amenity space and there was no objection to the impact on amenity.

On a vote of 1 in favour of the Officer recommendation, 3 against and 2 abstentions the Committee **RESOLVED**:

That the Officer recommendation to refuse planning permission and conservation area consent (PA/13/633 & PA/123/634) at 65 Tredegar Square, London, E3 4 be **NOT ACCEPTED** for the erection of 8 no self contained houses with 2 no on site car parking spaces (Full planning permission) and demolition of existing warehouse (Conservation Area Consent PA/13/634).

The Committee were minded to approve the scheme due to the following reasons:

- That the application would provide much needed family housing with amenity space in accordance with the policies in the Council's Core Strategy and the Development Plan for Bow that promoted such housing. On balance, this outweighed the failure to provide any one bed units as required in policy.
- The innovative design that related well to the surrounding Tredegar Square Conservation area.
- That there was no objection in principle to the redevelopment of the site and there would be no demonstrable harm to the amenity of the adjoining occupiers, as concluded in the Officers report.
- That any symptoms of overdevelopment were outweighed by the benefits of the scheme.

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 approval and conditions on the application.

(The Members that voted on this item were Councillors Helal Abbas, Anwar Khan, Tim Archer, Judith Gardiner, Gulam Robbani and Harun Miah)

## **6.2 Dame Colet And Haileybury Centre, Ben Jonson Road, London E1 3NN (PA/13/01433)**

Update Report tabled.

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) introduced the item for the demolition of Dame Colet House and Haileybury Centre and erection of two four storey residential blocks to provide 40 affordable housing units together with a three storey youth, sport and community centre building with associated landscaping, car parking and other ancillary works.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Councillor Abdal Ullah speaking in support as a ward Councillor, stated that the youth centres in the ward were in a poor state, so the proposals were much needed and widely supported in the community. There had been lengthy campaigns for this facility. It would provide first class facilities with a roof top Multi Use Games Area (MUGA).

Kamlesh Harris (Planning Officers) presented the detailed application that was a Council led initiative. She explained the site location, the outcome of the local consultation, the quality of the new leisure facilities and the housing mix. This comprised 100% affordable housing at the Council's preferred rent levels with family housing. The housing would be managed by Tower Hamlets Homes. All units would have private amenity space with adequate levels of community space. The under five play space fell marginally short of the policy target. However, the site was very close to play areas. She also described the proposed materials and the design of the development that would preserve views and enhance the setting of the York Square Conservation Area. The impact on amenity was acceptable and there would be conditions to control the hours of construction and the opening hours for the leisure facilities. The s106 had been considered by the Council's Planning Contributions Overview Panel and it was considered that the contributions were appropriate to mitigate the scheme. The scheme could only be delivered with the subsidy.

In response to questions, Officers clarified the policy requirement for one bed units in relation to affordable housing - 30% of the development. In relation to community access, it was reported that the new leisure centre would provide a whole range of inclusive services for all sections of the community in accordance with Council policy and the Equalities Act that had been carefully applied. The specification had been set by the Council's Youth Services to meet with their needs. Officers also explained the access plans to the MUGA. In relation to anti-social behaviour, it was anticipated that the new sports centre should help address this by providing activities for young people.

The Committee also heard from Ann Sutcliffe (Service Head, Strategic Property, Development and Renewal) who reassured Members that the scheme was financially viable and that finance had been earmarked for the scheme. The Council's Chief Finance Officer had assessed the scheme and had concluded that the scheme was viable as stated in the Cabinet reports on the subject.

On a unanimous vote, the Committee **RESOLVED**:

1. That planning permission (PA/13/01433) at Dame Colet And Haileybury Centre, Ben Jonson Road, London E1 3NN be **GRANTED** for the demolition of Dame Colet House and Haileybury Centre and erection of two four storey residential blocks to provide 40 affordable housing units together with the erection of a three storey youth, sport and community centre building with associated landscaping, car parking and other ancillary works subject to:

2. The prior completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) within three months of the date of this resolution, to secure the planning obligations and non-financial obligations as set out in the Committee report.
3. That the Corporate Director, Development & Renewal and Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) is delegated authority to negotiate and approve the legal agreement indicated above.
4. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out in the report.

### **6.3 Old Poplar Baths and rear ball court, East India Dock Road & Lawless Street, London E14 0EH (PA/13/01432)**

Update Report tabled.

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) introduced the item regarding Old Poplar Baths and rear ball court for the for the demolition of existing garages and ball court and erection of 10 storey residential block to provide 60 affordable housing units; internal and external alterations and refurbishment to Poplar Baths.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Paul Holliday spoke in objection to the residential block, as a resident of the area. There would be a loss of car parking space and garages and an increase in cars from the development. Whilst the residential scheme would be car free, he had been told by Council Officers that this could not be applied to 2-3 bed units. He objected to the loss of the existing open space and the height of the block that would be twice as high as the existing residential buildings. This would cause a loss of light, views and privacy and would set a dangerous precedent. Furthermore, construction work had already begun on site.

Lilian Collins spoke in support of the proposal as the Chair of the Poplar Baths Steering Group. The group had worked hard to have the baths re-opened and there had been numerous campaigns over the years. She highlighted the proposed new facilities that would bring this much loved centre back into use for local children whilst retaining the valuable features. The area was overpopulated, therefore there was a real need for these facilities. It would have a positive impact on the health of the community.

With the agreement of the Chair, it was agreed that the presentations on this item and item 8.1 - the listed building consent for the works to the Poplar Baths (PA/13/01432) would be considered together. However the Committee would vote on the items separately.

Paul Buckenham (Planning Officer) presented the application which was a

Council led initiative. He explained the plans for the Poplar Baths including the site location and the outcome of the local consultation. None of the objections related to this part of the scheme. He explained the works to refurbish the listed building whilst retaining the important features. The main interventions were to the south and eastern section of the building that was of less architectural merit. Much of the second class baths, the chimney and water tanks were to be demolished. In its place would be the roof top multi use games area (MUGA) that would be built in a style that was in keeping with the listed building.

There would be free access to the roof top MUGA for residents of St Matthias Estate.

The conservation experts supported the scheme (English Heritage, the Borough Conservation Officer) as the plans would preserve the character of the listed building. Highways and Transport for London were supportive of the scheme, subject to the conditions.

The Committee also noted the proposed layout of the new facilities including two swimming pools, a sports hall, gym, fitness studios and a café.

Mr Buckenham also explained the plans for the residential block that had received 17 representations in favour and 4 against. There would be 60 affordable units all at the Council's preferred rents with 45% family housing. Whilst there would be no dedicated under 5 child play space, it was planned to convert a nearby area of hard standing for such space. There were also a number of open spaces and parks in walking distance and the residents would have access to the new leisure facilities. The impact on neighbouring amenity was minimal. No objections had been raised to the loss of the garages from Highway Services. The existing tenants would be found alternative provision. The s106 had been considered by the Council's Planning Contributions Overview Panel and it was considered that the contributions, that were reliant on subsidy, were appropriate to mitigate the scheme.

The Committee also heard from Ann Sutcliffe (Service Head Strategic Property, Development and Renewal) who reassured Members that the scheme was financially viable and that finance had been earmarked for the scheme. The Council's Chief Finance Officer had assessed the scheme and had concluded that the scheme was viable as stated in the Cabinet reports on the subject.

In response to questions, it was reported that the area of hard standing did not have any formal use at present. It was considered that the density range could be accommodated given the good transport links, the sites proximity to the Town Centre and as that as the density was comparable to nearby developments. The scheme showed no signs of overdevelopment.

Whilst there would be some minor loss of light to properties at Woodhall Close, the properties affected were dual aspect and this mainly affected the non habitable rooms. As a result, the properties would continue to receive



adequate levels of light and would also benefit from improved outlooks and more natural surveillance.

On a vote of 3 in favour, 1 against and 2 abstentions, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission (PA/13/01432) at Old Poplar Baths and rear ball court, East India Dock Road & Lawless Street, London E14 0EH be **GRANTED** for demolition of existing garages and ball court and erection of 10 storey residential block to provide 60 affordable housing units; internal and external alterations and refurbishment to Poplar Baths to reinstate the main pool and create a new learner pool; demolition of chimney and associated ancillary works to provide indoor wet and dry sports and leisure facilities, roof top games area plus ancillary landscaping and vehicular parking, subject to
2. The prior completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) within three months of the date of this resolution, to secure the planning obligations and non-financial obligations as set out in the Committee report.
3. That the Corporate Director, Development & Renewal and Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) is delegated authority to negotiate and approve the legal agreement indicated above.
4. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out in the report.

#### **6.4 Shoreditch Station, Pedley Street, London E1 (PA/12/02661 and PA/12/03383)**

Update Report tabled.

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) introduced the item for the partial demolition of former Shoreditch Station building, with retention of brick facade and erection of a new 6 storey building to include retail, cafe, office, and art display and studio space at lower ground, ground and residential units.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Anthony Hoate spoke in support of the scheme as the application was recommended by Officers for refusal. He stated that the proposals were supported by the local community. There had been 23 letters in support with only 4 objections. The scheme would support a range of community activities and would activate the site and provide natural surveillance. As a result it was supported by the Police. The scale and height was acceptable and the design respected the surrounding area. The only works to the station building would be to the roof. Due to this, the application was below the threshold for Conservation Area Consent.

Adam Williams (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report and the update. He highlighted the changes to the Officers recommendation to remove the reason for refusal for the A3 use as this had been removed from the scheme. He also advised of the changes to omit the application for conservation area consent as this application had been withdrawn by the applicant. However, Officers considered that this application was still necessary based on the application and the opinion of English Heritage.

The Committee were advised of the key features of the scheme including the location, the good transport links and the outcome of the local consultation. It was considered the proposal was acceptable in terms of land use, scale and height and would provide an acceptable housing mix. It should also reduce opportunities for crime in the area. However, a key area of concern was the demolition of the Shoreditch Station building in the Conservation Area. The Borough's Conservation Officer considered that the building made a positive contribution to the Conservation Area and the plans would harm the area. English Heritage and the Victorian Society also supported this view and opposed the demolition.

A second concern was the impact from noise and vibration to future occupants given the proposed building's proximity to railway lines. Officers considered that the noise levels would be in excess of the accepted levels, based on the submitted noise report. (The applicant's consultant had advised that a reasonable level of insulation would be provided as opposed to a good standard as required). The applicant had submitted additional information on the day of the Committee regarding this issue. However the Council's Environmental Health considered that this was insufficient to overcome the issues. On balance, Officers considered that the application should be refused.

In response to questions about the importance of the building, the Committee heard from Mark Hutton, a Council specialist on Conservation issues, who highlighted the views of English Heritage and the Victorian Society on this matter and spoke about the historic interest of the building as a station. As a result, it was considered that the proposed demolition should be refused. Instead the Council should seek the retention and repair the building due to its importance to the area.

In terms of the noise levels, it was reported that the site was located immediately adjacent to railway lines and an overground station. As a result, the future residents would be subject to ground borne noise that would travel through the building. It was noted that this issue could be addressed through conditions. However the information needed for this had not been provided.

On a vote of 3 in favour, 2 against and 1 abstention, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission (PA/12/02661) at Shoreditch Station, Pedley Street, London E1 be **REFUSED** for the partial demolition of former Shoreditch Station building, with retention of brick facade, and erection of a new 6 storey

building to include retail, cafe, office, and art display and studio space (Use Class A1, A3, B1 and D1) at lower ground, ground and first floor level and 9 residential units (Use Class C3) at second to fifth floor level, comprising 2 x 1 bed, 4 x 2 bed and 3 x 3 bed units (amended proposal) for the reasons set out below:

- It is considered that the former Shoreditch Station building makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Brick Lane and Fournier Street Conservation Area and the proposed demolition of substantial elements of the building would fail to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Furthermore, it is considered that the public benefits that would be brought by the proposed development are not sufficient to outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area that would be caused by the proposal. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy SP10(2) of the Council's adopted Core Strategy (2010), Policy DM27(3) of the Council's adopted Managing Development Document (2013) and government guidance set out in Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).
- Based on the information submitted, the proposed development would fail to adequately protect future residential occupants from unacceptable levels of noise and vibration, to the detriment of residential amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy SP10(4) of the Council's adopted Core Strategy (2010) and Policy DM25 of the Council's adopted Managing Development Document (2013) require development to protect, and where possible improve, the amenity of surrounding existing and future residents and building occupants, as well as the amenity of the surrounding public realm.

#### **6.5 87 New Road, London, E1 1HH (PA/13/01566)**

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) introduced the item at 87 New Road, London for the Variation of Condition 3 of Planning Permission dated 06/02/2009 Ref: PA/08/02662 to extend the hours of operation from between 10.00 am to 10.00 pm to between 11.30 am to 11.30 pm on any day.

Adrian Walker (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report. He explained the outcome of the location consultation resulting in letters in support and against. It was reported that the area was of mixed character where a degree of additional noise and disturbance could be expected. There were also a number of existing restaurants that have permission to operate to similar times as requested by this application. However, there was still a need to control the hours of operation of commercial properties to protect residential amenity.

Taking this into account, it was considered that the hours requested were acceptable and that they would not have a detrimental impact on residents amenity. Environmental Health had not raised any objections to the proposal.

On a vote of 4 in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission (PA/13/01566) at 87 New Road, London, E1 1HH be **GRANTED** for the variation of condition 3 of Planning Permission dated 06/02/2009 Ref: PA/08/02662 to extend the hours of operation from between 10.00 am to 10.00 pm to between 11.30 am to 11.30 pm on any day for the following reason.

The proposed variation of condition 3 of planning permission ref: PA/08/02662 to extend the hours of operation of the restaurant is not considered to have a significant impact on the amenity of residential occupiers in the immediate vicinity and is therefore considered acceptable and in accordance to policies SP01(2ci), SP03(2b) and SP10(4) of the Council's adopted Core Strategy (2010) and Policy DM25 of the Council's adopted Managing Development Document (2013). These policies require development to protect, and where possible improve, the amenity of surrounding existing and future building occupants, as well as the amenity of the surrounding public realm.

## 7. DEFERRED ITEMS

### 7.1 85 - 87 New Road, London, E1 1HH (PA/13/01607)

Update report Tabled.

Jerry Bell (Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal) introduced the item at 85 - 87 New Road, London for change of use at 85 New Road from shop (A1 use class) to restaurant (A3 use class) with rear extension to provide waiting area, toilets (including one disabled) and seating for the existing restaurant at 87 New Road.

Adrian Walker (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report. At the last meeting of the Committee on 12<sup>th</sup> September 2013, Members were minded to approve the planning application contrary to the Officer recommendations to refuse. The reasons given by the Committee for this decision were: that the shop at 85 New Road was currently vacant and the loss of the A1 use was acceptable; that there was a lack of evidence that there was an over - concentration of restaurant uses in the area; that there was a lack of clear policy guidance in relation to this matter.

The Officers recommendation remained unchanged to refuse. However, should the Committee be minded to approve the application, Officers were recommending that a number of conditions be imposed as set out in the report including a condition limiting the opening hours from 11:30am to 11:30pm and the revised condition 3 and 4 in the update regarding the materials and the refuse storage arrangements.

On a vote of 3 in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission (PA/13/01607) at 85 - 87 New Road, London, E1 1HH be **GRANTED** for change of use at 85 New Road from shop (A1 use class) to restaurant (A3 use class) with rear extension to provide waiting area, toilets (including one disabled) and seating for the existing restaurant at 87 New Road subject to the conditions set out in the committee report with the alterations to the conditions in the update report.

## 8. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

### 8.1 Poplar Baths, 170 East India Dock Road, London E14 0EH (PA/13/01441)

Paul Buckenham (Planning Officer) presented the detailed report. For a summary of the discussion, see item 6.3 Old Poplar Baths and rear ball court, East India Dock Road & Lawless Street, London E14 0EH (PA/13/01432)

On a unanimous vote, the Committee **RESOLVED**:

That the application (PA/13/01441) at Poplar Baths, 170 East India Dock Road, London E14 0EH for listed building consent for internal and external alterations and refurbishment to Poplar Baths building including demolition of chimney and associated ancillary works to facilitate re-opening of baths as leisure centre and swimming pools be **REFERRED** to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government with the recommendation that the Council would be minded to grant Listed Building Consent subject to conditions as set out in the committee report.

### 8.2 PLANNING APPEALS REPORT

On a unanimous vote the Committee **RESOLVED**

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

## UPDATE REPORT

The meeting ended at 10.40 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Helal Abbas  
Development Committee