

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 21 NOVEMBER 2013

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

Members Present:

Councillor Helal Abbas (Chair)
Councillor Rajib Ahmed
Councillor Carli Harper-Penman
Councillor Denise Jones
Councillor Zara Davis
Councillor Kabir Ahmed (Executive Advisor to the Mayor and
Cabinet)
Councillor Md. Maium Miah (Advisor to the Mayor and Cabinet on
Third Sector and Community
Engagement)
Councillor Joshua Peck (Substitute for
Councillor Marc Francis)
Councillor Peter Golds (Substitute for (Leader of the Conservative Group)
Councillor Dr. Emma Jones)

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor John Pierce

Apologies:

Councillor Marc Francis and Councillor Dr. Emma Jones

Officers Present:

Pete Smith – (Development Control Manager, Development &
Renewal)
Jane Jin – (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Nasser Farooq – (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Megan Nugent – (Legal Services Team Leader, Planning, Chief
Executive's)
Richard Murrell – (Deputy Team Leader, Planning, Development
and Renewal)
Zoe Folley – (Committee Officer, Democratic Services Chief
Executive's)

–

1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made.

Councillors Helal Abbas and Joshua Peck declared an interest in agenda items (6.1) Suttons Wharf North, Palmers Road, London (PA/13/02108), (6.2) Land bounded by 2-10 Bethnal Green Road, 1-5 Chance Street (Huntingdon Industrial Estate) and 30-32 Redchurch Street (PA/13/01638, PA/13/01644) and (6.3) Land at Fleet Street Hill, London, E2 (PA/13/01637). This was on the basis that the Councillors had received correspondence from interested parties (including the ward Councillor for item 6.1) and had been approached by residents.

Councillors Rajib Ahmed, Peter Golds, Zara Davis and Denise Jones declared an interest in agenda items (6.1) Suttons Wharf North, Palmers Road, London (PA/13/02108), (6.2) Land bounded by 2-10 Bethnal Green Road, 1-5 Chance Street (Huntingdon Industrial Estate) and 30-32 Redchurch Street (PA/13/01638, PA/13/01644) and (6.3) Land at Fleet Street Hill, London, E2 (PA/13/01637). This was on the basis that Councillors had received correspondence from interested parties

Councillor Md. Maium Miah declared an interest in agenda items (6.1) Suttons Wharf North, Palmers Road, London (PA/13/02108), (6.2) Land bounded by 2-10 Bethnal Green Road, 1-5 Chance Street (Huntingdon Industrial Estate) and 30-32 Redchurch Street (PA/13/01638, PA/13/01644) and (6.3) Land at Fleet Street Hill, London, E2 (PA/13/01637). This was on the basis that the Councillor had received correspondence from interested parties and that he was also a Island Area Board Member for One Housing Group in respect of item 6.1.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 29th August 2013 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

3. 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

4. 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.

5. DEFERRED ITEMS

Nil items.

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

6.1 Suttons Wharf North, Palmers Road, London (PA/13/02108)

Update Report Tabled.

Pete Smith (Development Control Manager) introduced the report regarding Suttons Wharf North, Palmers Road, London seeking minor material amendments to the *approved Suttons Wharf North development comprising the conversion of ground, first and second floor levels to create ten additional residential units and associated minor alternations.

The Chair then invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Mr Kha'lique spoke in objection to the proposal from the Suttons Wharf Residents Group. He referred to the previous changes to the scheme to convert from commercial to residential units. He objected to the impact of these changes in terms of increased litter and other environmental challenges in the area. This additional conversion to housing would only worsen these problems. The proposals would change the nature of the area by converting potentially high end commercial units (that was welcomed in the area) to purely housing. The occupants, when moving in to the development, bought their properties on the basis that the units would be commercial units not residential. In response to questions, Mr Kha'lique stated that the approved commercial units would improve natural surveillance by generating a flow of people (even though the units would be closed at night). It was anticipated that the units would attract a high quality businesses given the quality of surrounding units in Palmers Road. He had sent to the Planning Officers photographs of the litter problems and Councillor Amy Whitelock Gibbs, a ward Councillor, was aware of the issues and had submitted a representation against the scheme.

Dr Abigail Woollard spoke against the proposal. She stressed the importance of the commercial units to the residents of the development to provide essential services (such as a chemist and a nursery). There were approximately 1200 residents in the development and there was a lack of

commercial facilities to support them. She considered that the previous conversion to residential units proceeded on the basis that these commercial units would be retained. So this was the last chance for the residents to save some commercial use within the development. In response to Members, Dr Woollard stressed the benefits for residents of having services in the development. The nearest commercial units were some distance away, requiring a large detour to visit the nearest shops for essential, sometimes late at night. There was also the potential to provide much needed nursery and health care facilities within the commercial units that would be lost.

Ben Kelway spoke in support of the scheme on behalf of the applicant. He stressed that the application was for minor amendments to the scheme. He commented on the overall benefits of the Suttons Wharf North scheme including 206 affordable houses and a significant contribution to the Borough's housing stock. The changes related to a small number of units in block B, granted consent in 2007 in very different market circumstances. The applicant's assessment found that there was currently no demand for commercial units at the site in view of the lack of footfall and the high level of commercial units in the area. It was highly likely that the units would be left vacant. He addressed the other issues raised in objection. The plans should improve surveillance and help prevent crime by activating the units that would otherwise be left empty. The issues around litter and bins were a management issues. He considered that the level of bins were proportionate to the number of occupants.

In response to Members about the marketing research, Mr Kelway reported that the applicant's assessment primarily looked at the demand for commercial uses as opposed to retail uses. The results showed that there was a lack of demand for such uses in the area given the overprovision of commercial units in the area. The study had been robustly tested by Council Officers. Mr Kelway acknowledged there had been no attempts to market the subject units directly for commercial use and limited exploratory work regarding the demand for nursery places.

Members further questioned the reasons for the application now and the robustness of the original viability assessment given the perceived lack of real change in the local economy. Mr Kelway responded that the original assessment was carried out in 2004. He underlined the changes in planning policy since then and the very different market conditions, that the applicant considered justified the proposal.

Jane Jin (Planning Officer) presented the committee report and the update report. She explained the location, the nature of the consented scheme and the previous amendments. She explained the tenure mix of the various blocks (that were all affordable housing) and had been completed. She explained the tenure mix of the proposed residential units including family sized units. A total of 33 representations had been submitted to the consultation and the objections raised were explained.

The scheme showed no signs of overdevelopment (despite exceeding the density guidance in the London Plan) which was a key test. The site was well serviced by commercial units given the close proximity to Town Centres. Therefore, the loss of the commercial units and the conversion for residential complied with policy. There would be a car free agreement and less vehicle servicing. It was considered that the refuse/recycling proposals were adequate in view of the additional pressure. The existing problems with rubbish were more of a management issue not due to lack of capacity. Officers had recently visited the site and had found that the problems with litter had improved (as shown by the photographic evidence). The management would be taking further steps to address any litter issues. In summary, Officers were recommending that the scheme should be granted planning permission.

In response to questions, Officers clarified the amount of commercial space that would remain in the development if granted. In response to questions about the residential units on the ground floor, it was explained that all of the units would have private space and defensible space and there would be adequate levels of community space.

On a vote of 3 in favour of the Officer recommendation, 4 against and 2 abstentions the Committee **RESOLVED**:

That the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission (PA/13/02108) at Suttons Wharf North, Palmers Road, London be **NOT ACCEPTED** for the application under s.73 of the Town and Country Planning Act for a variation of Condition 22 of the Planning Permission PA/11/3348 dated 30/03/12 at Suttons Wharf North, Palmers Road, London to seek minor material amendments to the *approved Suttons Wharf North development comprising the conversion of ground, first and second floor levels to create ten additional residential units and associated minor alternations to Block B

The Committee were minded to refuse the application due to concerns over:

- Overdevelopment of the site.
- Loss of the commercial units given the need for such uses for existing residents (for example to provide much needed childcare facilities).
- Lack of marketing evidence/exploration work to inform the lack of demand for the commercial space.

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, along with the implications of the decision.

The Councillors that voted on this item were Councillors Helal Abbas, Rajib Ahmed, Carli Harper –Penman, Denise Jones, Zara Davis, Kabir Ahmed, Md Maium Miah, Joshua Peck and Peter Golds.

6.2 Land bounded by 2-10 Bethnal Green Road, 1-5 Chance Street (Huntingdon Industrial Estate) and 30-32 Redchurch Street (PA/13/01638, PA/13/01644)

Update Report Tabled.

Pete Smith (Development Control Manager) introduced the report regarding Land bounded by 2-10 Bethnal Green Road, 1-5 Chance Street (Huntingdon Industrial Estate) and 30-32 Redchurch Street for the demolition and redevelopment to provide a mixed use development comprising two basement floors and between 2 - 14 storeys. The application also sought Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of 1-5 Chance Street and 28 and 30-32 Redchurch Street to facilitate the planning permission.

He also introduced the linked application (Agenda Item 6.3) regarding Land at Fleet Street Hill, London, for the redevelopment of the site to provide 34 residential dwellings of mixed tenure, the provision of 135 sqm of restaurant and 671 sqm of flexible commercial and community space, five car parking spaces plus other incidental works.

Note: It was agreed that the Committee would consider the presentations on the two schemes together (including the speakers cases, Members questions and debate) as the applications were closely linked. However, the Committee would vote on the items separately.

The Chair then invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Objector's Statements and Members Questioning

Robin Fellgett (Jago Action Group) spoke in opposition. He stated he was speaking on behalf of many residents. Whilst they supported the development of the Huntington Industrial Estate (HIE) site, the proposals was far too high and bulky and was out of keeping with the Conservation Area given the mid - rise nature of the surrounding buildings. Therefore it would harm the setting of area. The scheme breached many planning policies as noted in the Officers report.

He disputed the justification for the height to subsidise the number of affordable housing on the Fleet Street Hill site (FSH). The profit margins would be far in excess of what was needed to delivery the affordable housing as shown by the objectors own research. He considered that their proposal of a mid rise building (with a mixed tenure) would generate sufficient profit and should be considered. It would be possible to provide 80% of the floor space with a significant reduction in height, according to their research.

Any scheme should fit in with the Conservation Area, provide a mixed tenure with a reasonable profit. On this basis, he requested that the Committee refuse the HIE scheme but not the Fleet Street Hill Scheme subject to a greater mix in housing tenures.

In response to Members, he commented that the height of the HIE scheme would be 56 metres high. Therefore much higher than the surrounding buildings (including the Tea and Biscuit building and the nearby synagogue).

Rebecca Collings (Local resident and co-chair of OPEN Shoreditch) spoke in opposition to the schemes. She highlighted the experience of her organisation, as respected planning experts, with regards to commenting and changing major planning proposals. The consultation carried out by the application in February 2013 was misleading. The information consulted on suggested that the plans for the HIE site would be only a few stories higher than the Tea and Biscuit building. Given this, there had been no proper consultation on the actual proposal.

Brad Lochore spoke in opposition. He commented that he had lived near the HIE site for many years and that there had been a great amount of development in the area. He considered that the location was a prime example of a high quality housing estate in the Conservation Area that should be protected. Firstly, the height exceeded the highest building in the area, therefore would harm the setting. Furthermore, the height and design would build over and spoil the historic street pattern of Whitby Street. He supported the development of the site. However, this scheme breached many planning policy and English Heritage had concerns.

In response to Members, he considered that the proposed materials were acceptable for the Conservation Area and marked an improvement on the previous scheme.

Councillor Jon Pierce spoke in objection to the proposals, as the ward Councillor. He reported that fellow ward Councillor Mohammed Mukit also objected to the proposal. He emphasised the amount of opposition to scheme amongst the community. He considered that plans for the HIE site would damage the uniqueness of the area (especially the Redchurch Street and Brick Lane Conservation Area). It would therefore damage tourist trade and the local economy. English Heritage considered that proposal would harm the setting of the historic buildings. The proposals conflicted with the Council's Core Strategy which sought to protect the mid-rise nature of the Shoreditch area.

He also objected to the concentration of off site affordable housing at the FSH site given the need for a mixed community. It might also lead to requests for a gated development given the security issues. He expressed concerns about the lack of jobs for local people. It was recognised that there was a real need for new homes in the area. However, this scheme was unacceptable.

Applicant's statement and Members questioning

David Barnett spoke on behalf of the applicant. He stressed the scope of the consultation including engagement with ward Councillors. The proposals would provide 43% affordable housing across both sites (that was above the

policy requirement), mainly on the FSH site that would provide high private quality amenity space and a courtyard. A large percentage of the affordable housing would be family units at the Council's target rent levels. The proposals would create 155 jobs across both sites including commercial units for start up small and medium sized businesses via the s106 at capped rents levels for a period.

Mr Barnett confirmed the amendments to the previous HIE scheme to better fit in with the Conservation Area including the decrease in height and the introduction of mixed tenure units on both sites. Only 25% of the HIE building would be above the Tea and Biscuit building. The large majority of objection letters were pro - forma letters from out of Borough groups. The scheme would provide much needed housing, amongst other benefits and he requested that the schemes should be granted.

In response to Members about the consultation in February 2013, Mr Barnett stated that the Applicant had held a public exhibition (to which the local residents were invited) and distributed 1000s of leaflets. The meetings were well attended and the vast majority of the feedback was positive. During the consultation, the exact height of the HIE building was made clear. In response to Members about the level of public opposition (mainly to the height of the HIE scheme), Mr Barnett stated that the vast majority of the building would be seven stories or lower. In relation to the split in housing tenures, Mr Barnett stressed the need for this to maximize the affordable housing at the FSH site and the amenity space for the family sized housing that could not be provided at the HIE site due to the site constraints.

In relation to the proximity of the FSH site to railway lines, Mr Barnett stressed the merits of the location for family housing given the proximity to Allen Gardens. He also spoke about the opportunities to reactivate the derelict site, decrease nuisance and facilitate community cohesion (given the proposed courtyard, the bridge improvements and the mixing of commercial and residential units). This would bring real benefits for the local community.

Oliver Shepherd spoke in favour of the application on behalf of the applicant. He commented further on the local job opportunities, the lengthy consultation process for the scheme including the appointment of specialist architects to address the previous concerns with the last scheme. He also confirmed the improvements on the last scheme in light of the consultation.

Mhairi Weirto spoke in support as the Manager of the Spitalfields City Farm. Ms Weirto considered that the proposals had been significantly influenced by the consultation. She welcomed the plans for the FSH site and stated that it would help create a mixed community (with so many people living and working together) and should help address the asb problems in the area. In summary, she welcomed the revisions to the plans and the introduction of mixed housing tenures on both the sites.

Finally, Phil Hamilton spoke in support for the applicant. He commented on the affordable housing provision at the FSH site. He addressed the issues

around the proximity of the FSH site to the railway. All of the units would be dual aspect and would have windows opening into the quiet areas. The public space would be quiet and peaceful and, due to the design, the courtyard would be shielded from the railway. He referred to similar developments near railways and there had been no complaints. He highlighted the merits of the FSH scheme.

In response to questions about the demand for further retail services at the FSH site, i.e. a coffee shop (in view of the proximity to similar services in Brick Lane) he expressed confidence that such units would be in demand and could be sustainably occupied given the competitive rent rates proposed under the s106. Once established, he felt confident that the business would stay.

Nasser Farooq (Planning Officer) made a detailed presentation on the scheme. Mr Farooq firstly explained the plans for the Huntington Industrial Estate. He explained the location and surrounds including the heritage assets. He explained the proposed layout of the scheme, the amenity space, the materials and the improvements on the previous scheme. He addressed the issues around the height showing a height profile of the wider area. Officers considered that the proposed height accorded with policy that supported tall buildings in the area.

Officers were mindful of the heritage value of the surrounding buildings and the comments of English Heritage. However, Officers were of the view that the significant public benefits of the scheme would outweigh the harm caused to the surrounds. Therefore, the scheme satisfied the relevant tests in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requiring this to be demonstrated. Careful consideration had been given to the need to demolish 30-32 Redchurch Street and ways of retaining this if possible. However, given the costs of the option, the quality of the replacement and the wider benefits of the scheme, this proposal could also be supported and meet the tests in policy. The day light and sunlight impact on the neighbouring properties was acceptable, as validated by an independent review.

Mr Farooq also explained in detail the plans for the Fleet Street Hill site. Mr Farooq explained the location that was currently derelict with security issues. He explained the housing mix, the proposed courtyard, the commercial space and the general improvements with regards to natural surveillance. He stressed the measures to minimise any noise and vibration from the railway. Environmental Health had fully considered this issue and considered that the proposed conditions would deal with any issues. Mr Farooq also described the improvements to the bridge and the s106 package.

In response to questions, Officers clarified that the schemes would be car free, subject to the application of the Council's parking permit transfer scheme.

Questions were also asked about:

- The work to identify a suitable mid - rise building (in relation to the HIE site).

- The justification for demolishing 30-32 Redchurch Street given the buildings were in the Conservation Area.
- Whether the proposed stepped down terraces at the HIE site were in keeping with the appearance of the Conservation Area.
- Clarification of the recent planning history for Whitby Street. (i.e. when it was stopped up).
- The perceived in balance in tenures across the two sites.
- The suitability of the FSH site for family housing given the risk of noise to the occupants from the nearby railway and the security issues from Allen Park.
- The risk that the FSH site could become gated in view of the concerns around the security of the immediate area.
- The servicing arrangements for the commercial units at FSH.
- Whether the commercial units at FSH could be successfully occupied, over the long term, especially after the concessionary rent period. If not, there was a risk that any security issues would return.

In response, Officers addressed each point. Officers confirmed the servicing arrangements for the commercial units at FSH. The submitted tracking information showed that the vehicles could access and exit the site safely. There would be controls to manage deliveries.

Officers considered that the height of the HIE scheme was acceptable (although at the upper limits) on balance, in view of the benefits of the scheme. Whilst English Heritage had concerns about the heritage impact, it was of the view that the scheme needed to be considered in the balance.

It was reported that the separation in housing tenures was supported in policy where it could be demonstrated that it would deliver a better outcome as in this case (i.e. a higher proportion of affordable housing and amenity space). The viability testing looked at various different scenarios and found that a greater level of affordable housing at the HIE site would reduce viability given the site constraints, therefore reduce the overall affordable housing offer. The FSH site could provide better quality family housing and amenity space given the nature of the site. The viability assessment had been assessed by independent specialists. Both sites were also in a close proximity.

Officers also clarified the planning history of Whitby Street. The Council's Conservation Officer had not raised any concerns about this part of the scheme in terms of the impact on the historic street scheme.

A lot of work had gone into addressing the noise and vibration issues at the FSH site to ensure the necessary mitigation measures would be secured. The issues and the results of the testing had been thoroughly considered by

independent experts and Environmental Health who were satisfied with the stringent conditions to manage any impact.

There were a number of roof top terraces in the HIE area. The FSH scheme would greatly improve the linkages with surrounding area in accordance with policy.

Planning permission (PA/13/01638)

On a vote of 2 in favour of the Officer recommendation, 6 against and 1 abstention the Committee **RESOLVED**:

That the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission (PA/13/01638) at Land bounded by 2-10 Bethnal Green Road, 1-5 Chance Street (Huntingdon Industrial Estate) and 30-32 Redchurch Street be **NOT ACCEPTED** for the demolition and redevelopment to provide a mixed use development comprising two basement floors and between 2 - 14 storeys. The proposal provides 78 residential units (Use Class C3), 456 sqm Class A1, 359 sqm Class A1/B1/D2 and 1,131 sqm A1/A3/A4/D2 at basement and ground floor; parking, plant and ancillary accommodation; a central courtyard and accessible amenity roof terraces

The Committee were minded to refuse the application due to concerns over:

- Impact on the surrounds and the heritage assets in view of the height, scale and massing, demolition of 30-32 Redchurch Street, the design (especially the use of Roman Brick, the design of the proposed balcony and the roof terrace arrangements) and the loss of the historic street pattern with regards to Whitby Street. The heritage assets include: the Owl and the Pussycat Public House and the neighbouring Redchurch Street, South Shoreditch, Brick Lane/Fournier Street and Boundary Gardens Conservation Area.
- The failure to provide a mixed and balanced community given the overprovision of private sale within the development and concentration of affordable housing on the linked Fleet Street Hill application. (PA/13/01637)

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, along with the implications of the decision

Conservation Area Consent PA/13/01644

On a vote of 2 in favour of the Officer recommendation, 6 against and 1 abstention the Committee **RESOLVED**:

That the Officer recommendation to grant Conservation Area Consent (PA/13/01644) at Land bounded by 2-10 Bethnal Green Road, 1-5 Chance

Street (Huntingdon Industrial Estate) and 30-32 Redchurch Street be **NOT ACCEPTED** for the demolition of 1-5 Chance Street and 28 and 30-32 Redchurch Street in conjunction with the comprehensive redevelopment of the Huntingdon Estate site to provide a mixed use development.

The Committee were minded to refuse the application as it would be premature to grant this consent in the absence of a suitable replacement 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, along with the implications of the decision

The Councillors that voted on this item were Councillors Helal Abbas, Rajib Ahmed, Carli Harper –Penman, Denise Jones, Zara Davis, Kabir Ahmed, Md Maium Miah, Joshua Peck and Peter Golds.

6.3 Land at Fleet Street Hill, London, E2 (PA/13/01637)

For the summary of this application, see the previous item.

On a vote of 4 in favour of the Officer recommendation and 5 against the Committee **RESOLVED**:

That the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission (PA/13/01637) at Land at Fleet Street Hill, London, E2 be **NOT ACCEPTED** for the redevelopment of the site to provide 34 residential dwellings of mixed tenure (7x 1 bed, 12 x 2 bed, 8 x 3 bed, 6 x 4 bed and 1 x 5 bed) in buildings of part one, two, three, four and eight storeys. The development includes the provision of 135 sqm of restaurant (Use Class A3) and 671 sqm of flexible commercial and community space (Use Classes A1, B1a, D1 and D2), five car parking spaces plus other incidental works.

The Committee were minded to refuse the application due to concerns over:

- The failure to provide a mixed and balanced community given the concentration of affordable housing within the proposed development and the overprovision of private sale within the linked application for Huntingdon Industrial Estate (PA/13/01638, PA/13/01644).
- The suitability of the site for family housing given the security and environmental challenges within the area and noise and vibration from the nearby railway lines.
- The commercial units particularly whether the units could be sustainable and viably occupied.

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, along with the implications of the decision.

The Councillors that voted on this item were Councillors Helal Abbas, Rajib Ahmed, Carli Harper –Penman, Denise Jones, Zara Davis, Kabir Ahmed, Md Maium Miah, Joshua Peck and Peter Golds.

7. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

7.1 Planning Appeal - Poplar Business Park, Prestons Road E14 (PA/11/03375)

Pete Smith (Development Control Manager) presented the item. He explained the key outcome of the appeal.

In summary, the appeal was allowed on the basis of a 20% affordable housing level by floor area (21% by habitable room) – a total of 71 units (47 affordable rent and 24 intermediate). It also agreed with a S.106 package of £2,646,222; an additional £882,361 compared to the scheme reported to Strategic Development Committee.

Notwithstanding this, the level of affordable housing was less than that offered by the developer when the case was determined by the Strategic Development Committee in April 2012.

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

That the details and outcomes of the Poplar Business Park appeal as outlined in the report be **NOTED.**

The meeting ended at 10.40 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Helal Abbas
Strategic Development Committee