

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 9 JANUARY 2014

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

Members Present:

Councillor Helal Abbas (Chair)

Councillor Rajib Ahmed

Councillor Zara Davis

Councillor Dr. Emma Jones (Item 7.2)

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 Judith Gardiner (Substitute for
Councillor Denise Jones)

Councillor Peter Golds (Substitute for (Leader of the Conservative Group)
Councillor Dr. Emma Jones)(Items 1-6.1)

Other Councillors Present:

None

Apologies:

Councillor Marc Francis, Councillor Carli Harper-Penman and Councillor Denise
Jones

Officers Present:

Pete Smith

– (Development Control Manager, Development &
Renewal)

Jane Jin

– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)

Richard Murrell

– (Deputy Team Leader, Planning, Development
and Renewal)

Megan Nugent

– (Legal Services Team Leader, Planning, Chief
Executive's)

Pat Watson

– (Head of Building Development)

Adam Williams

– (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)

Zoe Folley

– (Committee Officer, Chief Executive's)

1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made.

Councillor Md. Maium Miah declared an interest in agenda item (5.1) Suttons Wharf North, Palmers Road, London (PA/13/02108). This was on the basis that the Councillor was an Island Area Board Member for One Housing Group.

Councillor Zara Davis declared an interest in agenda item (6.1) Former News International Site, 1 Virginia Street, London, E98 1XY (PA/13/01276 and PA/13/01277). This was on the basis that the Councillor owned property in the nearby area.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 21st November 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 AND MEETING GUIDANCE

The Committee noted the procedure for hearing objections, together with details of persons who had registered to speak at the meeting.

5. DEFERRED ITEMS

5.1 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.

Jane Jin (Planning Officer) presented the deferred report. It was reported that the Committee were minded to refuse the variation at its last meeting due to the perceived need for commercial units in the development and the lack of marketing work to inform the proposal. However, since then the applicant had amended the variation to reduce the number of residential units sought to 8 units (from 10) to allow the retention of some commercial floor to address the concerns.

Officers had considered the Members reasons for refusal and taking into account the amendment, considered that the suggested reasons would be very difficult to defend at appeal on planning grounds. Therefore, the Officers recommendation remained to grant the application. However, should Members be minded to refuse the application, the Committee were directed to the draft reasons for refusal in the report, based on the Committee's initial concerns.

In response to Members, it was confirmed that the commercial units could be for either A1 or B1 use. The residential mix remained broadly the same save the reduction of two residential units. Officers also clarified the servicing plans. The level of which should be minimal.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Officers sought permission to amend the s106 agreement to reflect the changes to the proposal, since last reported to the Committee regarding the reduction in residential units. Officers would work with the applicant to agree the revised contributions should the application be agreed.

On a vote of 6 in favour of the Officer recommendation, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That 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 be **GRANTED** to seek minor material amendments to the approved Suttons Wharf North development comprising the conversion of a part ground floor, first and second floor levels to create **8 residential units and retain 107sq.m of commercial floor space on the ground floor**; and associated minor alterations to Block B, SUBJECT to:

2. The variation to the legal agreement to secure the additional planning obligations set out in the Committee report of 21st November 2013 subject to amendment to reflect the changes to the housing offer since reported to that meeting.
3. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above acting within normal delegated authority AND to amend the s106 agreement as indicated above to reflect the amended proposal.
4. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to impose conditions and informatives on the planning permission to secure the matters set out in the main committee report.
5. That, if within 3 months of the date of this committee's resolution the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to refuse planning permission.

5.2 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)

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 Planning Permission and Conservation Area Consent for the demolition and redevelopment to provide a mixed use development. Mr Smith noted that it was open for Members to refuse the application and approve the Fleet Street Hill application, should they wish to do so.

Richard Murrell (Planning Officer) presented the deferred report. It was reported that the Committee were minded to refuse the application at its last meeting due to concerns over the impact on the heritage assets of the development and the imbalance in the proposed housing tenure. Officers had since considered the Members reasons for refusal and were of the view that they could be defended at appeal.

Mr Murrell advised Members that further representations from the developer had been received regarding the proposed reasons for refusal. The developer had carried out a review, informed by Counsel, of the reasons, who did not consider the reasons gave sufficient weight to the regenerative benefits of the scheme.

Mr Murrell stated that he thought Members had carefully weighed the possible regenerative benefits of the linked schemes against the harm caused by the proposal and had come to a reasonable conclusion. In light of the representations made by the developer, Members were asked to consider this point before making a final decision.

The Officers recommendations remained unchanged to grant the application. However, should Members be minded to refuse the application, the Committee were directed to the draft reasons for refusal in the report, based on the Committee initial reasons for refusal.

In response to a Member, Officers considered that the suggested reasons for refusal were reasonable on planning grounds as set out in the deferred report. The reasons related to subjective matters around the architecture of the buildings and their impact on the historic environment. The reasons could be defended on appeal. Although ultimately, any decision on this was likely to be made by the Secretary of State.

FPP PA/13/01638 – Planning Permission

On a vote of 2 in favour of the Officer recommendation and 4 against, the Committee refused to accept the recommendation to grant Planning Permission for the application.

On a vote of 4 in favour of the reasons for refusal and 2 against, the Committee **RESOLVED** subject to any direction from the Mayor of London:

1. That 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 **REFUSED** 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 for the following reasons as set out in paragraph 3.2 of the Committee report:
2. The proposed development, by virtue of its excessive height and bulk, is insensitive to the context of its surroundings and as such would not incorporate the principles of good design. By failing to relate well to the scale of the buildings in the immediate surrounds the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Redchurch Street Conservation Area and fail to preserve or enhance the setting of surrounding conservation areas. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Core Strategy (2010) Strategic Policies SP10 (2, 3 and 4) and SP12 (b and i) and Annex: 9 Delivering Place-Making 'Shoreditch'; Managing Development Document (2013) policies DM24, DM26 and DM27; and London Plan (Revised Early Minor Alterations to the London Plan 2013) policies 7.4, 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8d.
3. The detailed design of the building including the use of a stepped massing, a Roman profile brick, balconies and terraces with balustrades would be out of character with its surroundings and as such, would be contrary to: Core Strategy (2010) Strategic Policies

SP10(2, 3 and 4) and SP12(b and i) and Annex: 9 Delivering Place making 'Shoreditch'; Managing Development Document (2013) policies DM24, DM26 and DM27; and London Plan (Revised Early Minor Alterations to the London Plan 2013) policies 7.4, 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8d.

4. The demolition of 30/32 Redchurch Street would result in the loss of a building which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Redchurch Street Conservation Area. The public benefits of the proposal are not considered to outweigh the harm caused by the loss of the buildings and the proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy policy SP10, Managing Development Document policy DM27(3), London Plan policy 7.8(c and d) and guidance set within the Redchurch Street Character Appraisal dated 4th November 2009.
5. The development would be constructed over the historic route of WhitbyStreet and as such, would result in the loss of the traditional street pattern of the area, failing to reserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Redchurch Street Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Core Strategy (2010) Strategic Policies SP10 (2, 3 and 4) and SP12 (b and i) and Annex: 9 Delivering Place-Making 'Shoreditch'; Managing Development Document (2013) policies DM24, DM26 and DM27 and London Plan (Revised Early Minor Alterations to the London Plan 2013) policies 7.4, 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8d. The proposal would also be contrary to guidance set within the Redchurch Street Character Appraisal dated 4th November 2009.
6. The development by virtue of the lack of on-site affordable housing (particularly housing falling within the rented tenure) would fail to contribute to the creation of a mixed and balanced community in the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Strategic Objective S08 of the Core Strategy (2010), policy DM3(a) of the Managing Development Document and London Plan policy 3.9.
7. In the absence of a planning permission for the redevelopment of a linked scheme at Fleet Street Hill (LBTH Ref PA/13/1637) the development would not secure the provision of an appropriate level of affordable housing and S106 contributions. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies (legal agreement to secure an appropriate level of affordable housing and s106 contributions) and would fail to deliver affordable housing and mitigate against its impact. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with policy 3.12 of the London Plan, policies SP02 and SP13 of the adopted Core Strategy and policy DM3 of the Managing Development Document (2013).

PA/13/01644- Conservation Area Consent

On a vote of 2 in favour of the Officer recommendation and 4 against the Committee refused to accept the recommendation to grant Conservation Area Consent for the application.

On a vote of 4 in favour of the reasons for refusal and 2 against the Committee **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That 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 **REFUSED** 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 for the following reasons as set out in the paragraph 3.2 of the Committee report.
- (2) The proposed demolition of 2-10 Bethnal Green Road, 1-5 Chance Street (Huntingdon Industrial Estate) without the grant of planning permission for an acceptable replacement, would neither preserve nor enhance the Redchurch Street Conservation Area. As such, the proposed demolition would be contrary to policy SP10 of the adopted Core Strategy 2010, and Policy DM27 of the of the Managing Development Document (Adopted 2013).
- (3) The demolition of 30/32 Redchurch Street would result in the loss of a building which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Redchurch Street Conservation area. The public benefits of the proposal are not considered to outweigh the harm caused by the loss of the buildings and the proposal would therefore be contrary to Core Strategy policy SP10, Managing Development Document policy DM27(3), London Plan policy 7.8 (c and d) and guidance set within the Redchurch Street Character Appraisal dated 4th November 2009.

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

Pete Smith (Development Control Manager) introduced the report regarding Land at Fleet Street Hill, London, E2 for the redevelopment of the site to provide 34 residential dwellings of mixed tenure, restaurant use, flexible commercial and community space, five car parking spaces plus other incidental works.

Richard Murrell (Planning Officer) presented the deferred report. It was reported that the Committee were minded to refuse the application at its last meeting due to concerns over the suitability of the site for family housing, the imbalance in the proposed housing mix and concerns over the long term occupancy of the commercial units. Officers had since considered the

Members reasons for refusal and were of the view that they could be defended at appeal.

The Officers recommendations remained unchanged to grant the application. However, should Members be minded to refuse the application, the Committee were directed to the draft reasons for refusal in the report, based on the Committee initial reasons for refusal.

On a vote of 2 in favour of the Officer recommendation and 4 against, the Committee refused to accept the recommendation to grant Planning Permission for the application.

On a vote of 4 in favour of the reasons for refusal and 2 against, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission (PA/13/01637) at Land at Fleet Street Hill, London, E2 be **REFUSED** 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 due to the following reasons as set out in paragraph 3.1 of the Committee report:
2. The proposed development by virtue of the over-provision of affordable accommodation (particularly in the rented tenure) would fail to create a mixed and balanced community contrary to Strategic Objective 8 and policy SP02 of the Core Strategy 2010, policy DM3 of the Managing Development Document 2013, policy 3.9 of the London Plan 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to promote sustainable development through fostering social diversity and redressing social exclusion.
3. The proposed development, by virtue of its location between two railway lines, is very constrained. The access to site via the footbridge over the railway to Cheshire Street and the underpass from Allen Gardens are poor and make the site unsuitable for the provision of a large amount of family accommodation. The proposal is therefore contrary to the design objectives set within policy 7.1 of the London Plan 2011, policy SP10 and SP12 of the adopted Core Strategy and policies DM23 and DM24 of the Managing Development Document.
4. The provision of a large quantity commercial floorspace is inappropriate given the location of the site outside of a designated Town Centre. The provision of commercial floor space would not create a sustainable place and would be contrary to the objectives of Strategic Objective S06 and Strategic Policy SP10 of the Core Strategy 2010

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

7.1 Former News International Site, 1 Virginia Street, London, E98 1XY (PA/13/01276 and PA/13/01277)

Update Report Tabled.

Pete Smith (Development Control Manager) introduced the report regarding planning permission at Former News International Site, 1 Virginia Street, London, E98 1XY for a hybrid application (part outline/part detailed) comprising demolition of all buildings and structures on the site with the exception of the Pennington Street Warehouse and Times House and comprehensive mixed use development.

The Chair then invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

John Schuster spoke in objection on behalf of the nearby Quay 430 development and Telford's Yard. He objected to a number of issues regarding the development around:

- Loss of light. The submitted assessment of the impact on neighbouring properties was flawed as it was missing parts of the Quay 430 development. The assessment also underestimated the sunlight/daylight failings within the development itself.
- Design of the development. There were many issues with the design of the units. The standards fell below the accepted design standards.
- The noise impact on the neighbours. The Council's own Officers considered that the noise impact was too much. This should be mitigated.
- The impact from the construction works given the proximity to neighbouring properties. No noise assessment of this had been carried out. A more suitable lorry route for such activity should be found.
- Parking and congestion. The proposed ration between cars and units breached policy. Therefore, the development would worsen parking stress and congestion in the vicinity.
- The location and design of the proposed school. As a result, the roof top play space would be exposed to noise and pollution.

Jon Aldenton, speaking in objection on behalf of the Turk's Head Charity, also expressed concerns about the proposed school given the issues with pollution and the quality of the environment. He drew attention to another school with similar problems and the adverse affects on the pupils.

He expressed concern about the underground car parking. The car park would generate 260 movements a day if used.

He also expressed concerns about the design (the mixture of tower blocks with large amount of open space), the excessive amount of ponds, the safety of these features and the shape of the buildings. The flattened blocks would create a 'blade runner' element. He also considered that the density range was out of keeping with the area.

He considered that the scheme conflicted with Council policy and should be refused on the grounds of poor quality design, overbearing height, insufficient s106, unusable public space and harmful impact on the Tower of London.

Ross Faragher spoke in support. He advised that it was planned to start work, if granted, by March 2014. The scheme would allow Wapping and the wider area to connect and provide significant public realm improvements and public open space. He drew attention to the level of affordable housing. A significant amount of which would be delivered at an early stage. He also highlighted the proposed health care facilities, the new school and the plans to bring the listed Pennington Street Warehouse building back into use. The applicant was in advanced negotiations with technology businesses with a view to them occupying some of the units.

He drew attention to the s106 agreement. He also highlighted the extensive nature of the local consultation that had informed the key features of the scheme as described above and had also resulted in a number of changes. This included the reduction in height, moving part of the building away from the Quay 430 development, increasing the affordable housing offer and s106 contributions for highway improvements. He also highlighted the employment and enterprise package in addition to the s106 package. The applicant was working with Skills Match to secure local employment opportunities for residents and had employed a local resident to work as the workforce coordinator within the community for the scheme.

In response to Members, Mr Faragher confirmed the reduction in parking spaces – down from 1200 spaces to about 1000. Experience showed that the residents of similar developments didn't tend to use their cars everyday. So the impact on parking and congestion should be far less than anticipated by the objector. He noted the concerns around the potential for conflict between traffic from the development and the school. However, he considered that, given the distance between both and the school's operating times, both elements of the scheme should safely coexist without any safety impact.

The scheme had been reduced in height to address the concerns of English Heritage and the Pennington Street Warehouse had been redesigned to

address the concerns from the Greater London Authority. English Heritage considered that the scheme should be considered on balance.

Pete Smith (Development Control Manager), Richard Murrell and Adam Williams (Planning Officers) gave a detailed presentation on the scheme.

Richard Murrell firstly explained the application site and the extent of the pre application consultation including 45 events. He also confirmed the changes to the scheme regarding the affordable housing offer, the height and design. English Heritage and the GLA welcomed the improvements. English Heritage considered that, whilst the scheme would cause some harm, it should be considered in the balance. Mr Murrell highlighted the outcome of the local consultation including the objections from nearby Telford's Yard and the Smokehouse Studios regarding the construction impact.

Mr Murrell explained the policy support for the development. The plans would improve the permeability of the area and should attract visitors to the site given the quality of the public spaces.

Members also heard about the plans for the various plots, the height of the proposal, the design, the quality of the public squares, the servicing arrangements, the changes to the Times House building to provide affordable housing at an early stage, the works the Pennington Street Warehouse, the employment space and the plans to use local labour and to provide local apprenticeships.

Members were also advised of the outline plans for the secondary school. A lot of testing had been carried out to ensure that the site was suitable for such use and would comply with the relevant regulations. The scheme had been designed to separate the access routes of the school from vehicle movements from the main development. There would also be highway safety improvements to ensure this.

The housing offer complied with policy with 30% affordable housing. Officers considered that this offer was acceptable given the plans to delivery a new schools as well given the viability of the scheme.

Mr Murrell showed the Committee a wide range of views of the proposal from the surrounds including the impact on the setting of the Tower Bridge and the World Heritage Site. Members were advised of the views of English Heritage who considered that the proposal could cause harm to the setting of the Tower Bridge and that this needed to weighed against the public benefits.

Adam Williams gave a detailed presentation on the amenity impact of the scheme on the surrounding properties and also the proposed school. On balance, Officers considered that, despite the minor losses, the properties would generally continue to receive adequate levels of light. He also explained the views of Transport for London (TfL) and Highways regarding congestion in the vicinity. The applicant considered that the car parking plans were necessary for viable reasons, which Officers considered to be

acceptable given the benefits of the scheme. He also explained the plans to minimise the construction impact and to achieve acceptable levels of noise insulation within the development to be secured by condition.

Finally, Officers explained the s106 agreement drawing particular attention to a letter from TfL (submitted on the day of the Committee) further requesting that contributions be allocated to improvements to Shadwell DLR station. The letter highlighted that London Plan Policy prioritises transport mitigation over other mitigation. However, Officers were recommending that this funding should be directed to health care facilities given the needs in this area. Officers explained the reasons for their recommendation as assessed by the Council's Planning Contributions Overview Panel and TfL's reasons for their request.

Overall, Officers recognised the issues with the scheme. However, considered that, on balance, the merits of the scheme outweighed the impacts. Therefore, the scheme should be granted permission.

Following the presentations, some Members expressed concern over the length of the presentation and Officers explained that this was a complex case that required a detailed presentation.

The Committee asked questions about: the impact on the heritage assets, the scale and height of the proposal; the impact from the construction activity on residents (given the potential for the disturbance to last many years).

Members also asked about the s106 contributions, particularly the plans to mitigate the transport impact. There was some discussion about the need to relocate the contributions to meet the TfL request for transport given the scale of the development.

Questions were also asked about the new school given the site constraints and the proximity to a busy highway, the impact on parking and the possibility of conditioning the car parking spaces to prevent the letting of unused spaces.

Officers responded to the questions. It was considered that the scheme would enhance the setting of the area due to the quality of the public realm improvements. For example, it would add value to the Tobacco Dock/Pennington Street Warehouse area and could bring in more visitors and trade to the area. However, it would inevitable cause some harm to the longer views such as to the Tower Bridge – a detailed assessment of this being given in the report.

Officers noted the issues around the proposed school given that the site could only provide 40% of the external area. Whilst there were no similar schools in the Borough, the model was based on an established school in Chelsea. With careful management, it could successfully operate as showed by the testing. No specific air quality monitoring of the school plot itself had been carried out. However, the Environmental assessment assessed the air quality of the proposed school site.

Members might review the s106 proposals in view the comments around the DLR contributions. The sum for off site community facilities could possibly be used for community facilities within the development itself. It was possible to condition the car parking spaces to prevent the letting of spaces to non residents of the development.

Planning permission (PA/13/01276)

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

That planning permission (PA/13/01276) at Former News International Site, 1 Virginia Street, London, E98 1XY be **GRANTED** for a hybrid application (part outline/part detailed) comprising:

- (1) Outline submission for demolition of all buildings and structures on the site with the exception of the Pennington Street Warehouse and Times House and comprehensive mixed use development comprising a maximum of 221,924 sqm (GEA) (excluding basement) of floorspace.
- (2) Detailed submission for 82,596 sq m GEA of floorspace (excluding basement) in five buildings – the Pennington Street Warehouse, Times House and Building Plots A, B and C comprising residential (C3), office and flexible workspaces (B1), community and leisure uses (D1/D2), retail and food and drink uses (A1, A2, A3, A4, A5) together with car and cycle parking, associated landscaping and new public realm
Subject to
2. Any direction by The London Mayor
3. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the committee report.
4. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above acting within normal delegated authority.
5. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated authority to impose the conditions and informatives as set out in the Committee report and the Update report (or add or remove conditions acting within normal delegated authority) in relation to the planning permission.

Listed Building Consent Application (PA/13/01277)

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

1. That Listed Building Consent Application (PA/13/01277) at Former News International Site, 1 Virginia Street, London, E98 1XY be

GRANTED for works to the Grade II Listed Pennington Street Warehouse both internally and externally subject to

2. Any direction by The London Mayor
3. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated authority to impose the conditions and informatives (or add or remove conditions acting within normal delegated authority) in relation to the planning permission on the matters set in the report and the update report.

8. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

8.1 Indescon Court (Phase 2 site), 20 Millharbour (PA/13/00846 and PA/07/03282)

It was reported that this application had been withdrawn from the agenda by the applicant.

8.2 Block D, Professional Development Centre, English Street, London, E3 4TA (PA/13/02242)

Councillor Emma Jones replaced Councillor Peter Golds on the Committee for this item.

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

That the Committee resolve to REFER the application Block D, Professional Development Centre, English Street, London, E3 4TA (PA/13/02242) for the repair and refurbishment works to external store to include removal of existing non original windows and replacement with new external infill walls to the National Casework Unit with the recommendation that the Council would be minded to grant Listed Building Consent subject to conditions as set out in the Committee report.

PETE SMITH (DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MANAGER) - LAST MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE

The Chair reported that this would be last meeting of the Committee that Pete Smith (Development Committee Manager) would be attending as he would be leaving the Authority to take up another post at another Authority. The Committee thanked Mr Smith for his very valuable contributions and expertise in supporting the Committee and wished him well for the future.

The meeting ended at 10.00 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Helal Abbas
Strategic Development Committee