

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 5.30 P.M. ON MONDAY, 21 JULY 2014**

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

**Members Present:**

Councillor Sirajul Islam (Chair)  
Councillor Suluk Ahmed  
Councillor Mahbub Alam  
Councillor Amina Ali  
Councillor Julia Dockerill  
Councillor Amy Whitelock Gibbs  
Councillor Danny Hassell  
Councillor Md. Maium Miah  
Councillor Muhammad Ansar Mustaquim

**Other Councillors Present:**

Councillor Andrew Wood  
Councillor Shahed Ali (Cabinet Member for Clean and Green)  
Councillor Abdul Asad (Cabinet Member for Adult Services)

**Apologies:**

Lateness: Councillor Amy Whitelock Gibbs

**Officers Present:**

Paul Buckenham	(Development Control Manager, Development and Renewal)
Shay Bugler	(Strategic Applications Planner, Development and Renewal)
Robert Lancaster	(Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Alison Thomas	(Private Sector and Affordable Housing Manager, Development and Renewal)
Adam Williams	(Planning Officer, Development and Renewal)
Jerry Bell	(Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Richard Murrell	(Deputy Team Leader, Planning, Development and Renewal)
Amy Thompson	(Pre-Applications Team Leader, Development and Renewal)
Pat Watson	(Head of Building Development,

Fleur Francis	Resources) (Acting Team Leader - Planning, Directorate, Law Probity and Governance)
Zoe Folley	(Committee Officer, Directorate Law, Probity and Governance)

## **ORDER OF BUSINESS**

The Chair announced that it was hoped to conclude the meeting by 9pm to accommodate those observing Ramadan.

The order of business was changed at the meeting so that agenda item 8.4, Telehouse Far East, Sites 6 & 8, Oregon Drive, E14 2AA (PA/14/0074) was considered before item 8.3, 28 Ensign Street, London (PA/13/03068). The order of the remaining items remained unchanged. However, for ease of reference, the order of these minutes follow the agenda order.

### **1. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR FOR 2014/15**

It was proposed by Councillor Sirajul Islam and seconded by Councillor Amina Ali that Councillor Danny Hassell be elected Vice-Chair. Three Members voted in favour of this proposal.

It was proposed by Councillor Muhammad Ansar Mustaqim and seconded by Councillor Suluk Ahmed that Councillor Md. Maium Miah be elected Vice-Chair. Four Members voted in favour of this proposal.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That Councillor Md. Maium Miah be elected Vice-Chair of the Strategic Development Committee for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2014/2015

### **2. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made.

Councillor Md. Maium Miah declared an interest in agenda item 8.2, Land known as "Wood Wharf", Preston's Road, London, E14 9SF (PA/13/02966 AND PA/13/02967). This was because the Councillor had attended a presentation from the developers on the application with Officers present and was a ward Councillor for Canary Wharf.

Councillors Sirajul Islam declared an interest in agenda item 8.1, 100 Whitechapel road and land rear at Fieldgate Street & Vine Court (PA/13/3049). This was because the Councillor was a worshipper at the East London Mosque and a former member of Tower Hamlets Community Housing.

Councillors Sirajul Islam declared an interest in agenda 8.2, Land known as "Wood Wharf", Preston's Road, London, E14 9SF (PA/13/02966 AND PA/13/02967). This was because he had attended a presentation from the developers on the application with Officers present.

### **3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)**

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 15 May 2014 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 AND MEETING GUIDANCE**

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

### **6. STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE, QUORUM, MEMBERSHIP AND DATES OF MEETINGS**

**RESOLVED:**

That the Strategic Development Committee's Terms of Reference, Quorum, Membership and Dates of future meetings as set out in Appendices 1, 2 and 3 to the Committee report be noted.

### **7. DEFERRED ITEMS**

No items.

## **8. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION**

### **8.1 100 Whitechapel road and land rear at Fieldgate Street & Vine Court (PA/13/3049)**

Update Report tabled.

Paul Buckenham (Development Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the application at 100 Whitechapel road and land to the rear at Fieldgate Street & Vine Court. The Committee previously considered the application at its April 2014 meeting where, contrary to the Officer recommendation to refuse permission, the Committee were minded to grant permission. Since that time, the Committee Membership had changed following Annual Council and it was now required to consider the application afresh.

A number of issues had been resolved since the previous Committee meeting. However Officers were still recommending a refusal due to the nature of the concerns as detailed in the Committee report.

The Chair invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

Glenda Parkes spoke in support of the proposal highlighting the level of support for the scheme from residents, local business amongst other people and bodies. There were few representations in objection to the scheme. She highlighted the benefits of the scheme including: new jobs, the pedestrian link to improve permeability, new housing - a number with wheelchair access and the replacement of the unsightly vehicle workshop amongst other features. There had been no objections from the neighboring Tower House that would increase in value as a result of the proposal. Any development of the site would present challenges given the 'landlocked' nature of the site. The scheme generally complied with the sunlight and daylight requirements. The overall benefits of the scheme outweighed these impacts.

Councillor Shahed Ali spoke in support as a ward Councillor and a longstanding resident of the area. The area was of mixed character with commercial uses. He outlined the merits of the proposals in terms of the new link to improve permeability, the public realm improvements, the proposed new jobs and additional affordable housing. He considered that the housing mix was appropriate for the site with the level of smaller units. The community benefits far outweighed the concerns. The Mosque offered a range of facilities and services open to all. Everyone would therefore benefit from the expansion of the Mosque.

Councillor Abdal Asad also spoke in support of the scheme as a ward Councillor. He explained the benefits for the Tower House development. He welcomed the plans to improve permeability and the expansion of the Mosque. The previous Committee in April 2014 were minded to approve the

scheme. He recommended that the Committee should also approve the scheme.

Shay Bugler (Planning Officer) gave a detailed presentation of the application highlighting the site location, the adjoining Conservation Areas, the relationship of the scheme with the nearby Tower House development, the height in relation to the surrounding buildings and the public transport rating for the site. He advised the Committee of the outcome of the public consultation on the scheme.

The principles of redevelopment of the site and the proposed mix of land uses are supported by Development plan policies. However, there were a number of major concerns. Since the April 2014 meeting, five of the previous reasons for refusal had been addressed. However, four major concerns remained that go to the heart of the design of the scheme. Mr Bugler listed these concerns regarding: unsatisfactory housing mix in relation to policy, the impact of the development on the setting of the Conservation Areas and townscape generally, poor quality of the accommodation in terms of single aspect flats, sense of enclosure, privacy and daylight and the impact on the amenity of the occupants and neighbours of adjoining properties. In some cases, the impact was very significant and harmful, particularly for properties on Whitechapel Road and Tower House development. The lack of objections from Tower House residents could be attributed to the transient population as most of the units were privately rented.

Officers were confident that the four reasons for refusal as set out in the report could be successfully defended on appeal.

In response, Members considered that the pedestrian link would provide an important link from Fieldgate Street to Whitechapel Road. It was also commented that the policies in the Whitechapel Masterplan SPD supported taller buildings in the area and there were other tall buildings in the surrounding area. Members also welcomed the provision of additional housing. Some therefore considered that the scheme should be considered favourable in this context.

In response, Officers considered that that the height of the scheme was out of keeping with the buildings in the nearby Conservation Area that were mainly lower rise buildings. The Whitechapel Masterplan SPD does not encourage tall buildings in this location and the nearest tall building location set out in the Core Strategy is centred mainly around the Aldgate area. The site did not fall in an area identified in the vision for high density building. The Whitechapel hospital development was a special case, where the need to accommodate much needed primary and secondary health care provision on a relatively small, urban site required a taller building.

In response to further questions, it was considered that the sunlight and daylight failings were very significant, even taking account of the urban context where some loss could be expected. The sunlight/daylight assessment had been independently validated.

The scheme, if granted, would be car free subject to the operation of the Council's parking permit transfer scheme. A condition could also be attached to address the issues around ground born noise subject to review and approval by LBTH Environmental Health.

In relation to the Council's housing waiting list, it was reported that there was a particular need in the Borough for family sized affordable units, based on the housing needs assessments. The policy reflected this. However the policy allowed for a higher percentage of smaller private units for viability purposes and to meet need.

Officers confirmed that they had no objection in principle to the development of the site, but that reasons for refusal could be substantiated. The report sets out in detail the proposed housing mix and the issues with this. Mr Buckenham drew attention to the affordable housing offer of 50 flats, of which 36 would be affordable rent, out of a total of 221 flats.

On a show of hands, with 2 voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse, the Committee resolved not to accept the Officer recommendation to refuse planning permission and a motion was then put to grant permission for the application.

On a vote of 6 in favour to grant the application and 2 against the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission (PA/13/3049) at 100 Whitechapel road and land rear at Fieldgate Street & Vine Court be **GRANTED** for the demolition of existing vehicle workshop and car showroom; erection of a residential development comprising a total of 221 dwellings (comprising 46 studios; 92 x 1 bed; 52 x 2 bed; 20 x 3 bed; 11 x 4 bed) in an 18 storey building facing Fieldgate Street; and 2 buildings ranging in height from 8-12 storey building facing Whitechapel Road and Vine Court, provision of ground floor retail and restaurant spaces (Class A1 and A3), café (A3); 274.9 sqm extension to the prayer hall at the East London Mosque and provision of pedestrian link between Fieldgate Street and Whitechapel Road, extension to existing basement to provide 20 disabled car parking spaces, motorcycle spaces, 360 bicycle parking spaces and bin storage in basement, associated landscape and public realm works Subject to:
  2. Any Direction by the London Mayor.
  3. The prior completion of a legal agreement that the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to negotiate and complete.
  4. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to impose conditions and informatives on the planning permission, as necessary.

Councillor Amy Whitelock Gibbs could not vote on this item having not been present at the start of the item.

In giving reasons for their decision, the Committee considered that the scheme would provide much needed family sized housing in Whitechapel that would help families on the housing waiting list. The provision of smaller units was also welcomed given the number of smaller families and single people also in need of accommodation in the area. These benefits outweighed the concerns over the quality of the accommodation (reason 4.5 of the proposed reasons for refusal) due to the fact that the site was a landlocked site.

Whilst having regard to the concerns about the scale, form, height, appearance and layout of the scheme on the setting of the area (reason 4.3 of the report), the Committee commented that that the site fell within the boundary of the Whitechapel Vision Masterplan SPD area. This supported taller buildings in the area.

It was also considered that the standards required in terms of amenity (daylight, sunlight, privacy etc. (reasons 4.5) could not reasonably be achieved due to the confined nature of the site. In view of these issues, there needed to be some flexibility in assessing the sunlight and daylight impacts and other amenity impacts.

Furthermore, it was considered that benefits of the scheme outweighed the impact on amenity. It was also noted there had been no objections from the neighbouring Tower House.

## **8.2 Land known as "Wood Wharf", Preston's Road, London, E14 9SF (PA/13/02966 AND PA/13/02967)**

Update Report tabled.

Paul Buckenham (Development Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the application and the update report regarding the Wood Wharf site.

The Chair then invited registered speakers to address the Committee.

The Committee heard from Richard Gosling from the 'Save Our Water' group. Residents welcomed the development of the site but had concerns about the impact of the plot F1 building, one of the tallest buildings, on the nearby residents and the plot B2 development.

Mr Gosling considered that the F1 building would have an oppressive appearance, be out of keeping with the area and would overlook residential properties. There had been no consultation with residents regarding the plans. The plot B2 building, between Cartier Circle and the Blackwall Basin, would harm views to the O2 building and impact on the dock heritage and was of poor design. The application should be reviewed in light of these concerns.

Councillor Andrew Wood spoke raising objections. He stressed the need for new schools, health facilities to be physically delivered in view of the growing population. This should be mandatory with no option of financial contribution in the event that such facilities could not be provided. He questioned whether the child yield predictions were realistic. There was a lack of units for middle income residents and information about the impact on the docks.

Jason Syrett spoke in support. He stressed the strategic importance of the scheme in providing a large number of high quality housing with infrastructure. He listed the key features of the scheme, based on plans drawn up with the Council and key agencies and public consultation.

Howard Dawber spoke in support. There had been few objections to the scheme. There would be 25% affordable housing on site including family sized units at the Council's preferred levels. There would also be a new primary school with places for all children from the new development, amongst other new community facilities and open space. The capacity of the GP's surgeries would be in excess of the scheme's population. The F1 site should have little impact on the residential properties due to the generous separation distance and the slender design. The B2 building would provide an important landmark without any undue problems.

Robert Lancaster (Planning Officer) presented the report and update to Members. He reassured Members about the credibility of child yield predications using the Council's adopted formulae. Other assessments were less accurate. The intermediate units were focused towards smaller units due to the challenges around the affordability of larger intermediate units in this high value area.

Mr Lancaster explained the site location and referred to the control documents for this outline planning permission. He also explained the site designation, the planning history, the extant scheme, the height of the proposed buildings, the effect on the dock heritage and the outcome of the consultation. He drew attention to the indicative scheme, submitted alongside this scheme to show how the scheme might be delivered in accordance with the control documents.

The scheme would provide 25% affordable housing by habitable room with a review mechanism that might result in a financial contribution equivalent to an uplift of 15% additional housing by habitable room. It was considered that the public benefits of the scheme outweighed the less than substantial harm to the setting of the heritage assets. The impact on amenity was acceptable. There were contributions towards transport and highway improvements works amongst other matters.

Officers were recommending the application for approval.

In response to Members questions about the affordable housing, it was considered that the scheme delivered the highest percentage of affordable



housing that could be secured, taking into account the costs of developing the site, as shown by the viability assessment. The requirement for a review mechanism of the affordable housing would be written into the legal agreement.

With the permission of the Chair, the Committee heard from one of the supporting speakers again regarding the impact on the two buildings (highlighted by the speaker in objection). The details plans for these buildings would be developed in accordance with the control documents and submitted for approval as a reserved matter.

Alison Thomas (Strategy Sustainability and Regeneration LBTH), reemphasised the points about the low level of larger intermediate units in terms of their affordability for prospective occupants. Further consideration could be given to improving the affordability of such units.

It was intended that the health care facilities would have a 25 year lease as requested by the health care providers and it would be open for them to extend this should they wish to do so.

There were measures to ensure the continued provision of an Idea Store, either at the current location in Canary Wharf or the new location. In response to questions about the new primary school, Pat Watson (Head of Building Development, LBTH) outlined the options available in terms of school type. All options would be considered in accordance with the delivery timetable.

The Chair expressed a desire to see the physical delivery of the primary school, health facility and leisure facility as opposed to additional financial contributions. However, if not at all possible, the option of financial contribution should still be retained.

On a vote of 8 in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission PA/13/02966 at Land known as "Wood Wharf", Preston's Road, London, E14 9SF be **GRANTED** for Outline application (all matters reserved) for mixed-use redevelopment of the site known as "Wood Wharf" Subject to:
2. Any direction/call-in by The London Mayor.
3. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the Committee report. The figures provide a guide to the likely quanta of obligations based on the Indicative Scheme. The transport, streetscene and heritage related - contributions were fixed.
4. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal and the Service Head – Legal Services are delegated power to negotiate and complete the legal agreement indicated above acting within normal delegated authority.

5. 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 Committee report and as amended in the Update Report.
6. Any other informative(s) considered necessary by the Corporate Director Development & Renewal.
7. That, if within 6 months of the date of this committee the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to refuse planning permission.

On a vote of 8 in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That Listed Building Consent PA/13/02967 at Land known as "Wood Wharf", Preston's Road, London, E14 9SF be **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the Committee report.

The meeting adjourned at 7:35pm for 15 minutes.

Councillor Md Maium Miah left the meeting at 7:35pm.

### **8.3 28 Ensign Street, London (PA/13/03068)**

Update Report tabled.

Paul Buckenham (Development Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the application and the update report.

Adam Williams (Planning Officer) gave a presentation on the scheme explaining the site location, the proximity to the Conservation Area, the existing use, the points raised in support and objection during the local consultation. The site lay in the Central Activities Zone location that supported this type of scheme on the site. The proposed land use complied with policy. The scheme would deliver affordable housing, assessed by the independent viability testing as the maximum that could be secured. The height (as amended following consultation) and appearance responded well to the surrounding area with features to secure this. There were measures, such as privacy screening, to protect amenity in view of the separation distances. Whilst there would be some impact on amenity given the urban setting, this did not warrant refusal. A construction management plan would be secured as a condition to take into account the collective impact of construction works from other developments in the area. Contributions had been secured in line with policy although the full contribution requested by TFL towards the cycle hire scheme was not viable and a reduced amount was recommended. The scheme would be car free.

In response to questions, it could be requested that a minimum of seven wheelchair adaptable units were delivered.

The crossing would be provided as part of the London Dock scheme, prior to the opening of the new secondary school, which would improve pedestrian safety and movement in the surrounding area.

It was confirmed that the family affordable houses would have separate living and dining areas. There would be measures to prevent conflict between construction activity and school opening hours and the free flow of the highway.

On a unanimous vote, the Committee agreed to amend the hours of construction to start at 09:00 Saturday to minimise disruption to residents in view of the proximity of the proposal to residential properties.

On a vote of 7 in favour and 1 against, the Committee **RESOLVED**:

1. That planning permission (PA/13/03068) at 28 Ensign Street, London (PA/13/03068) be **GRANTED** for the demolition of existing building and erection of a new part 4, 6 and 14 storey building, (ground plus 14 storeys) to provide 65 residential units (Use Class C3); flexible commercial use of part of the ground floor for either Class A1/A2/B1 use; and other landscaping and highways works incidental to the application (amended application) Subject to:
  2. Any direction/call-in by The London Mayor.
  3. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the report.
  4. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal and the Service Head (Legal Services) are delegated power to negotiate and complete the legal agreement indicated above acting within normal delegated authority.
  5. 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 committee report and the amendment agreed at the meeting that the hours of construction be amendment to start at 09:00 Saturday.

#### 8.4 Telehouse Far East, Sites 6 & 8, Oregano Drive, E14 2AA (PA/14/0074)

Update Report tabled.

Paul Buckenham (Development Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the application at the Telehouse Far East, Sites 6 & 8, Oregano Drive.

Shay Bugler (Planning Officer) presented the application and the update report. The proposal would provide an additional data centre to Telehouse Campus and would provide a supporting role to the Blackwall Local Office Location. It was envisaged that the application would provide 150 full time jobs. Therefore, in land use terms, the application complied with policy.

It was considered that the height of the scheme was acceptable with a good quality design, following consultation with design and conservation officers on these matters. There were conditions requiring details of the lighting, boundary treatments and materials to be submitted for approval.

The proposal would preserve the listed wall and its setting and the Conservation Area without causing any undue impact on the amenity of the surrounding properties.

Appropriate Planning obligations would be secured to ensure the proposal was mitigated against and there was no undue pressure on infrastructure.

In response to questions about security, it was confirmed that details of such plans would be secured via condition. The plans included the re-routing of the cycle superhighway on Sorrell Lane to facilitate security.

The developer would exercise best endeavours to ensure that 20% of the construction phase workforce would be local residents of Tower Hamlets. LBTH Officers would work with the Employment Team to assist this.

It was clarified that the following sentence should be removed from paragraph 8.92 of the Committee report 'A financial contribution of £17,889 towards monitoring the Section 106 Agreement'.

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

1. That planning permission (PA/14/0074) at Telehouse Far East, Sites 6 & 8, Oregano Drive, E14 2AA be **GRANTED** for the redevelopment of the site for the erection of a 10 storey data centre building of 66m in height comprising approximately 24,370sqm of floor space including provision of roof top plant and satellite dish at site known as Site 6; reconfiguration of loading bay area to North building; new first floor bridge link to existing North building; erection of a 12 storey office development 65m in height comprising approximately 13,283m<sup>2</sup> of floor space known as Site 8; provision of 29 car and 128 cycle parking; re-routing of existing cycle path on Sorrel Lane 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 and complete the legal agreement indicated above acting within normal delegated authority.
5. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated authority to recommend the imposition of conditions, variation and informatives in relation to the matters set out in the Committee report.

#### **8.5 Former Glaucus Works (also known as Leven Wharf), Leven Road, E14 0LP (PA/13/03053)**

Update Report tabled.

Paul Buckenham (Development Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the application.

Gareth Gwynne (Planning Officer) gave a presentation on the application, explaining the site in the context of the surrounding area. No representations had been received in response to the local consultation. The main planning issues for consideration concerned: the land use, design, the housing and affordable housing mix, the issues around the unlisted gasworks, impact on amenity, the new amenity space and the planning obligations. Mr Gwynne addressed these issues and it was considered that the scheme was acceptable on these grounds without any undue impact.

In response to Members, it was confirmed that the scheme would be subject to the operation of the Council's permit transfer scheme. There would be parking spaces in the basement of the proposed development to accommodate these occupant's vehicles. It was confirmed that the proposed D1 units could be used for community uses. The education contributions would be pooled in accordance with the normal process and allocated based on need. Schemes coming forward for the wider site could include plans for a new school in accordance with the site designations in the Council's Core Strategy.

A Member questioned whether a free cash point could be provided as part of the scheme. Officers suggested that an informative could be added to the application to reflect this request.

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

1. That planning permission (PA/13/03053) Former Glaucus Works (also known as Leven Wharf), Leven Road, E14 0LP be **GRANTED** for the

demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site to provide a part 6, part 9 storey mixed use building with basement parking to provide 291sqm of commercial space (A1/A2/A3/A4, B1(a), D1 Use Classes) together with 126 residential units with associated landscaping, children's play facilities and public riverside walkway  
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 and complete the legal agreement indicated above acting within normal delegated authority.
5. 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 Committee report and as amended in the update report.
6. Any other conditions(s)/ informatives considered necessary by the Corporate Director Development & Renewal.
7. That, if within 3 months of the date of this committee the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to refuse planning permission.

**8.6 Archway House, 1 Muirfield Crescent and 47 Millharbour, London, E14 9SZ (PA/14/00604)**

This item was deferred for consideration at the next meeting of Committee on 14<sup>th</sup> August 2014 due to time constraints.

The meeting ended at 9.15 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Sirajul Islam  
Strategic Development Committee