

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 16 DECEMBER 2015**

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

**Members Present:**

Councillor Marc Francis (Chair)

Councillor Shiria Khatun

(Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for  
Community Safety)

Councillor Sabina Akhtar

Councillor Rajib Ahmed

Councillor Chris Chapman

Councillor Mahbub Alam (Substitute for Councillor Suluk Ahmed)

Councillor Peter Golds (Substitute for Councillor Chris Chapman Items 5.1-5.3)

Councillor Shah Alam (Substitute for Councillor Gulam Kibria Choudhury)

**Other Councillors Present:**

None.

**Apologies:**

Councillor Suluk Ahmed

Councillor Gulam Kibria Choudhury

**Officers Present:**

Jerry Bell

– (East Area Manager, Planning  
Services, Development and Renewal)

Gillian Dawson

– (Team Leader, Legal Services, Law,  
Probity and Governance)

Jane Jin

– (Team Leader, Planning Services  
Development and Renewal)

Nasser Farooq

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

Piotr Lanoszka

– (Planning Officer, Development and  
Renewal)

Adam Williams

– (Planning Officer, Development and  
Renewal)

Killian Harrington

– (Planning Officer, Development and  
Renewal)

Zoe Folley

– (Committee Officer, Directorate Law,  
Probity and Governance)

## 1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Councillor Peter Golds declared a personal interest in agenda item 5.2 Site south west of the junction of Glenworth Avenue and Saunders Ness Road, E14 3EB (PA/15/00360) as he had commented on the principal of the proposal but had reserved judgement on the material planning matters until consideration at this Committee meeting. He also declared a personal interest in agenda item 5.3 Wickham House, 69-89 Mile End Road and 10 Cleveland Way, London, E1 (PA/14/03547) as he had previously expressed support for the Spiegelhalter's building, however this had not affected his view of the application.

Councillor Rajib Ahmed declared a personal interest in the agenda items as he had received representations from interested parties and in respect of 6.1 Balfron Tower, 7 St Leonards Road, London, E14 0QR (PA/15/02554 & PA/15/02555) as the application was in his ward.

Councillor Sabina Akhtar declared a personal interest in agenda items 5.2 Site south west of the junction of Glenworth Avenue and Saunders Ness Road, E14 3EB (PA/15/00360), 5.3 Wickham House, 69-89 Mile End Road and 10 Cleveland Way, London, E1 (PA/14/03547) and 6.1 Balfron Tower, 7 St Leonards Road, London, E14 0QR (PA/15/02554 & PA/15/02555) as she had received representations from interested parties.

Councillor Mahbub Alam declared a personal interest in agenda items 5.2 Site south west of the junction of Glenworth Avenue and Saunders Ness Road, E14 3EB (PA/15/00360) and 6.3 Wickham House, 69-89 Mile End Road and 10 Cleveland Way, London, E1 (PA/14/03547) as he had received representations from interested parties and had attended events at the Waterlily.

Councillor Shiria Khatun declared a prejudicial interest in agenda item 6.2 Attlee House, Sunley House, Profumo House and College East, 10 Gunthorpe Street, London (PA/15/02156) as she worked for Toynbee Hall affected by the application. She announced that she would be leaving the meeting for the consideration of this item.

Councillor Marc Francis declared a personal interest in agenda items 5.2 Site south west of the junction of Glenworth Avenue and Saunders Ness Road, E14 3EB (PA/15/00360), 6.1, Balfron Tower, 7 St Leonards Road, London, E14 0QR (PA/15/02554 & PA/15/02555) and 6.3 Our Lady's Primary School, Copenhagen Place, Limehouse, London E14 7DA (PA/15/02148) as he had received representations from interested parties.

## 2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

The Committee **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 25 November 2015 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 and meeting guidance.

## 5. DEFERRED ITEMS

### 5.1 Vic Johnson House Centre, 74 Armagh Road, London, E3 2HT (PA/15/01601)

Update report tabled

**Councillor Shiria Khatun (Chair) for this item.**

Jerry Bell (Applications Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the application for the part demolition, part refurbishment, part new build (extension) to total 60 age restricted apartments (over 55s) sheltered housing scheme.

At last meeting of the Committee, Members were minded to refuse this application for a number of reasons. These were:

- Loss of amenity space in view of proposed increase in units and the loss of the communal lounge that would not be replaced like for like

- Overdevelopment of the site.
- Bulk and size of the proposal that would be out of character with the surrounding area.
- Impact on the amenity of the existing residents of the development in terms of noise and disruption during the construction phase.

In accordance with the Development Procedure Rules, the item was deferred to enable the Officers to prepare the supplemental report now before Members providing commentary on the proposed reasons and to set out detailed reasons for refusal.

Jane Jin (Team Leader, Planning Services, Development and Renewal) presented the detailed report reminding Members of the site location and the main issues for consideration. In terms of the first suggested reason, it was reported that whilst there would be a reduction in quantum of external communal space, it would be of a much better quality and be a vast improvement of what was currently there. It was also noted that the quality and quantity of internal space would increase.

In view of this, it was considered that the level of community space would be adequate for the development and that a reason on this ground would be difficult to defend at appeal.

In terms of the seconded reason – overdevelopment, whilst the London Plan density range did not apply to specific needs housing, the plans complied with the suggested density range in the plan. Furthermore, in qualitative terms, the scheme bore no symptoms of overdevelopment.

Regarding scale and bulk, it was considered that given the mixed character of the area and comparative heights, the scheme would fit in with the area.

In relation to the impact on residents, the applicant had given a firm commitment to provide mitigation and so had Gateway. This goes beyond what was normally required for construction management plans. Officers were satisfied that the measures could be secured by conditions.

Accordingly, Officers remained of the view that the scheme should be granted permission. However, if Members were minded to refuse the application, Officers were recommending the reasons in the report based on the issues raised at the last meeting by Members.

In response to a question about overdevelopment (given the impact on amenity space and increase in units), Officers reminded Members that, whilst there were no minimum standards in policy for amenity space in sheltered housing, if this were general housing, it would meet the policy standards

On a vote of 0 in favour of the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission, 5 against and 1 abstention, the Committee did not agree the recommendation.

Accordingly, Councillor Rajib Ahmed proposed and Councillor Peter Golds seconded a motion that the planning permission be **REFUSED** (for the reasons set out in the Committee report dated 16<sup>th</sup> December 2015) and on a unanimous vote, it was **RESOLVED**:

That planning permission at Vic Johnson House Centre, 74 Armagh Road, London, E3 2HT (PA/15/01601) be **REFUSED** for the part demolition, part refurbishment, part new build (extension) to total 60 age restricted apartments (over 55s) sheltered housing scheme, including new communal areas (lounge, function room, hair salon and managers office), and associated landscape gardens. The proposed use remains as existing. The scheme is on part 2, part 3 and part 4 storeys for the following reasons set out in paragraph 5.2 the Committee report dated 16<sup>th</sup> December 2015.

The proposed development, by way of the design, scale and bulk would appear as a visually incongruous and bulky building within the surrounding streetscene and would harm the visual amenity of the local area. The development would be contrary to policy DM24 of the Managing Development Document (2013), SP10 of the Core Strategy (2010) and policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2015).

The proposed development by reason of its excessive scale and bulk results in the overdevelopment of the site and this leads to an inappropriate loss of a proportion of the communal amenity space and a pro-rata loss of indoor communal lounge space. This would leads to an unsatisfactory form of development which is contrary to policies DM4 and DM5 of the Managing Development (2013), SP02 of the Core Strategy (2015) and policies 3.1, 3.4 and 3.5 of the London Plan (2015)

The proposed development has not adequately addressed how the construction phase would not lead to substantial impact on the health and welfare of the existing residents. The development would therefore be contrary to SP10 of the Core Strategy (2010) and DM25 of the Managing Development Document (2013) which seek to protect amenity for future and existing residents.

## **5.2 Site south west of the junction of Glenworth Avenue and Saunders Ness Road, E14 3EB (PA/15/00360)**

### **Councillor Marc Francis (Chair) for the remaining items of business**

Update report tabled.

Jerry Bell (Applications Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the item for the construction of a 1,705 GIA sq. m. 3-storey primary school to accommodate 280 pupils and approximately 30 staff. At the last meeting of the Committee, Members deferred the application for a site visit to inspect the site and assess the impact of the proposal.

Jane Jin (Team Leader, Planning Services, Development and Renewal) presented the report explaining the site location and the surrounds as well as the proposed start and end hours for the new school, outside those for the nearby St Luke's School.

It was noted that the site visit took place earlier in the week. At which, the impact on the highway from the school run (drop - off) from St Luke's School was observed noting that that it only took a matter of minutes. Due to this as well as the staggered start times, it was considered that impact on the highway would be minimal

It was also noted that further representations had been received about the location of the refuse storage site in terms of proximity to habitable rooms. To address this, residents had suggested alternative locations for the store. However, given the issues with these options, Officers continued to favour the recommended option given the mitigation measures and the conditions.

In response to questions about the proposed refuse location, it was stressed that the proposed mitigation including screening should protect visual amenity and ensure that there would be no undue impact on residential amenity.

On the question of school size and pupil numbers, it was noted that this was regulated by the Department for Education guidance and they had raised no objections to the scheme. The planning regime was silent on this issue. Nevertheless, Planning considered that there would be adequate space for the 280 pupils. The scheme had been designed to accommodate such numbers.

It was also confirmed that there was a presumption in favour of education development in national policy and this carried significant weight. With this in mind, Officers have carefully assessed the issues and considered that there were no material issues that outweighed the presumption in favour.

Officers also answered questions about the highway impact from the scheme. It was confirmed that Officers had assessed the traffic impact and the measures in the travel plan and considered that the impact on the highway would be acceptable.

On a vote of 3 in favour 0 against and 4 abstentions, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission be **GRANTED** at Site south west of the junction of Glenworth Avenue and Saunders Ness Road, E14 3EB for the construction of a 1,705 GIA sq. m. 3-storey primary school to accommodate 280 pupils and approximately 30 staff (PA/15/00360) subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Committee report and the update report.

**5.3 Wickham House, 69-89 Mile End Road and 10 Cleveland Way, London, E1 (PA/14/03547)**

Update report tabled.

Jerry Bell (Applications Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the item for the refurbishment of the former Wickham's department store. At the last meeting of the Committee, Members deferred the application for a site visit that took place earlier in the week to enable Members to inspect the site and better understand the impact of the proposal. At which, a number of issues were raised and responses to these questions were set out in the update report, regarding amongst other matters the impact of the roof extension and the proposed refuse collections arrangements.

Piotr Lanoszka, (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal) presented the detailed report highlighting the site location, the proposed layout, the proposed uses and the amendments to the plans. Responding to the issues raised at the site visit, he showed views of the proposed roof extension from the surrounding area, showing that it would be subservient to the former department store. In relation to waste collection, it was confirmed that this would remain as per the existing arrangements. Officers considered that the on street collection service would have little impact on the highway.

In view of the merits of the scheme, Officers were recommending that it was granted planning permission.

In response to questions from Members, it was explained that it would be very difficult to retain the existing banqueting hall as part of scheme. This would require far reaching changes such as unplanned physical changes to the building. Furthermore, whilst it was proposed to include a D2 use in the basement area, due to the nature of this environment (i.e. lack of windows) it was questionable whether it could operate from this unit. Members needed to weigh up the merits of retaining the banqueting hall against the merits of this scheme. The Waterlily facility, (whilst under previous management), had an extensive enforcement history including prosecutions that can be given some weight. This application should help address these problems

As explained above, it was recommended that the current waste collection arrangements be retained. Images were displayed showing that these could be successfully accommodated within the scheme. Consideration had been given to the suggestion that the collection take place within the building as set out in the update. However, it was found that, due to the nature of the site, this would require significant alterations.

Whilst there would be some impact on the tower, its significance would be protected. Historic England and the Victorian Society had withdrawn their objections to the scheme. The Council's Conservation Officer had looked carefully at the scheme and was satisfied with the plans in terms of both the enhancements to the external façade and the internal changes recognising their value. Overall there would be a net gain in heritage terms

It was noted that the scheme could accommodate a range of business uses and that the Council could go no further than specify the use class. It could not specify the end user. However, given the factors in favour of creating a co worker hub for SME business on the site, it was considered that the developers should naturally be encouraged to establish the SME type of business at the development. The applicant had also undertaken to provide a number of units as affordable workspaces.

Officers also explained the current position regarding Microsoft's use of the premises.

On a vote of 3 in favour 3 against and 1 abstention with the Chair casting a second vote in favour of the scheme, the Committee **RESOLVED**:

1. That planning permission be **GRANTED** at Wickham House, 69-89 Mile End Road and 10 Cleveland Way, London, E1 (PA/14/03547) for the refurbishment of former Wickham's department store comprising: retention of facade of former Spiegelhalter's shop at 81 Mile End Road to provide new entrance, change of use of second floor to office (Use Class B1), change of use of ground and basement floors to a flexible retail/leisure use (Use Class A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1/D2) and erection of roof extensions at third and fourth storey levels to provide 1,481sqm (GIA) of additional office space (Use Class B1); as well as reconfiguration of internal layout, restoration of external features and other associated works subject to:
2. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the Committee report.
3. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above. If within three months of the resolution the legal agreement has not been completed, the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to refuse planning permission.
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 Committee report.

## 6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

### 6.1 Balfroon Tower, 7 St Leonards Road, London, E14 0QR (PA/15/02554, PA/15/02555)

Jerry Bell (Applications Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the item for external and internal physical alterations and refurbishment works to Balfroon Tower.

The Chair then invited registered speakers to address the meeting.



Glenn McMahon and Vanessa Crawford (local residents) spoke in opposition to the application. They objected to the impact on the social housing given the proposed changes to the layout, tenure and affordability of the units. There was a real need for social housing and family housing given the housing waiting list. They also objected to the loss of historic features. There was also a lack of consultation with occupants on the plans affecting the building.

The speakers then responded to questions of clarification about the consultation and the costs of the scheme to leaseholders. The Chair reminded Members that the cost to leaseholders were not a planning issue and that Members must only consider the planning issues. Furthermore, the housing tenure of Balfron Tower had never been controlled under the planning regime so this was also not a material planning matter.

Neal Hunt (Poplar HARCA) and Richard Coleman (Heritage Advisor) spoke in support of the scheme. They referred to the wider estate regeneration scheme. They also referred to the terms of the transfer agreement in relation to Balfron Tower and the developer's commitment to providing good quality social housing. Every effort had been made to preserve the heritage value of the tower. The changes would only affect the least valuable parts of the building. Indeed Historic England were supportive of the amended scheme. The changes were necessary to bring the building up to modern standards including the replacement windows.

The speakers then responded to questions of clarification from Members, explaining the nature of the repair work, the responses from Historic England and the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Society to the changes, the fire escape plans and the internal changes to facilitate this. They also answered questions about the replacement tiles, the security measures to prevent anti social behaviour and the landscaping plans. This included the introduction of softer landscaping.

The speakers also noted that concern had been expressed at the proposed open plan layout for certain units. It was felt that the proposed layout would maximise use of the flats and overall, it would not be that dissimilar to the existing layout and would maintain the spirit of the Goldfinger design.

Officers reminded Members that service charges and management issues were not relevant planning matters. Members must only consider the material planning issues relating to the physical changes to the site.

Nasser Farooq, (Team Leader Planning Services, Development and Renewal) presented the report explaining the site and surrounds, the historic importance of the building on relisting. Consultation had been carried out on the scheme and the issues raised were summarised in the Committee report and the presentation slide. This included a summary of the different responses of the historic groups to the proposals.

Members were advised of the proposed changes, particularly the options considered and discounted for the replacement windows and the reasons for this. They also noted images of the proposed external alterations, the plans to

retain heritage flats, the internal changes and the conditions ensuring the reuse of the quarry floor tiles.

Members also noted the landscaping improvements, the condition on CCTV, mindful of the heritage value of the building.

It was also reported that a request had been made to the Secretary of State to call in this application. As such, the Council would need to wait for direction from the Secretary of State prior to issuing any decision

Given the benefits of scheme, Officers were recommending that it be granted planning permission and listed building consent.

In response to Members questions, it was confirmed that the overall number of housing units would remain the same under the application. Given the management arrangements, it was expected that this should include the provision of CCTV. A number of cycle spaces would be provided on a voluntary basis. Steps would be taken to ensure the replacement tiles matched those that had been replaced, noting they were one of the least valuable elements to the listing. However, they would be thicker and more durable and be bigger. It was also confirmed that the new windows, in contrast with the existing windows, would be fit for purpose. They would also reflect the spirit of the original architecture.

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

That the planning permission be **GRANTED** at Balfron Tower, 7 St Leonards Road, London, E14 0QR for external and internal physical alterations and refurbishment works to Balfron Tower (PA/15/02554) subject to the conditions and informatives in the Committee report.

That the Listed Building Consent be **GRANTED** at Balfron Tower, 7 St Leonards Road, London, E14 0QR (PA/15/02555) subject to the conditions and informatives in the Committee report.

## **6.2 Attlee House, Sunley House, Profumo House and College East, 10 Gunthorpe Street, London (PA/15/02156)**

Jerry Bell (Applications Manager, Development and Renewal) introduced the item for the demolition of Attlee House, Sunley House and College East and the provision of a new mix used development.

Adam Williams (Planning Officer Development and Renewal) gave a presentation on the application explaining the site location, the surrounds, the poor quality of the existing accommodation and planning history for the site. Consultation on the proposal had been carried and the key issues raised were summarised.

Turing to the proposal, it was considered that the proposed land use complied with policy and would provide an acceptable level of affordable housing. All

of the rented units would be at social target rent levels which was strongly supported. The proposal would respond well to the neighbouring buildings, preserve and enhance the Conservation Area and the Grade II listed building as well as natural and passive surveillance. To illustrate these points, the Committee were shown images of the proposals from the surrounding area. There would also be improvements to Mallon Gardens, supported by the Council's Parks Team.

The scheme had been amended to address the amenity failings particularly at 38 Commercial Street. Whilst some of the windows within this property would experience losses, overall it was considered that the surrounding properties would continue to benefit from adequate levels of light.

The Committee also noted the servicing and car parking plans and the financial contributions.

Given the benefits of the scheme, Officers were recommending that it be granted permission.

In response to questions, Officers clarified the measures to improve the day light and sunlight exposure to neighbouring properties including the redesigning of the proposed Attlee House replacement building to lessen the impact on 38 Commercial Street. It was also clarified that the scheme had been sensitively designed to minimise the impact on the area including setbacks in the design to match the surrounding area. The buildings to be demolished were of no architectural merit.

In relation to child play space, it was noted that the plans included dedicated under 5 play space as required in policy. Whilst there was a lack of provision for the over 5 age groups, due to the site constraints, there were parks nearby. As a result, the level of child play space complied with policy.

Officers also answered questions about the viability appraisal and the reasons for the lack of Cross Rail contributions.

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

1. That planning permission be **GRANTED** at Attlee House, Sunley House, Profumo House and College East, 10 Gunthorpe Street, London (PA/15/02156) for the demolition of Attlee House, Sunley House and College East (Excluding part facade retention of College East) and construction of ground, basement plus part 3, part 4 and part 5 storey buildings providing 63 Class C3 residential units and 264 sq m (GIA) Class B1 office floorspace. Demolition of Profumo House and construction of a new building comprising basement, ground and 4 storey building comprising 990 sq m (GIA) Class B1 office floorspace 418 sq m (GIA) Tonybee advice services. Provision of car and cycle parking, amenity and play space, with associated plant and works. (PA/15/02156) subject to:

2. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the Committee report
3. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above acting within normal delegated authority.
4. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated authority to recommend the conditions and informatives in relation to the matters set out in the Committee report.
5. 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 consent.

### **6.3 Our Lady's Primary School, Copenhagen Place, Limehouse, London E14 7DA (PA/15/02148)**

Update report tabled.

Jerry Bell (Applications Manager) introduced the item for the demolition of existing buildings for the redevelopment of the site to provide a residential led development.

Killian Harrington (Planning Officer, Development and Renewal) presented the application explaining the site location and the residential nature of surrounding area including the listed buildings.

Turning to the proposal, the plans would provide a policy compliant level of affordable housing, located across all proposed blocks. At this point images were shown of the appearance of the proposal, viewed from the surrounding area.

Consultation had been carried out on the scheme and the issues raised were noted.

It was considered that the proposed land use was acceptable given the need for new residential development and that the site was no longer fit for purpose for a school. It was also considered that the plans would preserve and enhance the area, without being overbearing. It would also provide child play space in excess of the minimum requirements and a policy compliant level of wheelchair accessible units. All of which complied with the quality standards in policy.

Whilst the proposed density exceeded the range in the London Plan, it bore no symptoms of overdevelopment. Steps had been taken to mitigate the loss of loss of light to neighbouring properties mostly affecting non habitable rooms or dual aspect properties. Due to this, it was felt that any losses in terms of

amenity did not warrant a refusal. The scheme would be car free with a number of cycle spaces.

Officers were recommending that the application was granted planning permission.

In response to questions, Officers explained the nature of the sunlight/daylight failings. It was confirmed that the units within Southwater Close already suffered compromised levels of sunlight as they were already obstructed. So it was the design of that development itself that had created these problems. As for the properties in Elland House, expected to suffer a reduction in light, most of the windows affected were secondary windows. In addition, there would be obscure glazing to protect privacy.

Officers also answered questions about the impact on the listed buildings and the character of the surrounding area.

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

1. That planning permission be **GRANTED** at Our Lady's Primary School, Copenhagen Place, Limehouse, London E14 7DA for the demolition of existing buildings for the redevelopment of the site to provide buildings ranging between 4 part 5 storeys to 7 storeys in height comprising 45 residential units including affordable housing (Use Class C3), together with associated disabled car parking, cycle parking, open space, landscaping and infrastructure works (PA/15/02148) subject to:
2. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the obligations set out in the Committee report and the update.
3. That the Corporate Director Development & Renewal is delegated power to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above acting within delegated authority.
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 Committee report.
5. 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 consent.

#### 6.4 Phoenix School, 49 Bow Road, London E3 2AD (PA/15/02445)

Jerry Bell (Applications Manager) introduced the item.

Nasser Farooq (Team Leader, Planning Services) presented the application for a listed building consent for a Council owned building. He explained the main features of the application, supported by LBTH Education Services,

English Heritage and the Secretary of State who had recommended that the Council approve the application.

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

That the Listed Building Consent be **GRANTED** at Phoenix School, 49 Bow Road, London E3 2AD (PA/15/02445) for the conversion of two existing non-original bin stores into use as a Food Technology Classroom with support kitchen area. Works include; removal of existing timber panels and double doors, removal of a non-original non load bearing blockwork wall, new vent openings through retained side doors, fitting new external windows and doors within existing structural openings, alterations to the existing drainage to suit kitchen requirements, new internal plasterboard partition wall, new wall, floor and ceiling finishes, new light fittings and extract ventilation subject to conditions as set out in the Committee report.

## 7. **OTHER PLANNING MATTERS**

None.

The meeting ended at 10.10 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Marc Francis  
Development Committee