

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, 12 MARCH 2020

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

Members Present:

Councillor Abdul Mukit MBE (Chair)

Councillor John Pierce
Councillor Dipa Das
Councillor Leema Qureshi
Councillor Kevin Brady

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Tarik Khan

Officers Present:

Paul Buckenham	– (Development Manager, Planning Services, Place)
Sally Fraser	– Team Leader (East)
Gareth Gwynne	– (Area Planning Manager (West), Planning Services, Place)
Kathleen Ly	– Planning Officer
Rachel Mckoy	– (Head of Commercial & Contracts, Legal Services Governance)
Aleksandra Milentijevic	– Planning Officer
Simon Westmorland	– (West Area Team Leader, Planning Services, Place)
Matthew Wong	– Planning Officer
David Knight	– (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

Apologies:

Councillor Mufeedah Bustin
Councillor Dan Tomlinson

1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were received at the meeting.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

The Committee **RESOLVED**

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

3. RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROCEDURE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS AND MEETING GUIDANCE

The Committee **RESOLVED** that:

1. The procedure for hearing objections and meeting guidance be noted;
2. In the event of changes being made to recommendations by the Committee, the task of formalising the wording of those changes be delegated to the Corporate Director, Place along the broad lines indicated at the meeting; and
3. 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, Place be delegated authority to do so, provided always that the Corporate Director does not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision.

4. DEFERRED ITEMS

There were no deferred items.

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION**5.1 North and South Passage, Iron Mongers Place, E14**

An update report was tabled.

Paul Buckenham (Development Manager) introduced the application which relates to a north/ south walkway which runs between Westferry Road and Sherwood Gardens in the Isle of Dogs.

Matthew Wong (Planning Services) informed the Committee that (i) the original application PA/13/01547 had granted permission for the installation of gates and barriers within the walkway and this permission was implemented. With condition 4 of the permission had required that these gates should remain unlocked at all times; and (ii) the current proposal now seeks to vary condition 4 of that planning permission, to allow the gates to be locked and pedestrian access along the walkway to be stopped.

Mr Wong stated that the application was being reported to the Development Committee because there have been than 20 individual representations in support of the development.

The Committee noted that its application has been considered against (a) the Council's approved planning policies contained in the London Borough of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (January 2020) as well as the London Plan (2016), the National Planning Policy Framework and all other material considerations; (b) the Draft London Plan (2019) as this carries substantial weight.

Mr Wong stated that:

- The proposal is considered to be unacceptable as it would (1) result in the loss of a safe, convenient and traffic free access way, and disadvantage those less able pedestrians, (2) provoke less sustainable transport choices; and (3) lead to the creation of underused spaces which may result in antisocial behaviour and a lack of social cohesion, contrary to policies D.DH2, S.DH1, D.DH8 and S.TR1 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan (2020);
- In 2013, planning permission was granted for the construction of two gates and two sets of barriers within the walkways (ref PA/13/01547). This permission was duly implemented and two gates were installed, one at the northern end adjacent to Sherwood Gardens and another at the southern end adjacent to Spindrift Avenue. The gates are approximately 1750mm -1800mm high and comprise of brick piers at either end with fixed, metal infill panels containing vertical posts. Condition 4 of the consent required that the gates always remain unlocked.
- Two sets of physical barriers had also been constructed within the walkways, in locations immediately to the north and south of Ironmongers Place. The barriers did not close off access to the passages, rather they act as physical obstacles to ensure cyclists and those on vehicles must dismount before traversing through.
- The walkway is protected through a Section 106 Agreement which was entered into on 15/10/1986 between the owner of the site, the Council and the London Docklands Development Corporation (LDDC). The agreement provided specific reference to the passage and its formal adoption as a walkway, under Section 35 of the Highways Act 1980. Clause 4 of the agreement states that the Walkway (passage) must always remain open to the public unless with the written agreement with the Council. The Agreement also stated that the walkway must remain accessible by all and shall permit easy passage by wheelchairs; and
- A complaint had been received in 2018 that the gates to either end of the walkway had been locked. A Compliance Officer had attended the site and observed that Condition 4 of PA/17/01547 had been breached. Accordingly, a breach of condition notice had been served on 17 May 2019 and was on hold awaiting the outcome of this application.

Therefore, the officers considered that the proposal is recommend for refusal.

The Chair invited the registered speakers to address the Committee.

A resident of Ironmongers Place informed the Committee that he was addressing the meeting in support of the application to permanently lock the gates and access to the passageway. The resident concerns maybe summarised as follows:

- There are issues with criminal activity and anti-social behaviour within the passageway.
- The locking of the gates would help provide a secure and safe environment; and
- The locking of the gates would assist in reducing amenity concerns relating to litter and noise.

Rachael Dickson from the JTS Partnership addressed the meeting as the Applicants Representative and the following is a summary of the points raised:

- The walkways have become the focus for anti - social behaviour (ASB) and that residents are being subjected to undue noise and disturbance due to people 'loitering' within the walkways.
- Residents had also raised concerns regard the level of ASB in the area. The applicant therefore considered that locking of the gates would reduce occurrences of such ASB and associated crime within and around the passageway; and
- Applicant had submitted a 'Crime Statistics' Report which has indicated levels of crime in and around the site from the period of October 2016 to October 2019

However, the Committee was informed that:

- The data that had been included shows that there had also been changes in the overall level of crime in the area over three time periods – (i) from before the gates were locked between October '16 and January '18, (ii) while the gates were (unlawfully) locked between Feb '18 and May '19 and (iii) after June '19, when the gates were unlocked.
- The report concludes that level of ASB and crime had been greater before the gates had been unlawfully locked. It is also was noted that the results appeared to show no real increase in crime since Enforcement Action was taken and the gates were once again unlocked.

In response to the above the Committee indicated that:

- Given the similarities in the overall crime rate reduction across the whole Island Gardens Precinct and that of the Ironmongers Development, the reduction in crime in and around the subject development during 2018 and May 2019 cannot be directly attributed to the locking of the gates.
- The proposal would result in the loss of a safe, convenient and traffic free access way, which would disadvantage those less able pedestrians, would provoke less sustainable transport choices.

- Reduced natural surveillance may allow the passage to become a more attractive location for drug dealing, robbery, fly tipping and Anti-Social Behaviour.
- The wider Island Gardens area experienced a general reduction in crime during the same dates, suggesting there were alternative causes. It therefore cannot be accurately ascertained that the proposed locking of the gates would cause a reduction in anti-social behaviour.
- The passage being out of sight of residents or being more difficult to access by police patrols would make it easier to store or discard stolen mopeds/cycles and aid burglary of surrounding properties.
- The locking the gates may in fact lead to an increase in antisocial behaviour within the walkways, given that they would still be accessible from Ironmongers Place but not used regularly and properly as pedestrian thoroughfares.
- If the gates were locked, the design and location of the existing gating would allow the gates to be easily climbed and would not deter illegitimate users of the site. and
- Any attempt to reduce anti-social behaviour should be consistent with planning policies which encourage activated areas, natural and passive surveillance. These methods would assist in reducing anti-social behaviour whilst also ensuring socially connected communities.

On a vote of 4 in favour the Committee **RESOLVED:**

That the proposed variation of Condition 4 from Planning Permission PA/13/01547 is refused for the following reason:

The proposal is considered to be unacceptable as it would result in the loss of a safe, convenient and traffic free access way, which would disadvantage those less able pedestrians, would provoke less sustainable transport choices and would lead to the creation of underused spaces which may result in antisocial behaviour and a lack of social cohesion, contrary to policies D.DH2, S.DH1, D.DH8 and S.TR1 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan (2020).

For the avoidance of doubt the planning Officer asked committee to confirm that their vote was for refusal. This was agreed.

5.2 Brune House, Bell Lane & Carter House, Brune Street & Bernard House, Toynbee Street, London E1

An update report was tabled.

Paul Buckingham (Development Manager) introduced the application that sort approval for the replacement of the existing 1200mm railings and addition of gates to a height of 1800mm along the northern and eastern boundaries of the Holland Estate.

Kathleen Ly (Planning Services) presented this application which was being reported to the Development Committee as more than 20 individual representations supporting the development have been received.

Ms Ly advised the Committee that (i) this application has been assessed against planning policies contained in the London Borough of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (January 2020), the London Plan (2016), and the National Planning Policy Framework; and (ii). The application has also been considered against the Draft London Plan (2019) as this carries substantial weight.

The Committee was informed by Mr Simon Westmorland (West Area Team Leader - Development Management) that (a) the proposal would result in an incongruous form of development that will neither preserve nor enhance the local streetscape nor maintain the positive character and appearance of the conservation areas; (b) the increase in height to the railings and addition of vehicle and pedestrian gates will result in a gated community, unnecessarily segregating the estate from the public realm; (c) this proposal would negatively affect the social integration of the area and be contrary to the promotion of mixed and balanced communities.

Therefore, the officers considered that the proposal is not considered to be acceptable in policy terms and is not supported.

The Chair invited the registered speakers to address the Committee.

Kabir Ahmed the Chair of the Holland Estate Management Board addressed the meeting the main points that he raised maybe summarised as follows:

1. At the time of the Stock Transfer from LBTH to Eastend Homes (EEH) in 2006, the bid made to residents to win support for this process was based mainly on a programme of improvement works to the buildings and the estate i.e. '*security and safety*'; and '*boundary treatment with gated access*'. This included lifts and perimeter security enhancements (as in the current application) to offer better safety on the estate as well as the key promise of lifts to the blocks in the application area';
2. During the housing stock transfer these promises were supported by the Council and all the consultation documents included these as key aspects of work that will be undertaken once transfer was completed;
3. Additionally, these enhancements were granted planning permission as part of the broader applications (PA/08/02347 refers), of estate improvements that EEH made after they took possession of the estate;
4. At the time the Council encouraged residents to consider transfer to housing associations with the promise of being able to make improvements to the estate. Key promises that led to residents voting for transfer were improved security measures and lifts;
5. If permission is not granted, it would bring into question that whole process and whether those promises made were worth the paper it was written on. It would be a betrayal of the trust that residents put into the whole stock transfer process and on the information supplied to residents by both the Council and EastendHomes;
6. With this historical context, and promises made to residents at the time of stock transfer, we believe that the application deserves exception and should be considered for approval by the Development Committee.

7. Since the stock transfer in 2006, the night time economy has increased drastically in the area, which has seen an increase in ASB. Residents are plagued with non-residents using the estate as a urinal, taking drugs, dealing drugs, noise issues related alcohol, groups congregating and causing general nuisance and intimidation, amongst many other issues. Therefore, the experiences and difficulties faced by residents who live in the area should be taken into account and this application be approved in order to improve the quality of life and wellbeing for these residents.

Councillor Tarik Khan addressed the main points that he raised are summarised as follows:

Councillor Khan indicated that the:

- a. use of historically appropriate style of fencing, at a height that is applicable to the streetscape, would provide the strong boundary that has always been there, but with a more open and permeable feel;
- b. proposed design would in effect enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area through the railings being of a conservation type style and therefore should be welcomed and approved;
- c. Proposals would not have a significant adverse effect on the accessibility and permeability of the local area. The courtyard areas leading into the estate are not public thoroughfares and visually as you enter the state, you get an impression that there is no through route except leading into the individual buildings. There are signs indicating the estate is for private resident access only; and
- d. proposed improvements will deal with the issues associated with ASB, and allow residents to use these communal spaces again, with clear benefits to social inclusion and wellbeing within the estate, and in terms of interaction between residents within the estate on Brune Street and outside, because the fencing allows much more visual permeability than the wall that was there before. These are very real issues that the proposed perimeter will actually improve, with negligible negative results.

However, the Committee was informed that:

- The improvement of entrances to reduce anti-social behaviour, to exclude intruders and enhance the appearance of the blocks as presented at the Stock Transfer Stage would be subject to further resident consultation, planning approval and the development of new homes for rent and sale. As such, the submitted information does not warrant or justify the approval of the proposal as any planning proposal is subject to a formal assessment and is considered on its planning merits.
- The proposal is not supported given the increase in height, reduction in the width between the rails and prominent location of the fence fronting the street;
- The proposal would result in an incongruous form of development which would negatively impact the local street network and would not be

socially inclusive, cohesive or connective. Additionally, the design of the gates is more of a modern approach and is not considered to be in keeping with the estate;

- Development should be sympathetic in form, scale, materials and architectural detail to the heritage asset and/or setting. The existing views along Brune Street are currently open and transparent as the existing 1200mm railings is not considered to be a dominant feature and is not imposing to the streetscape;
- The proposed pedestrian access gates would restrict movement within the estate and surrounding area. This is contrary to policy which encourages development to increase and maintain well-connected areas. Enclosing all access points will limit the number of connections available when moving from one point to the other, and thus impacting upon the pedestrian connectivity to the wider street network;
- The applicant and received public comments identify the site as a private estate where public access is restricted. However the erection of the 1800mm high railing and gates would create a hostile and enclosed environment, unnecessarily segregating the estate from the public realm. This would result in the estate becoming a 'gated community' where accessing the site would only be possible via a key code or intercom. However, the London Plan and the Local Plan sought to resist the creation of gated communities which do not promote socially inclusive and cohesive neighbourhoods or connectivity between places. The enclosing of the estate would negatively affect the social integration of the area and be contrary to allowing mixed and balanced communities;
- The National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan sought to create safe, secure and appropriately accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion;
- The London Plan also aims to achieve the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design and ensures development can be used safely, easily and with dignity by all regardless of disability, age, gender, ethnicity or economic circumstances. Development should be convenient and welcoming with no disabling barriers, so everyone can use them independently without undue effort, separation or special treatment;
- Reduced natural surveillance may allow the passage to become a more attractive location for drug dealing, robbery, fly tipping and Anti-Social Behaviour;
- The purpose intended for the gates and railings although intended to improve the quality of life for residents in terms of safety and security, is contrary to Council's policies which encourage socially connected communities. Therefore, alternative methods to alleviate anti-social behaviour should be considered which could include activating areas to provide natural and passive surveillance; and
- The proposal would restrict movement and access, does not incorporate the principles of inclusive design and is not sensitive to nor enhance the local streetscape and conservation areas.

On a vote of 2 in favour 2 against, with the Chair exercising his **casting** vote in favour, the Committee **RESOLVED**:

That the proposal is refused for the following reason:

- That it would result in an incongruous form of development that will neither preserve nor enhance the local streetscape nor maintain the positive character and appearance of the conservation areas. The increase in height to the railings and addition of vehicle and pedestrian gates will result in a gated community, unnecessarily segregating the estate from the public realm. This would negatively affect the social integration of the area and be contrary to the promotion of mixed and balanced communities. Accordingly, the proposal is not considered to be acceptable in policy terms and was refused.

For the avoidance of doubt the Planning Officer asked committee to confirm that their vote was for refusal. This was agreed.

5.3 De Paul House, 628-634 Commercial Road, London, E14 7HS

An update report was tabled.

Paul Buckenham (Development Manager) informed the Committee that the proposed development sort to replace an existing 52-bedroom hostel with a 109-bedroom mix of hostel and housing in multiple occupation (HMO). Out of the total number of the proposed rooms, 25 would be associated with the hostel use situated on the lower ground and ground floor levels. Additionally, 84 rooms it was noted are proposed to be provided for a long-term residential accommodation in the form of housing with shared facilities. This would consist of residents having exclusive use of their ensuite bedrooms whilst sharing communal facilities that include living, kitchen, dining and amenity spaces. In addition, some of the bedrooms on the fifth and sixth floors would have private balconies.

Ms Aleksandra Milentijevic advised the Committee that the existing hostel has the capacity to accommodate 263 occupants in a number of 2 and 3 bedrooms and multi-bed dormitories. Whilst the applicant is proposing a total number of 185 occupants in the currently proposed scheme to be apportioned as follows: 41 in hostel rooms and 144 in the shared living accommodation. It was noted that officers have identified a number of issues associated with the proposed land use. Which included (i) the lack of justification for the need of the HMO use; (ii) its unaffordability; and lack of effective management arrangements. In addition, the proposal fails to provide appropriate affordable housing contributions as required by planning policy.

Notwithstanding that the proposed HMO use is not supported in principle, Ms Milentijevic stated that the:

- Quality of the proposed HMO accommodation is not considered to be acceptable given the proposal's failure to provide sufficient communal amenity space for the future residents and adequately lit communal indoor amenity spaces.

- Existing building is predominantly three storeys along Commercial Road with a staircase enclosure on the north-eastern corner which reaches four storeys. At the rear, the building steps down to two and one storey with a concrete boundary wall. The existing building has limited value in terms of its external appearance and its replacement with an appropriately designed building is acceptable in principle.
- Proposed building would be seven storeys in height with the two top floors set back on all sides. The scale, height and massing of the proposed development are considered to be excessive and the top floors would be characterised by a poor fenestration pattern. As such, the proposed building would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the St Anne's Church conservation area, in which the application site also lies. Further, the applicant has not submitted an archaeology assessment as required by planning policy.
- Proposal would further fail to provide an adequate amount of cycle parking linked to the HMO use. In addition, the proposed cycle storage would comprise of a shared space within a general storage area which lacks a clear and obvious purpose. This is considered unacceptable in principle due to the safety concerns and likely obstructions.
- Although on-street servicing has been previously agreed and as such is considered acceptable in principle, the proposal has not provided an adequate delivery and servicing strategy that would ensure that adverse impact on the transport network would be mitigated. The applicant has also not provided enough information to satisfy the policy requirement that the proposed development would incorporate enough waste storage capacity to cater for the future occupiers, there are also concerns about the placement of the disabled car parking space. The refuse would be collected via an on-street platform lift, however, the proposal failed to provide adequate details to ensure that the waste management and collection can be successfully achieved; and
- Application site is in an area of a particularly low air quality. The applicant has failed to submit an air quality assessment to demonstrate that the proposal would achieve the air quality neutral standard and has also not submitted enough information to satisfy the relevant requirements contained in the energy and sustainable policies.

Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development does not constitute sustainable development as required by the NPPF. It would fail to comply with the relevant policies in terms of land use, quality of the proposed accommodation, design and heritage, highways, waste, and environmental matters. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to secure the relevant financial and non-financial contributions. Therefore, the officers recommend the proposed development be refused planning permission.

The Chair invited the registered speakers to address the Committee.

Fidelma Boyd Chair of the Parish Council of the RC Church addressed the meeting the main points that she raised maybe summarised as follows:

- The new proposals, albeit amended in terms of upper elevation and re-location of the entrance, still does not represent an appropriate development in the conservation area.
- This application would not adhere to the Council policy 'to achieve high-quality design and protection of amenity within the borough' and in particular the following points within the policy: 'provide layouts that are safe, secure and take account of crime prevention and are developed in accordance with Secured by Design principles' and 'ensure appropriate provision of outdoor amenity space, whether public, private or communal which accords with appropriate minimum standards and is compatible with the character of surrounding areas'.
- The current building on the site raises some serious safeguarding concerns, both for the school/college students who frequently stay there and those long-term residents who are clearly in need of support. It is hard to envisage that the proposed substantial enlargement of the building would not be accompanied by an increase in safeguarding concerns.

Councillor James King; Tom Walker (Local Resident); and Lucinda Longwill (Local Resident) then addressed the meeting the main points are outlined below:

- The cumulative effect of other construction works in the area.
- Lack of affordable housing provision.
- Impact on social cohesion from the increased transient population.
- Concerns over the continued provision for the most vulnerable people.
- No clear management for the proposed development.
- Harm to the character and appearance of the St Anne's Church conservation area, Lowell Street conservation area, and Our Lady Immaculate Church.
- Impact on the amenity of the surrounding residential properties, loss of daylight and sunlight, loss of privacy, outlook and view; dust, pollution and traffic impacts during the construction stage.
- Impact on the capacity and safety of the surrounding transport network including the DLR, on-streetcar parking, pick-ups/drop offs, servicing and deliveries.
- Environmental impact including the creation of a wind tunnel, increase in noise and air pollution.

Duncan Parr, Planning Partner, Rapleys LLP addressed the meeting as the Applicants Representative his comments are summarised below:

The development would:

- Provide accommodation for tourists on a moderate budget;

- Offer short-term co-living spaces for people on shorter contracts and medium-term tourists not being able to rent a flat in the area;
- Have good accessibility to transport;
- See a decrease in the number of occupants due to the increase in height; and
- Have a positive impact on the street scene with the provision of a ground floor café.

On a vote of 4 in favour the Committee **RESOLVED**:

That subject to any direction by the Mayor of London, planning permission is **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

- 1) The proposed development fails to demonstrate the need for the proposed large-scale HMO use on the site. In addition, the proposal fails to provide affordable housing contributions. As a result, the proposal is contrary to Local Plan policies D.H2, D.H7 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (2020).
- 2) The scale, height and massing of the proposed seven storey building would be overbearing to the local character of the area and as such would cause harm to the St Anne's Conservation Area. The site layout and scale of the proposed development fails to follow good design principles indicating the over-development of the site. The proposal fails to secure high quality design detailing. Also, the applicant has not submitted an archaeological assessment as required. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Chapters 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), London Plan (2016) policy 7.4 and 7.8 and Local Plan policies S.DH1, D.DH2 and S.DH3 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (2020) and the St Anne's Church Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Guidelines (2009).
- 3) The proposed HMO accommodation would not provide adequately lit communal indoor amenity spaces. There would also be a lack of communal amenity space for future occupiers of the proposed HMO accommodation. As such, the quality of the proposed shared living accommodation is not considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016) and S.H1, D.H2, D.H3, D.H7 and D.DH8 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (2020).
- 4) The proposal fails to ensure that the operational needs of the proposed development would not adversely impact the safety and capacity of the transport network. Insufficient information has been provided to ensure that the proposed wheelchair car parking space would not impact the safety of the transport network along Island Row. In addition, insufficient Trip Generation data has been provided and an adequate Servicing and Delivery Plan has not been provided. This is contrary to Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), London Plan (2016) policies 6.3, 6.9, 6.12 and 6.13 of the London Plan (2016) and Local Plan policies S.TR1, D.TR2, D.TR3 and D.TR4 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (2020).
- 5) The proposal has not provided a sufficient amount of cycle storage, and the storage that is provided would not meet policy requirements due to

its location and accessibility, which contradicts Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), London Plan (2016) policies 6.9 and 6.13 and Local Plan policy D.TR3 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (2020). The proposal also fails to demonstrate that enough waste storage capacity, management and collection would be provided to satisfy the requirements of policy D.MW3 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (2020).

- 6) In the absence of sufficient information, including an air quality assessment and energy assessment based on the GLA's Energy Assessment guidance and recommendations for the use of SAP10 carbon factors, the proposed development would not be in accordance with Chapters 14 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), London Plan (2016) policies 5.2 and 7.14, and Local Plan policies D.ES1 and D.ES7 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (2020).
- 7) In the absence of the s106 agreement to provide the relevant financial and non-financial contributions to mitigate the impacts of the development, the proposal fails to comply with policy D.SG5 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (2020).

6. OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

Nil items

The meeting ended at 9.17 p.m.

**Chair, Councillor Abdul Mukit MBE
Development Committee**