

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 8 September 2015

Present:

Councillor Peter Dean (Chairman)

Councillors Vanessa Allen, Graham Arthur, Douglas Auld, Kathy Bance MBE, Eric Bosshard, Katy Boughey, Lydia Buttinger, Stephen Carr, Simon Fawthrop, Ellie Harmer, Charles Joel, David Livett, Russell Mellor, Alexa Michael, Angela Page, Richard Scoates and Michael Turner

Also Present:

Councillors Peter Morgan and Ian F. Payne

24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Nicky Dykes and Michael Turner; Councillors Angela Page and Stephen Carr acted as their respective substitutes.

25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In relation to Item 5.3 - Footzie Social Club, Councillor Mellor declared he would approach consideration of the development with a clear, open and non-determined mind. Councillor Mellor spoke as Ward Member for Copers Cope but did not take part in the final discussion and refrained from voting.

26 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 13 JULY 2015

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 July 2015 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

27 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

The following three written questions were received from Councillor Peter Fookes, Ward Member for Penge and Cator:-

Question1

Further to my question at the last Full Council meeting, what progress has been made in taking action against the owners of 23 Genoa Road, Penge who have built a massive extension without planning consent?

Chairman's Response

After a planning investigation into the above property in connection with the unauthorised rear extension, the applicant submitted an application on 13 July 2015 which was invalid and returned on 28 August 2015.

The enforcement officer's delegated report dated 6 July 2015 was prepared prior to receiving the above retrospective application on 13 July 2015 and is currently with our legal services team. This matter was held in abeyance as an application was submitted to the Council. I understand that the enforcement notice against the unauthorised development is due to be issued this week as a result of the returned invalid application.

Question 2

What action is being taken against the owner of 15 Genoa Road, Penge, who consistently dumps building waste at the front of his property before clearing it up? Can we not issue an untidy site notice?

Chairman's Response

Section 215 Notices are served when the land in question is considered to be adversely affecting the amenity of the area under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

The owner of the property has removed the items of rubbish from the front of the property and as a result of doing so removes the need to issue a Notice.

The planning investigation team has, as a result of these actions, written to the owners to warn them of the Council's concerns and informing them that further action could be considered if it continues.

Question 3

How many enforcement notices remain outstanding across the borough?

Chairman's Response

At this moment in time, there are 39 cases awaiting full compliance with Enforcement Notices served.

Three oral questions were received from members of the Avalon Area Action Group, Orpington.

Mr Bill Miller made the following statement before the questions were raised:-

"The three of us here represent the Avalon Area Action Group which is concerned with Bromley's proposed intensive use of Manorfields as a hostel for the homeless.

The three questions are posed to this Committee to address our concerns about the meeting on 9 June and specifically that:-

- the information contained in the planning officer's 10 page report reviewed was too shallow on which to make an informed decision;
- insufficient consideration was given to the legal challenges of the application; and
- if you follow the official paperwork through, there are discrepancies on precisely what permissions and conditions have been, or should have been granted over the development."

Question1

Can the Members of the DCC please re-read the email sent to them on 12 July and advise whether there is anything in the requested amendments to the minutes which is incorrect, irrespective of whether the DCC would regard these amendments as material or not? If there are inaccuracies, would the Committee please explain what they are.

Chairman's Response

The AAAG e-mail of 12 July 2015 was sent direct to DCC members and was therefore available to Members on 13th July 2015. The Members of the Committee approved the Minutes that were prepared by the Council. They are not in a position to give separate comment on the e-mail submitted by the AAAG.

Supplementary Question

The question has not been fully answered. If there were any inaccuracies in the document we sent, please explain what they are.

Chairman's Response

The Chairman reaffirmed the Committee were not in a position to comment on the e-mail submitted by the AAAG and there were no inaccuracies in the Committee Minutes which were confirmed by all Members at the previous meeting.

Question 2

The Minutes confirmed that no challenges were made to the barrister's statements. Can the Committee please confirm that they considered the barrister's statements and a) had either satisfied themselves prior to the meeting that the barrister's comments were irrelevant or b) that they decided at the meeting that the allegations did not justify further investigation before a decision was made? And if so which was it?

Chairman's Response

The oral representation was made direct to the Committee at the meeting on 9 June 2015 and Members had the opportunity to take that representation and all other planning policy and material planning considerations into account.

Questioner's Statement

This response is completely incongruous; the Committee ignored non-compliance with policy.

Question 3

The planning notification issued by the Planning Officer on 11 June to Alliance Planning refers to permission being granted 'for the development referred to in your application received on 5th March 2015 as amended by documents received on 26 May 2015'. The last document issued by the Planning Officer and included in the Agenda for 9 June 2015 at page 86 stated : The maximum occupation of the one, two and three room units within the House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (not the self-contained units) will be 50 persons (any age).

Therefore is the correct interpretation that permission is only granted in respect of a maximum occupation of 50 (as the permission makes no reference to any subsequent documents after 26 May)? and if so does the application need to be represented at the Development Control Committee if the Applicant wishes to house a higher number of occupants?

Chairman's Response

The planning permission defines the consent that has been granted. This does not set a limit on the number of occupiers. The agenda at page 6 sets out a comment on the application from the Environmental Health/Housing Officer about separate HMO restrictions (these are not town planning matters). An updated Environmental Health/Housing officer comment about HMO restrictions was made and this was reported to the Committee. The actual planning application did not contain a maximum figure.

Supplementary Question

So no maximum limit was set for the application?

Chairman's Response

That is correct.

28 PLANNING REPORTS

28.1 (DC15/00140/FULL3) - Old Town Hall, 30 Tweedy Road, Bromley BR1 3FE

Members considered the following planning application report:-

Item No.	Ward	Description of Application
5.1 (page 15)	Bromley Town	<p>Application for planning permission and listed building consent to enable partial demolition of the Bromley Town Hall building and replacement with extensions no greater than 3 storeys high to facilitate a change of use from Office (Class B1) to 94 bedroom hotel use (Class C1) to include hotel restaurant, conference, wedding and multi-functional space in addition to 2 independent restaurants (Class A3) fronting Widmore Road together with re-configuration of the existing access ramp on Widmore Road and provision of pick up/drop off in Tweedy Road and South Street.</p> <p>Planning Permission for the erection of a 5-storey residential apartment building (Class C3) containing 53 units (18 x 1 bed, 34 x 2 bed, 1 x 3 bed), with basement parking for 28 cars and 104 cycle parking spaces upon the neighbouring South Street Car Park, together with associated landscaping and public realm improvements.</p>

Oral representations in support of the application were received from the applicant's agent, Mr Mark Hoskins. Mr Hoskins made the following points:-

- Having been selected to progress the regeneration of the Old Town Hall, Cathedral Hotels recognised that as well as providing a unique opportunity, there was also a significant responsibility for them to deliver a new scheme which would respect the historic identity of the building and its surroundings. Extensive collaboration had taken place with key stakeholders including the Council's officers, Historic England and CABE.
- The proposed mixed-use development scheme fulfilled the aspirations for Site C of the Bromley Town Centre Area Action Plan.
- The diverse mix of boutique hotel, restaurants and residential uses would add to the vitality of the town centre.
- The hotel and restaurant uses alone were expected to deliver 120 fte jobs.
- In heritage terms, the proposed hotel and restaurant use for the Old Town Hall represented a very 'good fit' and would provide compatible uses for the existing building resulting in minimal physical change to the fabric of the Grade II listed structure. It would also safeguard the viable reuse of a building which Historic England had identified as a 'building at risk'.

- The quality of design had been a paramount consideration since the inception of the project both in respect of the changes to the Old Town Hall and the new apartment building. All stakeholders had been integral to the process of design, evolution and refinement.
- The proposals for the Old Town Hall would involve removal of the insensitive 1970s additions at the rear and replacing them with sympathetic extensions remaining wholly subservient to the host building.
- The enabling residential scheme upon the South Street Car Park Site had been configured to knit with the existing urban environment, being of appropriate scale and mass, retaining a significant landscaped corridor fronting Tweedy Road and incorporating a cranked main elevation to enhance vistas towards the listed Town Hall and East Street.
- The proposals complied with relevant planning policy in all respects. Furthermore, due to the significant merits of the scheme in regeneration, economic and heritage terms, a multitude of other planning considerations weighed heavily in favour of the proposals.
- The Old Town Hall was a building which had rather lost its way in recent years. This scheme would help restore it as a focal point within the town centre creating an asset unique to Bromley.

In response to Member questions, Mr Hoskins considered that due to its town centre location, the target market for the residential properties would be aimed mainly at young professionals and possibly older residents but would also attract people who recognised the benefit of town centre living.

With regard to concerns raised in relation to the single pick up/drop off bay at the front of the hotel, Mr Hoskins reported that the provision of parking was essential for the operational management of the hotel. Discussions had taken place with TfL in this regard and relevant parties would explore long-term options for parking on other sites and the possible provision of a valet service in the future. In the meantime however, town centre parking was located nearby. Discussion had also taken place to ensure the bay would not cause traffic congestion and the Fire Service had been approached to ensure emergency vehicles would not be obstructed.

The Development Control Manager reported the following:-

- Comments from Ward Member Councillor Michael Rutherford in support of the application had been received and circulated to Members.
- The Waste Adviser had raised no objections to the application.
- Under the head 'Old Town Hall' on page 15 of the report, the beginning of the first sentence was amended to read:- 'The original Town Hall faces Tweedy Road.....'
- The ninth bullet point on page 16 of the report was amended to read:- 'Alterations to the Tweedy Road hotel entrance.....'
- The second paragraph on page 32 should refer to 28 car parking spaces, not 26 as reported.

- The final paragraph of the description of development set out on page 15 of the report was amended to read:- 'Planning permission for the erection of a 5-storey residential apartment building (Class C3) containing 53 units (18 x 1 bed, 34 x 2 bed, 1 x 3 bed), with basement parking for 28 cars and 108 cycle parking spaces upon the neighbouring South Street Car Park, together with associated landscaping and public realm improvements.'
- The proposed conditions were amended to run in numerical order.
- The Accommodation Schedule for the South Street Car Park phase was added to the list of documents.
- A Plan A-117 Rev P1, relating to typical layouts for hotel rooms was added to the list of documents.
- For the sake of clarity, minor amendments were made to conditions 9, 12, 13, 14, 17, 22, 23, 26, 28, 37, 40 and 44.

The Chairman considered the site to be of significant importance and remarked that the listed building had remained vacant for far too long. The submitted proposals were of excellent design which accorded with the Council's Area Action Plan and Members were encouraged to recognise the commerciality of town centre schemes. The listed building would be retained as a result of the development which would have minimal impact on the surrounding area. The erection of five storeys was not considered too excessive and the proposed parking provision was adequate. The site was located in an area with access to good public transport together with several public car parks in close proximity. The Chairman fully supported the proposals and moved that the application be granted.

Councillor Buttinger seconded the motion to approve the application and requested the condition regarding landscaping include a requirement for replacement trees to be of an indigenous species.

It was agreed that the current building had outlived its office use. The proposed development was of good quality design and would result once again, in the building being made available to the general public. The residential element of the proposals was required to make the scheme viable and would be well-placed in the town centre with accessibility to good transport facilities. There was some concern that the proposed taxi area (which would also be used as a 'cellar drop'), may cause traffic congestion and in this regard, it was suggested that underground car parking for hotel users could be provided at South St Car Park.

Councillor Fawthrop did not support the application on the grounds that the large number of visitors to the hotel could result in an overspill of traffic in Bromley as a whole.

Councillor Carr considered valet parking could be made available to guests; a service which need not necessarily be in close proximity to the hotel.

In summing up, Members agreed that the Old Town Hall was a beautiful building both internal and external which must be maintained and accessible for public use.

Members having considered the report and representations **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED (SUBJECT TO THE PRIOR COMPLETION OF A SECTION 106 AGREEMENT)** as recommended and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Chief Planner with amendments to conditions 2, 4, 19, 30, 37 and 40 as follows:-

Condition 2: Include amended plans received since the report was written including minor amendments i.e. details of rooms in the Old Town Hall accessible by wheelchair and a detailed drawing of the Court Street pavement ramp.

Condition 4: Amended to read:-

'No demolition of any part of the Old Town Hall shall take place until a contract has been let for the implementation of the Old Town Hall part of the development hereby approved.

Reason: To comply with Policy BE8 of the Unitary Development Plan and to ensure that approved demolition takes place within the context of a scheme for improvement to the Old Town Hall and not on a random basis.'

Condition 19: Amended to read:-

'Before any work on site is commenced, energy strategy assessments and strategies for reducing carbon emissions shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority simultaneously for each phase. The result of these strategies shall be incorporated into the final design of the buildings prior to first occupation in accordance with the approved documents. The strategies shall include measures to allow the development to achieve an agreed reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of at least 35% above the TER level required by the Building Regulations 2013. The development should aim to achieve a reduction in carbon emissions of at least 20% from on-site renewable energy generation. The final designs, including the energy generation shall be retained thereafter in operational working order and shall include details of schemes to provide noise insulation and silencing for and filtration and purification to control odour, fumes and soot emissions of any equipment as appropriate.

Reason: In order to seek the most up to date scheme at the time of implementation and to achieve compliance with the Mayor of London's Energy Strategy and Policy 5.2 and 5.7 of the London Plan 2011.'

Condition 30: Amended to read:-

'(i) Before any part of the Old Town Hall part of the site hereby permitted is first occupied, bicycle parking (including covered storage facilities where appropriate) shall be provided in accordance with details submitted and approved and the bicycle parking/storage facilities shall be permanently retained thereafter.

(ii) Prior to the commencement of the South Street Car Park part of the development hereby permitted, details of bicycle parking (including covered storage facilities where appropriate) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle storage will be provided in accordance with approved details prior to the first occupation of any of the units and shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in order to provide adequate refuse storage facilities in a location which is acceptable from the residential and visual amenity aspects.'

Condition 37: Amended to read:-

'The use of the restaurants hereby permitted shall not operate before 7 am or after 12.30 am the following day, on any day, with the last customer entry no later than 11 pm.

Reason: To comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interests of the amenities of the area.'

Condition 40: Amended to read:-

'The hotel and ancillary hotel restaurant within the Old Town Hall part of the site shall be used as a hotel and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class C of the schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Reason: To comply with the submitted plans and Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in order to enable the Council to reconsider any change of use with regard to the listed building and in the interests of the amenities of the area and the vitality and viability of the town centre.

28.2 (DC/15/00141/LBC) - Old Town Hall, 30 Tweedy Road, Bromley BR1 3FE

Members considered the following planning application report:-

Item No.	Ward	Description of Application
5.2 (page 51)	Bromley Town	<p>Application for planning permission and listed building consent to enable partial demolition of the Bromley Town Hall building and replacement with extensions no greater than 3 storeys high to facilitate a change of use from Office (Class B1) to 94 bedroom hotel use (Class C1) to include hotel restaurant, conference, wedding and multi-functional space in addition to 2 independent restaurants (Class A3) fronting Widmore Road together with re-configuration of the existing access ramp on Widmore Road and provision of pick up/drop off in Tweedy Road and South Street.</p> <p>Planning Permission for the erection of a 5-storey residential apartment building (Class C3) containing 53 units (18 x 1 bed, 34 x 2 bed, 1 x 3 bed), with basement parking for 28 cars and 104 cycle parking spaces upon the neighbouring South Street Car Park, together with associated landscaping and public realm improvements.</p>

The Chairman moved that the application be approved; this was seconded by Councillor Michael.

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED that LISTED BUILDING CONSENT be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

28.3 (DC/15/00701/FULL1) - Footzie Social Club, Station Approach, Lower Sydenham SE26 5BQ

Members considered the following planning application report:-

Item No.	Ward	Description of Application
5.3 (page 57)	Copers Cope	Demolition of the existing buildings and redevelopment of the site comprising the erection of a basement plus part 8/9/10/11/12 storey building to accommodate 296 residential units (148 x one bed; 135 x two bed and 13 x three bed units) together with the construction of an estate road, 222 car parking spaces, 488 cycle parking spaces and landscaping of the east part of the site to form an open space accessible to the public.

Oral representations in support of the application were received from the applicant's agent, Mr Christopher Francis. Mr Francis made the following statement:-

"There is a political nettle in front of you this evening and I ask you to have the courage to grasp it.

Whilst there is wide-spread acknowledgement of the desperate need for additional new housing, particularly in London, you as a Council consistently say "not in our backyard". This I believe, is because you are seeking to preserve what you consider to be an essential facet of grand suburbia – detached and semi-detached houses with gardens – whilst ignoring the needs of the young and old who want one and two bedroom flats in accessible locations.

This site, close to Lower Sydenham Station is ideally located to provide a worthwhile boost to local housing provision without giving rise to any harm to the amenity of other established residential occupiers.

Elsewhere in the borough there would be loud and extensive objections to the development of c.300 new units so ask yourself why there is a lack of objection from residents to this scheme? It has been well advertised; we consulted over 370 local residents and held an open evening: it featured on the front page of the South London Press and was also in the Bromley Shopper.

Yes the site is designated as MOL – this is a designation found in the 1976 GLDP based on a large grid square area on a diagrammatic plan not on any critical analysis of this site. As our submission shows if such critical analysis is undertaken using the criteria now set out in the London Plan the site would not be designated as MOL as it:

- i) *is not clearly distinguishable from the built up area;*
- ii) *does not include facilities which serve either the whole or significant parts of London; and*
- iii) *does not contain features or landscapes of national or metropolitan value.*

If you decide to refuse this application you are saying to all Londoners including all Bromley's residents, "we don't care about the needs of your children and those who want to live in a well-served part of our borough; we only wish to keep the status quo, but by the way we will allow significant development in the MOL if it is for the likes of us" – just look at the cricket club up the road and 89 Kings Hall Road.

As politicians you will be very aware that the direction of decision makers in Government and at the GLA is actively to address housing need. The Inspector who recently overturned the Council's decision to refuse the development of the HG Wells Centre made a particular point at the outset of his decision in noting that:

"The Government is seeking to significantly boost the supply of housing, as set out in paragraph 47 of the NPPF."

We have submitted evidence, which each of you has received, which shows that Bromley does not have the required five year supply of identifiable housing land, let alone provision to exceed the London Plan targets as also required. You only come to where you are as a result of permissions granted on appeal: 223 units at Dylon1 for example. Permission for this current application will go to addressing this policy shortfall and therefore should be looked at favourably without having to go through the appeal process."

Councillor Carr (Leader of the Council) challenged Mr Francis' assertion that Bromley's housing targets had not or could not be met, pointing out that the Borough had consistently met its London Plan targets and that the Council's current statements on housing land supply and the draft Local Plan show how future housing targets would be met. Mr Francis said his claim was evidenced by documentation put forward by Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners Ltd which indicated a shortage of identified land would render the targets unachievable.

Mr Francis further informed Members that an appeal would automatically be submitted should Members decide to refuse the application.

Supporting correspondence together with a package of documents was received from the applicant and circulated to Members. Appendices 1 (correspondence from the GLA) and 2 (comments from TfL) which were omitted from the published report were also circulated.

The final sentence of the second paragraph on page 89 of the report was amended to read:-

'It could be used to establish that the benefits of the scheme outweigh the harm done by inappropriate development through very special circumstances, however the case for very special circumstances has not convincingly been made in this instance.' (The remainder of the sentence was deleted).

In the third recommended ground for refusal on page 112 of the report, the semi-colon after the word 'gain' was removed and inserted to follow the word 'open' on the subsequent line.

The Chief Planner confirmed debate would always occur around housing targets however, the current figures reflected information contained within the recently adopted London Plan and its Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment so overall, officers had confidence that targets would be achieved.

Speaking as Ward Member for Copers Cope, Councillor Mellor confirmed he was addressing the application with an open mind and without a predetermined opinion. Having closely scrutinised the agenda item and papers sent to him from Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners on behalf of the applicant, by letter of 28 August 2015 together with a detailed Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners review (August 2015) entitled Bromley Five Year Housing Land Supply Assessment dated 27th August 2015, Councillor Mellor offered his personal opinion and objected to the application on the following grounds:-

- the site was situated within MOL and should be protected as such;
- inadequate car parking provision had been made;
- the proposals would create an over-development of the site and result in a lack of amenity space;
- there was a lack of infrastructure – e.g. education and health (in particular, there was no GP surgery in the Ward); and
- there was a lack of adequate public transport with only a single bus service operating within the area and a limited train service from Lower Sydenham station.

Councillor Mellor congratulated the author of the planning report for producing a non-biased, well-crafted, detailed document which also contained a full list of referenced policies.

The Chairman also refuted Mr Francis' statement that the housing targets would not be met and moved refusal of the application on the grounds set out

in the report. This was seconded by Councillor Michael who supported the Council's role as a custodian of MOL and GB land.

The proposed development was considered by Members to be of poor design and one which would result in an over-development of the site.

Whilst Councillor Bance would like to see affordable housing provided, the dimensions of a number of the proposed accommodation were too small. The site was also designated as MOL and should remain so.

Based on her knowledge of the area, Councillor Allen reported that the current site was in a dreadful state. Many houses in the surrounding area had been converted into flats and whilst the site could be considered for housing, this particular application was of poor design and an over-development. Councillor Allen suggested the application could be deferred.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations **RESOLVED that the application be REFUSED** as recommended, for the reasons set out in the report of the Chief Planner as follows:-

1. The proposed redevelopment of this site designated as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) for residential purposes is considered to be inappropriate development in principle. The applicant has failed to demonstrate very special circumstances or that the proposal is a sustainable form of development. Furthermore the substantial level of harm that would arise from the development by way of harm to the MOL, design, and amenity and flood risk is considered to outweigh any housing land supply or other socio-economic benefits that would arise or benefits of opening up public access to the MOL and enhancing its landscape. As such the proposal is contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF (2012) and Policies 7.17 of the London Plan (2015) and G2 of the UDP (2006).
2. This site is considered to be an inappropriate location for a tall building as it fails to satisfy the requirements of Policy BE17 of the UDP. Furthermore, the proposal by virtue of its scale, form and monolithic appearance, amount of development, adverse impact on the Landscape and the Skyline, poor response to the existing street network and connections, failure to improve or enhance the legibility and character of the area, adverse podium design, lack of active frontage and poor public realm amounts to overdevelopment of the site and fails to provide a scheme of high quality design contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF (2012), Policies H7, BE1 BE4 and BE18 of the UDP, Policies 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan, The Mayors Housing SPG and SPG1 Good Design Principles and SPG2 Residential Design Guidance.
3. The proposal by virtue of its podium design, poorly considered access arrangements, outlook for some of the ground floor units; and questions over the ability of single aspect flats to promote natural ventilation and mitigate solar gain or provide adequate amenity in terms of noise when windows are open; fails to demonstrate that a high quality living environment with

satisfactory standards of amenity will be provided for future residents. Furthermore it has not been demonstrated that the development is capable of providing 10% wheelchair provision across all tenures, with suitable access, car parking and internal layout. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies H7 and BE1 of the UDP, Policies 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.6 of the London Plan, The Mayors Housing SPG, SPG2 Residential Design Guidance and the Bromley's Affordable Housing SPD (2008).

4. This site lies within Flood Zone 2 and 3 and meets the requirements for Sequential Test in the NPPF. Despite the ability of the design to mitigate flood risk, the approach taken has significant adverse effects on the quality of the development. As such it has not been demonstrated that an appropriate solution to mitigate potential flood risk can be achieved in accordance with the aims and objectives of the NPPF (2012) and Policy 5.12 of the London Plan.

Councillor Mellor abstained from voting.

The meeting ended at 8.20 pm

Chairman