Contents

Introduction ........................................................................... 1
Approval rate ........................................................................ 2
London Borough of Barking & Dagenham ......................... 3
London Borough of Barnet .................................................. 4
London Borough of Bexley ................................................... 5
London Borough of Brent .................................................... 6
London Borough of Bromley ............................................... 7
London Borough of Camden .............................................. 8
London Borough of Croydon ................................................. 9
London Borough of Ealing .................................................. 10
London Borough of Enfield ............................................... 11
Royal Borough of Greenwich ............................................. 12
London Borough of Hackney .............................................. 13
London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham .................... 14
London Borough of Haringey .............................................. 15
London Borough of Harrow ................................................. 16
London Borough of Havering .............................................. 17
London Borough of Hillingdon .......................................... 18
London Borough of Hounslow ......................................... 19
London Borough of Islington .............................................. 20
Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea ......................... 21
Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames ....................... 22
London Borough of Lambeth ............................................ 23
London Borough of Lewisham .......................................... 24
London Borough of Merton ................................................. 26
London Borough of Newham ............................................ 27
London Borough of Redbridge ......................................... 28
London Borough of Richmond ......................................... 29
London Borough of Southwark ........................................ 30
London Borough of Sutton ................................................. 31
London Borough of Tower Hamlets .................................. 32
London Borough of Waltham Forest ............................... 33
London Borough of Wandsworth ....................................... 34
City of Westminster ......................................................... 35
Introduction

The May elections saw great change in London. While Labour maintained many of their strangleholds, and the Conservatives held on to key Labour targets, it was not always business as usual. There were 667 newly elected councillors, many of whom have taken their place on the key planning committees determining major applications in London. Across London, there were 20 new committee Chairs and an average of 1 in every 3 councillors on the main planning committees were newly elected.

We have taken a look at every borough in London to assess their decision making in the six months since May. Our focus has been on the main committees – those dealing with larger and more strategic applications, though we have included all four Westminster committees as they all consider relatively key applications. In Lewisham’s case, we have also included their 3 sub-committees as the main planning committee has not considered a single application since May.

Committees across London operate in different ways. Some, like Wandsworth, use their one committee to consider all applications – large and small – while others like Barnet preserve their main committee for larger applications and allow area committees to decide on smaller or household applications.

For committee watchers in London, there are recurring themes. Pro-regeneration boroughs with strong political and officer leadership rank highly for approvals – Brent, Ealing, and Hackney deliver almost universally positive determinations. At the other end of the scale, traditionally problematic boroughs such as Bromley, Havering and Richmond remain difficult to navigate. A change in administration in Kingston has seen positive results – 6 out of 6 main applications approved – and a change in committee chair and membership has seen more positive results in Tower Hamlets, with 4 out 4 strategic applications approved including two highly controversial proposals for Crisp Street and the London Chest Hospital.

With the London Mayoral elections only 18 months away, major applications will start to become ever more political. Some boroughs will be spoiling for a fight with Sadiq Khan, particularly those in outer London, and the Mayor will need to continue exercising his substantial planning powers if he wants to boost his numbers and speed up delivery.
### Approval rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Approval Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Barking &amp; Dagenham</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Brent</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Enfield</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Lambeth</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Hackney</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Wandsworth</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Barnet</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Newham</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Redbridge</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Camden</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Ealing</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Harrow</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Bexley</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Waltham Forest</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Islington</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Hammersmith &amp; Fulham</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Southwark</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Borough of Greenwich</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Havering</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Hounslow</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Merton</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Hillingdon</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Haringey</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Sutton</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Richmond</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Borough of Kensington &amp; Chelsea</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Bromley</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Lewisham*</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No applications considered
The elections in May 2018 saw Labour secure each of the 51 seats available for a third time in a row, resulting in a solely Labour Planning Committee. Since then, 10 applications have been heard with all 10 approved. The low number of applications can be explained by the meetings in August, September and October being cancelled.

Although a completely Labour Borough, there is not complete unity within the party. In June 2018, Barking and Dagenham Councillor, Phil Waker, urged the Planning Committee members that they are not selective enough when it comes to considering applications. He stated that, “we are considered a brownfield, anything goes here. It’s no good saying ‘comparatively it’s not that bad’. “ However, this seems to have little sway on the Planning Committee who have approved all applications in the subsequent meetings.

In March 2018, a notable application that came forward was for Beam Park, which included 3,000 homes (50% affordable), two primary schools and a railway station. The proposal was under extra-scrutiny as it was also subject to approval from Havering Council. Barking and Dagenham’s Planning Committee approved the proposal whilst Havering’s Committee refused. However, in September 2018 the Mayor of London’s office approved the scheme.
The elections in May 2018 saw the Conservatives buck the London trend by increasing their majority over Labour from 1 to 13, which has been reflected in committee composition. The Planning Committee has retained experienced councillors on both sides and decisions have been consistently in line with officers’ recommendations. In many instances there has been party unity on applications with many being approved unanimously, or close to.

Unlike other London Boroughs, Barnet members are still willing to look at viability pragmatically, (unless it adds to a reason for refusal) car parking, height and density are still the pressure points for both Labour and Conservative Members. However, historic sensitivities are being refocused after the Mayor of London called-in several large applications in the previous Council (Hasmonean School, Mill Hill Research and Development Centre and a phase of the Grahame Park regeneration) and there is a recognition amongst Barnet members that if they do not make a decision, the Mayor will make it for them.

The application for the Pentavia Retail Park will be an interesting test case for Mayoral call-in. It was the only application to be refused and by far the most controversial application owing to a significant amount of objection due to the location, height, parking standards and perceived impact on the surrounding area.
London Borough of Bexley

Planning Committee

Chair:
Cllr Peter Reader
West Heath

6 Conservative 2 Labour

50% of the members new to the committee in May 2018

25% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39* Applications determined
91% Approved
94% In line with officer recommendation

* This does not include 5 applications where a decision was not taken (3 deferred and 2 withdrawn)

Analysis

The elections in May 2018 saw very little change to the Conservative control of Bexley. The Tories won 34 seats (-1) to Labour’s 11 seats (+1).

Bexley Councils’ growth strategy lays out a plan to meet the need of building new homes by ‘increasing development density’. Since May, the planning committee has been acquiescent to that strategy, approving 29 of the 32 proposals put before it.

Within the accepted proposals there are ‘high-density’ schemes including 8 and 13-storey residential blocks.

The 13-storey block will become the tallest building in Bexleyheath and will bring more than 500 new homes (20% affordable) to the Borough.

Only three applications have been refused and only two against recommendation. For those two applications the typically suburban and outer-London issues of insufficient parking and impact on the privacy of neighbouring properties were the key drivers for members.
The elections in May 2018 saw the Labour Group, under the leadership of Councillor Muhammed Butt, further consolidating control over the Council. Labour now hold 60 of the 63 seats.

Having served on the Council since 2010, Councillor James Denselow is the newly appointed Chair. To date, he has guided meetings with knowledge and confidence. However, Deputy Chair Councillor Robert Johnson has already had to Chair the Committee on several occasions in Councillor Denselow’s absence but has done so with great confidence, demonstrating his development expertise from years as a Council Officer in regeneration.

The biggest application determined by the Planning Committee since May was St George’s application for the former Northfields Industrial Estate, which proposed 2,900 homes as well as commercial, leisure and community space. The vote to approve the application was unanimous.

Since May 2018, two applications have been deferred which were in fact first refused by Planning Committee members, only for an Officer to suggest deferment so that a follow-up report could be written. Neither application has yet returned to Committee.
London Borough of Bromley

Development Control Committee

Chair:
Cllr Alexa Michael
Bromley Common and Kesto

14 Conservative 2 Labour 1 Independent

35% of the members new to the committee in May 2018
24% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Applications determined
33% Approved
100% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

The Development Control Committee consider major proposals and the lack of decisions made by the main committee can be explained by the presence of fortnightly sub-committees that deal with the more minor applications.

The Mayor’s new housing targets, as part of the Draft London Plan, has caused a debate within Bromley Council as to where the homes should go. Many of the Members who have Green Belt in, or close to their wards are adamant that further uplifts in housing numbers should be placed in Bromley’s urban centre and Bromley Town, much to the disquiet of the ambitious and young Bromley Town Members, who believe that they, and the town’s infrastructure have taken their fair share of development.

For the two refused applications the Committee agreed with the reasons that the Chief Planner gave for not recommending the proposal. The common theme for the two proposals was that they were perceived to be over-bearing and excessively dense. The approved application was the proposed construction of three, three storey buildings to provide 24, 2 bed 4 person flats with associated parking and landscaping.
London Borough of Camden

Planning Committee

Chair:
Cllr Heather Johnson
Regent’s Park

13 Labour 2 Conservative 1 Liberal Democrats

50% of the members new to the committee in May 2018
38% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 Applications determined
95% Approved
95% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

After May 2018, the Planning Committee experienced a 50% change in membership. However, the long-serving chair, Councillor Heather Johnson remains and ensures continuity alongside Councillor Danny Beales, Cabinet Member for Investing in Communities.

Members of the Planning Committee frequently follow officer recommendation (95% of the time since May), however where sensitivities exist, particularly in relation to influential local neighbours and in conservation areas, they are not afraid to speak out and even depart from expert advice. On the one occasion which the Planning Committee voted against officers’ recommendation the reason cited was detrimental impact on a conservation area.

One of the most controversial applications before the Planning Committee in recent months has been Essential Living’s Construction Management Plan for its 100 Avenue Road development. A well organised campaign was established which directed residents on how best to submit objections to the application and the meeting itself was disrupted on several occasions by campaigners expressing their frustration at the proposed number of traffic movements in a residential area. As a result of concerns over the proposed routes, members of the Committee initially voted to refuse the application. However, on advice of the Head of Development Management, the Committee voted defer to enable consultation with TfL and further evidence to be considered.
London Borough of Croydon

Planning Committee

Chair:
Cllr Paul Scott
Woodside

6 Labour 4 Conservative

80% of the members new to the committee in May 2018
70% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved</strong></td>
<td><strong>Refused</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36* Applications determined
94% Approved
94% In line with officer recommendation

* This does not include 3 applications where a decision was not taken (2 deferred and 1 withdrawn)

Analysis

The Croydon Planning Committee, one of two planning committees in the Borough, considers the larger (floorspace over 300 square metres) and more controversial proposals when compared to the Planning Sub-Committee.

Labour have a marginal majority on Planning Committee, this tends to make the voting very partisan between Labour and the Conservatives on proposals, with the Tories often trying and failing to frustrate the Labour agenda.

Since May, the Planning Committee has heard 36 proposals and approved 34 of them. The Committee have only refused 2 applications out of the 36 recommended to them by Planning Officers.

The two refused applications were refused for different reasons. One proposal was considered over-development and detrimental to the character of the area. The other, altering and converting a space above a public house into a flat, was seen as not in compliance of DM21 (Protecting and supporting district and local centres).
Analysis

Labour made moderate gains in the May 2018 elections, taking four seats and retaining control of the Council. Post-election, there has been a significant turnover in the membership of the planning committee with over a third new to the Council and a new chair – Cllr Shital Manro. The Planning Committee is selected from a pool of twenty five councillors with thirteen members sitting at each meeting. The quorum is one third of the entire committee membership. The numbers of committee members is derived from the proportion of seats held in the Council, with Labour allowed ten members, the Conservatives two members and the Liberal Democrats one at each meeting.

The Committee have continued to return a relatively high rate of application approvals, with only one application refused against officer recommendation and one deferred (subsequently approved). The application refused was to revise an existing consent to Moullin house, adding a single storey to the proposals and increasing the number of units from 29 to 37. The application was refused as it constituted ‘over development’ given its height, despite assertions from the Planning Officer that the site would be well screened from neighbouring properties.

Ealing is an important borough for residential development as they are turning their focus to delivering their manifesto pledge to provide 2,500 genuinely affordable homes. They will attempt to do so in part through estate regeneration, which they have secured in recent years in Southall and South Acton. Leader of the Council, Julian Bell is well known for his pro-development stance and Cllr Manro is similarly known for supporting major developments in the borough.
Planning Committee

Chair:

Cllr Mahmut Aksanoglu
Southby

9 Labour 3 Conservative

58% of the members new to the committee in May 2018

50% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Applications determined

100% Approved

85% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

Despite Labour’s electoral success in the borough, Enfield Council has seen significant changes to Leadership, Mayor, Committee Chairs and members, with first-time elected councillors taking on these roles. One of the more surprising appointments was Cllr Mahmut Aksanoglu becoming Chair of the Planning Committee who, new to the Council in May 2018, has no councillor or Committee experience under his belt. Many of the other members in the Planning Committee are also new councillors and their lack of experience will set the tone for early meetings.

Of the 12 members, seven are new members, including six who were elected for the first time in May 2018. The huge influx of new members hasn’t had a negative impact with only one result that went against recommendation: to approve an application for the development of a small two-storey extension that was recommended for refusal on the basis that it will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset. However, after a statement from Councillor Andy Milne, Grange Ward, in support of the applicant, the Planning Committee overturned the officer’s recommendations and approved the planning application subject to usual site conditions.

Usually, any contentious or big planning applications received will be heard by a Planning Panel, which is a non-executive body made up of members of the Planning Committee. The panel will provide officers and members an opportunity to listen to ideas raised prior to decision at Planning Committee.
Greenwich has 51 councillors and is a Labour-held borough since 1971. The current composition is 42 Labour councillors and nine Conservative councillors.

Greenwich Planning Board has 11 members and is dominated by Labour with 9 to 2 Conservative. Meetings are held twice-monthly. The Chair of the Planning Board is now Cllr Sarah Merrill who takes over from Cllr Mark James. Leader of the Council, Cllr Danny Thorpe, has made good on his promise to remove Cabinet members from the Planning Board, meaning that five new members now sit on the committee.

Greenwich also has Area Planning Committees. For smaller, non-strategic schemes, planning applications may get referred to the relevant Area Planning Committee for three reasons. Firstly, if the proposal does not comply with the Council’s planning policies and it has a recommendation from the Chief Officer for approval. Secondly, if there are eight or more objections to the application and it is recommended for approval. And thirdly, if a Cllr requests the application be determined by the Committee. All Area Planning Committees are chaired by Cllr Sarah Merrill.

Most planning application refusals were due to the application falling outside of the location identified for tall buildings in the council’s core strategy. On a number of occasions, the Mayor of London has stepped in and blocked decisions to refuse permission to major housing developments, E.g Rockwell’s proposals to build 771 homes at the end of Anchor & Hope Lane, meaning he will now decide whether or not it will go ahead. Rockwell had previously planned to build on the VIP industrial estate behind Atlas and Derrick Gardens, with five 10 Storey blocks, but the application was refused, with chair Sarah Merrill calling the proposal “reminiscent of Stalingrad”. All 11 Councillors voted to reject the scheme but the Mayor defined it as an “opportunity area”.

One application, recommended for refusal, was approved. The proposal was for an internal conversion of the existing industrial unit to create a new clinical facility initiated by the King’s College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust. The GLA’s Industrial Land Demand report June 2017 noted that industrial land release across London had exceeded expectations, and therefore most boroughs should seek to retain their industrial land. Greenwich falls within this “retain” category. In addition, the proposed development had poor access to public transport and is likely to rely on people driving to the site. As such, the planning officers deemed the proposal did not demonstrate an exceptional circumstance to allow for non-industrial uses. However, the planning board resolved to grant temporary planning permission subject to a number of conditions, including submitting and receiving approval for a car park management plan and completing a revised Flood Risk Assessment.
London Borough of Hackney

Planning Sub-Committee

Chair:
Cllr Vincent Stops
Hackney Central

8 Labour 1 Conservative

44% of the members new to the committee in May 2018
44% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 Applications determined 97% Approved 97% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

Councillors Vincent Stops and Katie Hanson have been retained as the Chair and Vice-Chairs of the Planning Sub-Committee, which will maintain a level of consistency from the previous administration. Cllr Vincent Stops is one of the most experienced committee chairs in London, having led the planning committee function in Hackney for over five years. Both Councillors have previously shown their opposition to the more left-wing elements of the Labour Party, having signed a councillor petition calling for Jeremy Corbyn to stand down as leader in 2016.

There are four new councillors on the Committee, of which one, Cllr Clare Joseph, was elected in May 2018. It is notable that two new members, Councillors Clare Joseph and Peter Snell, have voiced their opposition to development in the past. Since 3rd May, however, the Planning Sub-Committee has very rarely voted against a Planning Officer’s recommendations. Officer’s reports and Planning Committee minutes indicates that parking provision is a critical and potentially pivotal issue when it comes to their stance on various schemes. In the past, the sub-committee has pushed for reduced parking and advocated ‘car free’ commitments.

Household projections up to 2026 indicate that Hackney will be subjected to considerable housing growth. The latest Housing supply programme will see more than 400 homes being built and managed by the Council. Studio Egret West has recently unveiled a new canalside mixed-use scheme, redeveloping storage facilities to provide housing and workspace. The Council has also decided to introduce a license scheme to protect the borough’s growing number of private renters.
Hammersmith and Fulham’s Planning Committee is chaired by a councillor who was only elected for the first time in May this year, following the promotion of her ward colleague and the previous Chair to the Cabinet. This is an unusual position for a newly elected councillor, especially one who has no previous experience of the planning process. Unsurprisingly, the two Opposition members are delighting in the potential for political mischief making by exploiting the Chair’s inexperience. The Council has also taken the decision to reduce the membership of the Committee from 10 members to 8.

Hammersmith and Fulham’s Planning Committee enjoys a good relationship with officers, as demonstrated by the high number of applications that are voted for in line with officer recommendation. Of two applications that were refused by the Committee, reasons included adverse traffic impact, height and bulk; over intensification; and ‘an unneighbourly form of development with increased overlooking.’

Fulham Gasworks is the most notable application considered and approved by the committee since May. The proposals would deliver 1,843 new homes, 35% of which would be affordable. The Committee discussed the training and employment opportunities; the public and private amenity space; the construction management plan to mitigate noise and disruption; and the phasing of the affordable housing delivery.
Analysis

The May elections in Haringey saw a significant turnover in the membership of the Council, following the fallout from the resignation of Claire Kober after vehement protest from the left wing of the Labour party over the Haringey Development Vehicle.

Despite a high proportion of members new to the committee and almost half new to the Council, only one application has fallen foul of the Borough’s shift to the left. The committee is chaired by Vincent Carroll, a one-time property lobbyist.

The committee recently refused planning permission for a development which would have provided 121 homes on the site of the former Marks and Spencer store in High Road, Wood Green. Planning officers had given the green light to the proposals, but councillors complained that the proportion of affordable homes would be less than the borough’s 40%.
London Borough of Harrow

Planning Committee

Chair:
Cllr Keith Ferry
Greenhill

4 Labour 3 Conservative

43% of the members new to the committee in May 2018
14% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43 Applications determined
93% Approved
93% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

In Harrow Cllr Keith Ferry has remained as Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration, a post he has now held for most of the period since 2010. Ferry also remains Chair of the Planning Committee, allowing him to retain significant control on the inputs and outputs of Harrow’s planning agenda.

The Planning Committee largely follows the officer’s recommendation, with Harrow having an approval rate of 93%. Approximately half of these applications had unanimous approval, while the other half had a split vote, with the 4 Labour members aligning their votes for the application and the 3 Tories aligning their votes against. Most of the applications where the Tories voted against were on the grounds of overdevelopment, lack of parking or conservation issues.

Although affordable housing is an important consideration, several applications have been approved without any affordable housing allocation, usually because the development wasn’t viable.

It should be noted that 3 applications were unanimously refused despite an officer recommendation for approval. All 3 were refused on the grounds of overdevelopment, bulkiness and excessive scale, suggesting that all councillors, regardless of their party allegiance will align their voting where a development is considered significantly inappropriate for the borough. Two of these refusals were in all Labour wards, Headstone South and Harrow-on-the-Hill, while one was in an all Conservative ward, Hatch End.
London Borough of Havering

Planning Committee

Chair:
Cllr Robby Misir
Pettits

4 Conservatives 3 Resident groups 1 Labour

38% of the members new to the committee in May 2018

13% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Applications determined 85% Approved 77% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

After the elections in May 2018, Havering remained politically complex as the Conservatives failed to win control of the Council. Both the Conservatives, winning 25 and Labour, winning 5 gained seats however, the remaining 24 seats were split between various resident associations and an independent. Since then, only 16 applications have been heard with 9 being approved.

In August 2018, Government figures reported that Havering was the 11th worst local authority in the UK for missing new homes targets. A Council spokesman responded that “We are embarking on one of the most ambitious home building and regeneration strategies in London.” However, seeing as the Council does not have a party with a majority, it will be challenging to pursue a pro-development or regeneration agenda across the Borough.

The most contentious application the Committee has had to hear, has been the development of 30 new homes on a village green. The proposals were met with protests outside the Council however, the Committee approved the application with a marginal majority. In this case the Conservative Chairman, Cllr Misir providing the deciding vote in favour of the scheme.
London Borough of Hillingdon

Major Applications Planning Committee

Chair:
Cllr Edward Lavery
Cavendish

6 Conservatives 3 Labour

44% of the members new to the committee in May 2018

22% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 Applications determined

76% Approved

100% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

If an application is deemed to be ‘major’ (10 or more residential units, a site of 0.5 hectares or more, etc), it will be determined by the Major Planning Applications Committee irrespective of where it is within the Borough.

Cllr Edward Lavery (Conservative) remains Chair of the MAPC. In general, members accept developers’ viability reports, and listen to, but do not always agree with officers. Throughout the pre-Committee stage officers have a lot of power, but this does not necessarily resonate with the Committee.

The committee tends to use refusals as a last resort and instead will defer applications to give an applicant the opportunity to amend. Members are favourable to sites with CGIs of the proposed scheme. They will also tend to thoroughly read reports, meaning that if there is a weakness in the application, they will pick up on it. Parking and highways is a cross Party issue, and members are will strive to know the situation regarding access.

Hillingdon’s target set by the Government and the London Plan is to build 8,385 dwellings by 2026 or a target of 559 each year.
London Borough of Hounslow

Planning Committee

Chair:

Cllr Corinna Smart
Brentford

13 Labour 2 Conservatives

33% of the members new to the committee in May 2018

20% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 Applications determined

85% Approved

85% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

The Council has seen a high turnover of councillors as a result of the May elections, with 23 new elected members sitting in the Council this year. This is reflected on the planning committee’s new composition, with seven new members on the committee this year.

Cllr Corinna Smart is the new Planning Committee Chair and has already begun to exert her authority at meetings. She has been not afraid to steer the members of the committee to a decision or if they go off topic.

But there has some been chaotic decision making. In August, four of the five applications were voted down against officer recommendations to approve. Five Labour councillors were absent and Councillor Tony Louki moved refusal on three of the four refused applications. He is an outspoken critic on development when he perceives the application having a detrimental impact on residents.

Apart from this meeting however, the Planning Committee have usually been kept in line by Cllr Smart and has mainly followed officer recommendations. As with most high-level planning committees, usually only applications that are recommended for approval get to committee, and so far 85% of applications have been approved since May 2018.
London Borough of Islington

Planning Committee

Chair:
Cllr Martin Klute
St Peter’s

10 Labour

70% of the members new to the committee in May 2018
60% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Applications determined
89% Approved
89% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

The Planning Committee is almost unrecognisable from before May 2018 with only three returning members and seven new faces. Six of the new members to the Committee were only elected for the first time in May. Long-serving Councillor Martin Klute therefore plays an important role in providing experience and stability to the Committee.

Islington Planning Committee has some of the toughest planning policies in London, designed to deliver as much ‘genuinely affordable housing’, by which Islington Labour Group mean social rent, as possible.

In April, the High Court considered a case that centred around a planning application for a residential development on the site of the former Territorial Army building on Parkhurst Road. The High Court judgment made clear that developers cannot overpay for land, and then argue that they are not able to meet any of the borough’s ‘genuinely affordable housing’ requirements because they have overpaid for the land. Members of the Planning Committee often cite this and view developers’ viability statements with cynicism.

The reasons stated for the one application refusal since May were: lack of affordable housing, uncharacteristic street frontages and inadequate provision for on-site servicing.
Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea

Planning Committee

Chair:

Cllr Quentin Marshall
Courtfield

4 Conservatives 1 Labour

40% of the members new to the committee in May 2018
20% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Applications determined
40% Approved
60% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

With such a small membership, each committee members’ vote is more likely to have an impact on planning outcomes and so each vote is more valuable than other more traditional planning committees who have a larger membership.

Cllr Quentin Marshall has retained his position as Chair. He is willing to engage with developers on significant planning applications and clearly sets out his objectives for judging development proposals. The Chair is reinforced by his experienced Vice-Chair, Cllr James Husband, who has been engaged in a planning committee in the borough for nearly his entire tenure with the council.

Although the Council is beginning to return to normality post Grenfell, in terms of planning, the disaster is still a prominent part of the committee’s discussions. Concerns about height and tower safety are, of course, the core concerns but there are other issues relating to the event that can have an influence on their decisions. An application was refused for a nine storey, mixed use development on Freston Road at a meeting on 17th July 2018 because it “would unreasonably impact on...the recovery of the individuals and families” affected by the Grenfell disaster.

Members are also willing to go against officer’s recommendation if the applicant does not show adequate benefits for the local community. At a meeting on 29th September 2018, members refused an application recommended for approval which proposed a part-30, part-22, and part-7 storey building comprising a hotel, residential apartments along with amenity and commercial space. The reasons behind the refusal were that the benefits of the development would not outweigh the harm caused by the schemes impact on light and privacy for surrounding residents.
Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames

Development Control Committee

Chair:
Cllr Patricia Bamford
Chessington South

9 Liberal Democrats 2 Conservative

60% of the members new to the committee in May 2018
45% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One application approved at following meeting after deferral to allow application to address some issues of concern.

6 Applications determined 100% Approved 100% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

The elections in May 2018 saw significant change to Kingston’s political control, with the Liberal Democrats taking a large majority on the main planning committee. Since then, only 6 applications have been heard with all 6 approved – in most cases – unanimously or close to.

The biggest test of the new administration was Meyer Homes’ application for the Toby Jug site in Tolworth. The site had a chequered planning history and significant community and political opposition for over 15 years.

Meyer Homes had seen previous applications refused and deferred but received a 10-1 vote in favour of their 950-home scheme, despite the Lib Dems campaigning against a previous 705-homes scheme prior to the elections.

In this case, a revised affordable housing contribution, ambitious housing targets, and an inspectors’ judgement from a previous appeal also helped to influence a positive outcome.
Planning Applications Committee

Chair:
Cllr Clair Wilcox
Streatham South

6 Labour 1 Green Party

57% of the members new to the committee in May 2018
57% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Applications determined 100% Approved 100% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

Lambeth is an officer led authority, and this is reflected in the approval of 12 applications considered by the committee. The Committee has a strong relationship with officers, who will often ask detailed and thorough questions. Cllr Clair Wilcox is an experienced member of the committee, having served as a Vice Chair and Chair for a number of years. Cllr Jo Simpson is a practicing Local Authority Planner and an influential figure in the council, serving as the Vice Chair of the Committee. She is also married to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Jobs and Skills, Cllr Jack Hopkins.

Following the success of the Green party in this year’s Local Elections, the Committee has one non-Labour member, Cllr Becca Thackray. Four of the members are first time elected councillors and as such are continuing to look closely to officers for guidance and support.

The biggest application since May 2018 was for Berkeley Homes’ Oval Gasworks site, which proposed 738 units as part of a mixed-use development with community and employment space. The proposal split the committee evenly, with the Chair using her overriding vote to grant approval. The scheme exemplified common themes of debate in Lambeth, which included affordable housing, on-site affordable workspace, meaningful community space and quality of design.
London Borough of Lewisham

Strategic Planning Committee

Chair:
Cllr John Paschoud
Perry Vale

9 Labour (2 Labour and Co-operative party)

Analysis
The Strategic Planning Committee deals with larger applications than the Planning Committees. The Strategic Planning Committee has also expanded from 8 to 9 members. Of the 7 planned meetings organised by the Strategic Planning Committee since the May elections only 2 have taken place. One of these meetings was solely to elect a Chair, Cllr. John Paschoud, and Vice-Chair, Cllr. Alan Smith, of the Committee.

The Strategic Committee has yet to consider any items beyond how to approach the appeal on the Meyer Homes scheme, which has now been resubmitted and will be determined by the committee later this year.
The Planning Committees generally deal with smaller applications than the Strategic Planning Committee such as loft extensions, extra dwellings for homes but Planning Committee A did consider an application for 136 new homes that was refused on lack of affordable housing and massing grounds.

### Planning Committee A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 Applications determined  
94% Approved  
In line with officer recommendation

### Planning Committee B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 Applications determined  
100% Approved  
In line with officer recommendation

### Planning Committee C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 Applications determined  
100% Approved  
In line with officer recommendation
London Borough of Merton

Planning Applications Committee

Chair:
Cllr Linda Kirby
Graveney

6 Labour 2 Conservative 1 Liberal Democrats 1 Merton Park Independents

- 50% of the members new to the committee in May 2018
- 20% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 Applications determined | 81% Approved | 81% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

Following the May elections, the Labour Party has retained control of the Council and has seen a small change to the Committee’s composition, with Labour retaining a majority of 2, but now with a Liberal Democrat representative joining two Conservatives and one Independent on the committee.

Although there has been a significant turnover on the committee and 2 newly elected councillors, there is still a wealth of experience on the committee. The Chair Linda Kirby is hugely experienced having been a councillor since 1986 and previously having chaired the committee during the previous administration.

The Committee has generally followed the recommendation of the Planning Officer (81%). However, applications which are perceived as too ‘bulky’ and/or affecting parking are more likely to be rejected despite the Planning Officer’s recommendation, as has occurred on all 4 applications rejected to date.

Another issue to consider is the split between the East and West of the borough. Typically, you get far more objections from the more affluent wards in the West (Village, Wimbledon Park, Dundonald, Hillside) which are dominated by the Conservatives. Applications in these wards often attract multiple objections and speakers.
London Borough of Newham

Strategic Development Committee

Chair:
Cllr James Beckles
Custom House

9 Labour

89% of the members new to the committee in May 2018
44% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved</strong></td>
<td><strong>Refused</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved</strong></td>
<td><strong>Refused</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 Applications determined
96% Approved
100% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

The newly elected Mayor, Rokhsana Fiaz has set planning and development as a priority in Newham and has even personally taken on the cabinet responsibility for Strategic Housing Delivery, Regeneration and Planning.

With a total of eight new members, four of whom were first elected in May 2018, the committee has a completely new outlook. The new Chair, Cllr James Beckles, has no previous planning experience but has taken to the role enthusiastically. In the past, he has been vocal in his opposition of Jeremy Corbyn’s leadership and appears a more pro-development Chair than Ms Fiaz’s traditional supporters. The only member to retain her position on the committee from the previous cycle is Cllr Rachael Tripp. In recent meetings, Cllr Tripp’s experience has been evident by her grasp of complex issues and her probing questioning of applicants. Cllr Tripp often uses her committee experience to assist new members in navigating committee proceedings.

As well as listening to officers, the committee pays close attention the Design Review Panel’s (DRP) feedback. This panel advises on major developments within the borough and comprises a Chair and up to three others taken from a group of 15 built environment professionals, including architects, urban designers and landscape architects. The Committee Chair and lead members, like Cllr Tripp, often question DRP members in attendance at meetings to clarify key points on the applications under review. For instance, the DRP’s feedback had a significant influence on the outcome of the Gallions Quarter, Phase 2A application. The scheme was approved by the Committee on the 11th September 2018 after it met quality standards set by the DRP.

Design was a key reason behind the only refused application which proposed a 17-storey development reviewed on the 9th October that would provide up to 100 residential units. According to the committee, the proposed development failed to add the ‘value expected of all tall buildings because its design fails to integrate and positively contribute to its location’. As such the proposed height will negatively impact on the character of the area and the livelihoods of surrounding residents.
London Borough of Redbridge

Planning Committee

Chair:
Cllr Jyotsna Rahman Islam
Aldborough

9 Labour 2 Conservative

55% of the members new to the committee in May 2018
36% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 Applications determined 96% Approved 96% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

Post the May elections, Cllr. Jas Athwal has retained his position as Leader of the Council. Cllr. Athwal has previously stated his aim to make Redbridge the ‘destination of choice for developers and investors’ showcasing his positive attitude to regeneration in the borough. The introduction of the new Cabinet position for Planning and Planning Enforcement, occupied by Cllr. Sheila Bain, reflects a renewed emphasis of the administration to deliver more homes and tackle local rental issues in the Borough.

The Planning Committee has seen a significant change since the May elections with over half of the membership replaced, a third of which are newly elected to the Council. Cllr. Jyotsna Rahman Islam is the current Chair of the Planning Committee with previous Chair, Cllr. Paul Merry, now taking up the position of Vice-Chair. Cllr. Islam was elected in May on a local Labour manifesto commitment to deliver 1,000 new affordable homes in the borough by 2023.

With 96% of applications following officer’s recommendation to date, the committee appear to be following through on the administration’s aspirations, but one cannot draw too heavily on this sample as many of the applications to the Committee have been minor, the largest application determined contained just 35 homes. The single application refused was as a result of inadequate vehicle access that would be detrimental to road safety.
London Borough of Richmond

Planning Committee

Chair:

Cllr Jonathan Cardy
Fulwell and Hampton Hill

6 Liberal Democrats  2 Conservative  1 Green party
* 18 members are in a pool, of which the composition of 9 is drawn from each month

56% of the members new to the committee in May 2018
44% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 Applications determined  
63% Approved
79% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

The elections in May 2018 saw significant change to the administration in Richmond, with the Liberal Democrats decimating the previous Conservative-run Council with huge gains. The Planning Committee is run on a pool system, meaning that only half of the 18 members of the committee sit in judgement at each committee. The committee has had relatively few applications of any significance to content with to-date, with many of the applications related to minor house extensions or Tree Preservation Orders. Where refusals have been directed, parking and the environment have been key considerations for members in line with the Liberal Democrat manifesto commitments. As yet, the committee remains untested by any strategic planning applications so matters of great controversy in leafy Richmond are to come as they manage the implications of their vastly increased housing targets.
The Planning Committee has seen significant changes to its personnel since the local elections in May. The new Chair, Cllr Martin Seaton, is new to the committee and replaces long-term former Chair Cllr Nick Dolezal. Cllr Seaton has no previous planning experience.

There have been 10 applications in total on the planning committee's agenda of which two were deferred in the most recent meeting. As such, of the 8 applications which have been put to a vote 7 have been approved in line with the officer’s recommendation. The one application which was refused, against the officer's recommendation, proposed a 10-storey block intended for a 200-room hotel on Blackfriars Road which the Committee described as 'an inappropriate use of land' and, as such, does not justify its impact on surrounding residents.

The application exposed some disagreement in the ruling Labour Group, with other councillors backing Cllr Seaton's stance against the plans, most notably his ward colleague and new Deputy Leader, Cllr Lury. On the contrary, the Council Leader Peter John publicly endorsed the scheme from an early stage and his support was matched by the Cabinet Member for Growth, Development and Planning, Cllr Situ, who publicly welcomed the decision.

However, the most publicised and controversial planning application was on the Elephant & Castle Shopping Centre regeneration which was brought before the Committee on 3rd July 2018.

As ward councillor, Cllr Seaton has been vocal in his opposition to the plans and even stepped-aside as Chair when the application came before the committee to act as an objector. Despite this the plans were approved by 4 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

The application exposed some disagreement in the ruling Labour Group, with other councillors backing Cllr Seaton’s stance against the plans, most notably his ward colleague and new Deputy Leader, Cllr Lury. On the contrary, the Council Leader Peter John publicly endorsed the scheme from an early stage and his support was matched by the Cabinet Member for Growth, Development and Planning, Cllr Situ, who publicly welcomed the decision.
London Borough of Sutton

Planning Committee

Chair:

Cllr Kevin Burke
Sutton West

5 Liberal Democrats 3 Conservative 1 Independent

60% of the members new to the committee in May 2018

50% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 Applications determined

72% Approved

83% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

The Planning Committee saw considerable change in the aftermath of the local elections in May. Notably, the loss of former Lib Dem Chair Cllr Samantha Bourne who lost her seat. The loss of the Chair was coupled with the introduction of 6 new members to the committee of which 5 are new to the Council as a whole.

Cllr Kevin Burke has been promoted to Chair having been on the committee throughout the previous election cycle. He has been outspoken on his party website about opposing overdevelopment with his ward colleagues.

The committee has met on five occasions and has mostly reviewed minor applications. There have been several refusals of planning application scrutinised by the new committee. An example of a refused application from the committee meeting on 5th September 2018 showcases some key issues borough wide.

The plans proposed the erection of an industrial unit with flexible employment space with on-site parking. These were refused because it ‘would not make the most efficient use of the land’ and providing an ‘over provision of car parking which would not deter unnecessary car use’.

Parking may be a key issue for the committee as the Liberal Democrats are naturally attracted to the Mayor of London’s drive to reduce parking and encourage more sustainable transport across the capital.
Analysis

Tower Hamlets’ Strategic Development Committee (SDC) got off to a rocky start after the May 2018 Local Elections when 3 sessions in a row either got cancelled or moved, resulting in the first session not taking place until the end of July. With 100% of the Committee members new and over 50% first-time elects, there have been few opportunities for them to develop experience on consideration of Tower Hamlets’ biggest planning applications.

With an entirely new Committee, Cllr John Pierce has taken over as the Chair of the SDC, replacing long-serving councillor, Marc Francis, who was the chair of both the SDC and the Development Committee for several years. After four years of relatively idiosyncratic decision making and many refusals against officer recommendations the early signs are positive for major applications.

The 4 applications approved so far have all faced significant opposition from members of the public, with the controversial Crisp Street Market and London Chest Hospital applications played out in front of a packed and raucous public gallery. The committee has placed huge emphasis on the affordable housing levels of each application and this will continue to be a key issue for members.

With regards to Tower Hamlets’ Development Committee, there is more inconsistency in development decisions, as would be expected from smaller, less strategic development – with approvals against office recommendation and refusals against recommendations similarly.

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Applications determined

100% Approved

100% In line with officer recommendation

* The above is based on three committee sessions since May 2018 – the other three were cancelled.
London Borough of Waltham Forest

Planning Committee

Chair:
Cllr Jenny Gray
Leytonstone

4 Labour 1 Conservative

20% of the members new to the committee in May 2018
0% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 Applications determined
90% Approved
93% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

The relatively minor changes to the composition of the Planning Committee allowed members to continue with business as usual. Of the 29 applications considered, they have been split relatively evenly between large developments and minor rear extensions or single storey developments.

The Planning Committee largely follows the officer’s recommendation with 27 out of the 29 in line with the officer’s advice. Of the 26 applications approved, almost all cases had unanimous approval or the 4 Labour members aligning their voting, with the one Conservative member usually voting against or abstaining.

When approving, 35% affordable housing (which is the Council’s minimum target), was a significant consideration, and S106 contributions are carefully scrutinised to ensure maximum benefit is due to the Council. In some cases, further contributions were asked for as a condition for granting approval.

It is worth noting the two applications that were refused despite the officer’s recommendation. One was refused on the grounds of design, after it was considered out of keeping with the immediate area and was considered detrimental to the Conservation area, while the other was refused due to the loss of specialist older people’s (sheltered) housing that was not being replaced in the proposed plans. Both applications received considerable public objections, suggesting that members will consider local resident grievances and other concerns despite the officer’s recommendation.
London Borough of Wandsworth

Planning Applications Committee

Chair: Cllr Will Sweet
Fairfield

6 Conservative 4 Labour

50% of the members new to the committee in May 2018

30% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

104 Applications determined 97% Approved 99% In line with officer recommendation

Analysis

The Wandsworth Planning Committee has seen a fairly significant change in membership with half the committee replaced after the May elections. This does not seem to have affected approval applications however, with the committee approving 97% of applications heard since May.

Unlike some committees, who split their ‘major’ and ‘minor’ applications, the committee hears all applications together, hence the number of applications heard. When hearing an application recommended for refusal, it is most likely that the committee will choose to defer the application and hear it again at a later date. Since May, four applications have been deferred with two applications subsequently approved.

Two applications have been refused – 92 Putney Bridge Road – proposals for a multi-use development (flexible class, office space and nine residential units) and 1 Armoury way (flexible use and office space). The committee refused 1 Armoury Way for its excessive scale, whilst 92 Putney Bridge Road was refused for its inappropriate design. The Committee also concluded that the 92 Putney Bridge application would be underutilising a prominent and strategically important location due to insufficient public realm improvements. One application was also approved against officer recommendation on an albeit minor application for a roof extension. The committee disagreed with officers that it was an inappropriate design.
City of Westminster

Planning (Major Applications) Sub-Committee

Chair: Cllr Gotz Mohindra
Regent’s Park

5 Conservative 2 Labour

43% of the members new to the committee in May 2018

43% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 Applications determined

80% Approved

92% In line with officer recommendation
City of Westminster

Planning Applications Sub-Committee (1)

Chair:
Cllr Tony Devenish
Knightsbridge & Belgravia

3 Conservative 1 Labour

50% of the members new to the committee in May 2018

50% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 Applications determined

97% Approved

100% In line with officer recommendation
City of Westminster

Planning Applications Sub-Committee (2)

Chair:
Cllr Robert Rigby
Regent’s Park

3 Conservative 1 Labour

25% of the members new to the committee in May 2018

25% of members new to the Council in May 2018

Decision making since May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval</th>
<th>Recommended for refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 Applications determined

83% Approved

87% In line with officer recommendation
Analysis

Planning in Westminster has seen significant change in personnel since the May 2018 elections, both in terms of Cabinet member responsibility, as well as the various planning committee chairmanships. Despite that, the first six months of the Council term has not given a significant indication as to just how much the planning environment might change over the coming years. But significant change is coming. Westminster’s Cabinet has already agreed a new planning regime that will include, amongst other things, the introduction of the right of members of the public to address committees. A new local plan is also going to be going out to consultation that is likely to have significant policy changes.

At an officer level there is also going to be significant change with the role of Director of Planning Development being removed and replaced with a new role of merging with that of the Director of Placeshaping. The coming months are therefore going to be of huge interest to the property industry in Westminster. Observers will also be interested in how Sadiq Khan’s relationship with Westminster might impact on planning – there has already been a significant falling out over the pedestrianisation of Oxford Street.