



STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA

7.30 pm	Thursday 16 August 2018	Council Chamber, Town Hall, Main Road, Romford RM1 3BD
----------------	------------------------------------	---

Members 8: Quorum 3

COUNCILLORS:

Conservative Group (4)

Ray Best
Jason Frost
Maggie Themistocli
Melvin Wallace (Chairman)

Residents' Group (1)

Reg Whitney

Upminster & Cranham Residents' Group (1)

Linda Hawthorn

Independent Residents Group (1)

Graham Williamson

Labour Group (1)

Keith Darvill (Vice-Chair)

For information about the meeting please contact:

Taiwo Adeoye 01708 433079, Richard Cursons 01708 432430 or Victoria Freeman 01708 433862

**taiwo.adeoye@onesource.co.uk richard.cursons@onesource.co.uk
victoria.freeman@onesource.co.uk**

**To register to speak at the meeting please call 01708 433100
Before 5.00pm on Tuesday 14 August 2018**

Protocol for members of the public wishing to report on meetings of the London Borough of Havering

Members of the public are entitled to report on meetings of Council, Committees and Cabinet, except in circumstances where the public have been excluded as permitted by law.

Reporting means:-

- filming, photographing or making an audio recording of the proceedings of the meeting;
- using any other means for enabling persons not present to see or hear proceedings at a meeting as it takes place or later; or
- reporting or providing commentary on proceedings at a meeting, orally or in writing, so that the report or commentary is available as the meeting takes place or later if the person is not present.

Anyone present at a meeting as it takes place is not permitted to carry out an oral commentary or report. This is to prevent the business of the meeting being disrupted.

Anyone attending a meeting is asked to advise Democratic Services staff on 01708 433076 that they wish to report on the meeting and how they wish to do so. This is to enable employees to guide anyone choosing to report on proceedings to an appropriate place from which to be able to report effectively.

Members of the public are asked to remain seated throughout the meeting as standing up and walking around could distract from the business in hand.



AGENDA ITEMS

1 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman will announce details of the arrangements in case of fire or other events that might require the meeting room or building's evacuation.

These are the arrangements in case of fire or other events that might require the meeting room or building's evacuation. (Double doors at the entrance to the Council Chamber and door on the right hand corner (marked as an exit).

Proceed down main staircase, out the main entrance, turn left along front of building to side car park, turn left and proceed to the "Fire Assembly Point" at the corner of the rear car park. Await further instructions.

Development presentations

I would like to inform everyone that Councillors will receive presentations on proposed developments, generally when they are at the pre-application stage. This is to enable Members of the committee to view the development before a planning application is submitted and to comment upon it. The development does not constitute an application for planning permission and any comments made upon it are provisional and subject to full consideration of any subsequent application and the comments received as a result of consultation, publicity and notification.

Applications for decision

I would like to remind members of the public that Councillors have to make decisions on planning applications strictly in accordance with planning principles.

I would also like to remind members of the public that the decisions may not always be popular, but they should respect the need for Councillors to take decisions that will stand up to external scrutiny or accountability.

Would everyone in the chamber note that they are not allowed to communicate with or pass messages to Councillors sitting on the Committee during the meeting.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

(if any) - receive.

3 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Members are invited to disclose any interest in any of the items on the agenda at this point of the meeting.

Members may still disclose any interest in an item at any time prior to the consideration of the matter.

4 MINUTES (Pages 1 - 4)

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 19 July 2018 and to authorise the Chairman to sign them.

5 DEVELOPMENT PRESENTATION - FREIGHMASTER ESTATE, COLDHARBOUR LANE RAINHAM (Pages 5 - 12)

6 P1004.18 - LAND AT NEW ZEALAND WAY RAINHAM (Pages 13 - 34)

7 P1229.17 - 89-101 NEW ROAD RAINHAM (Pages 35 - 48)

8 P1242.17 - CONSULTATION RESPONSE - BEAM PARK, FORMER FORD ASSEMBLY PARK SITE, NEW ROAD RAINHAM (Pages 49 - 52)

9 QUARTERLY PLANNING PERFORMANCE UPDATE REPORT (Pages 53 - 58)

10 URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any other item in respect of which the Chairman is of the opinion, by reason of special circumstances which will be specified in the minutes, that the item should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency

Andrew Beesley
Head of Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
Council Chamber, Town Hall, Main Road, Romford RM1 3BD
19 July 2018 (7.30 - 8.25 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Conservative Group	Jason Frost, +Robby Misir, Maggie Themistocli and Melvin Wallace (Chairman)
Residents' Group	Reg Whitney
Upminster & Cranham Residents' Group	Linda Hawthorn
Independent Residents Group	Graham Williamson
Labour Group	Keith Darvill (Vice-Chair)

An apology was received for the absence of Councillor Ray Best.

+ Councillor Robbie Misir substituted for Councillor Best.

Councillor Christine Smith was also present at the meeting.

Unless otherwise indicated all decisions were agreed with no vote against.

The Chairman reminded Members of the action to be taken in an emergency.

4 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

No interest was disclosed at the meeting.

5 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2018 were agreed as correct records and signed by the Chairman with the following amendment:

Minute No. 2, St George's Hospital, Suttons Lane, Hornchurch refers: That the condition of building report be circulated to members.

6 NEOPOST HOUSE, SOUTH, STREET, ROMFORD - 3 X NEW RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS AND EXTENSION TO EXISTING BUILDING TO PROVIDE 122 UNITS AND NEW GP SURGERY

The Committee received a presentation from Mr Michael Watson (Galliard Homes), Martin Herbert (WYG) and Robert Hirschfield (Robert Hirschfield Architects).

Members of the Committee then questioned the presenters and raised issues for further consideration prior to submission of a planning application.

The main issues raised were:

- The need to ensure that there are adequate provisions in place for the ongoing maintenance of the open space.
- Whether the proposal at the density proposed was appropriate.
- Whether the proposal delivered the appropriate mix of dwelling sizes particularly given the Local Plan need for 3 bed units.
- The level of car parking was important given that there was little increase over that to be provided with the office to residential conversion.
- Affordable housing should be offered to the Council as provider.
- Concern over poor the outlook over the adjacent B&Q site.
- Concern over the amount of amenity space for the number of units.
- Concern that the layout may be cramped with buildings too close to one another.
- Important that any submitted application included a full sunlight assessment.
- Important that the Clinical Commissioning Group were on board and supportive of the doctors surgery provision before any application was submitted.
- Important that restriction on ability of future occupiers from obtaining parking permits was considered.
- Consideration should be given to increasing the amount of affordable housing to meet the Mayors target of 35%.

The Committee noted the presentation.

- 7 **MARSHALLS PARK SCHOOL, PETTITS LANE, ROMFORD -
DEMOLITION OF SINGLE STOREY FORMER YOUTH CENTRE BLOCK
AND ERECTION OF PART SINGLE STOREY AND PART TWO STOREY
TEACHING BLOCK WITH ASSOCIATED EXTERNAL WORKS AND CAR
PARKING ADAPTATIONS TO ALLOW 2 FORM ENTRY EXPANSION TO
EXISTING SCHOOL**

It was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Development Presentations

Introduction

1. This part of the agenda is for the committee to receive presentations on proposed developments, particularly when they are at the pre-application stage.
2. Although the reports are set out in order on the agenda, the Chair may reorder the agenda on the night. Therefore, if you wish to be present for a specific application, you need to be at the meeting from the beginning.
3. The following information and advice only applies to reports in this part of the agenda.

Advice to Members

4. These proposed developments are being reported to committee to enable Members of the committee to view them at an early stage and to comment upon them. They do not constitute applications for planning permission at this stage (unless otherwise stated in the individual report) and any comments made are provisional and subject to full consideration of any subsequent application and the comments received following consultation, publicity and notification.
5. Members of the committee will need to pay careful attention to the probity rules around predisposition, predetermination and bias (set out in the Council's Constitution). Failure to do so may mean that the Member will not be able to participate in the meeting when any subsequent application is considered.

Public speaking and running order

6. The Council's Constitution only provides for public speaking rights for those applications being reported to Committee in the "Applications for Decision" parts of the agenda. Therefore, reports on this part of the agenda do not attract public speaking rights, save for Ward Members.
7. The items on this part of the agenda will run as follows:
 - a. Officer introduction of the main issues
 - b. Developer presentation (15 minutes)
 - c. Ward Councillor speaking slot (5 minutes)
 - d. Committee questions
 - e. Officer roundup

Late information

8. Any relevant material received since the publication of this part of the agenda, concerning items on it, will be reported to the Committee in the Update Report.

Recommendation

9. The Committee is not required to make any decisions with respect to the reports on this part of the agenda. The reports are presented as background information.



Pre-Application Reference:	PE/01273/2017
Location:	FREIGHTMASTER ESTATE, COLDHARBOUR LANE, OFF FERRY LANE, RAINHAM
Ward:	RAINHAM AND WENNINGTON
Description:	REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE TO PROVIDE UP TO 11 LIGHT INDUSTRIAL/INDUSTRIAL/STORAGE UNITS
Case Officer:	Jacob Lawrence

1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 This proposed development is being presented to enable Members of the committee to view it before a planning application is submitted and to comment upon it. The development does not constitute an application for planning permission and any comments made upon it are provisional and subject to full consideration of any subsequent application and the comments received as a result of consultation, publicity and notification.
- 1.2 The proposed detailed planning application has been the subject of two pre-application meetings with Officers, on 1 February 2018, and 5 April 2018.
- 1.3 The scheme has continued to be developed following feedback from the pre-application meetings.

2 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

2.1 Proposal

- Redevelopment of site with demolition of all existing buildings and erection of up to 12 x new buildings, parking/loading areas and landscaping. The

buildings would be used for either light industrial (Class B1(c), industrial (Class B2) or storage and distribution (Class B8) use.

- The form of the proposed planning application has not been decided, although it is likely to be an outline application with all matters reserved except access.
- The total proposed floorspace would be up to 40,000 sq metres. Buildings would be of various sizes and heights, reflecting the intended industrial/storage uses proposed.
- Vehicle access would be from Coldharbour Lane and a further vehicle route to the current landfill jetty is indicated.
- Within the site would be mainly vehicle circulation space, parking and loading bays. To the edges of the site, particularly adjacent to the river, landscaped areas are proposed.

2.2 Site and Surroundings

- The site is located at the southernmost point of the Borough adjacent to Rainham Landfill and the River Thames. The site measures approximately 10.5 hectares in size.
- The site has poor access to public transport and other services, it is approximately 5 kilometres walk or cycle from Rainham railway station.
- Vehicular access is via Coldharbour Lane, a private road that runs along the edge of the landfill site and connects to Ferry Lane and the A13.
- Currently on the site are five large warehouse type buildings, providing around 28,000 sq metres of floor space, numerous smaller buildings and yard areas used for open storage. A fence separates the site from the riverside path.
- Further to the east and north of the site is the Inner Thames Marshes SSSI

Planning History

- 2.3 The site has been in longstanding industrial/storage use and there is no particular relevant planning history.

3 CONSULTATION

- 3.1 At this stage, it is intended that the following will be consulted regarding any subsequent planning application:

- Mayor of London
- London Fire Brigade
- Environment Agency
- Port of London Authority
- Natural England
- Historic England
- Thames Water
- Essex and Suffolk Water
- EDF Energy
- National Grid
- Transport for London

4 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- 4.1 In accordance with planning legislation, the developer will be engaging with key stakeholders, such as local Members and businesses, on these proposals as part of the pre-application process.

5 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the committee must consider are:

- Principal of development
- Relationship with neighbouring landfill site/London Riverside Conservation Park
- Design quality, quantum and scale of development
- Traffic generation

5.2 Principal of Development

- Within the current policies in the Local Development Framework, the Freightmaster Estate site is included within a site specific policy (SSA17) covering the wider area including the Rainham Landfill site. Policy SSA17 seeks to incorporate the site into the London Riverside Conservation Park, once the landfill is complete and restored as public open space.
- The Council's submitted Local Plan is due to be examined in October with adoption in 2019. The Local Plan states as a key economic growth feature of the spatial strategy that the Freightmaster Estate would be protected as a Strategic Industrial Location for continued industrial use and Policy 19 of the Plan seeks such protection.

- There is therefore a conflict between existing and emerging policy as to the acceptable future land use of the site. However, taking account of the following factors, it may be possible to conclude that the proposed redevelopment for industrial/storage purposes would be acceptable in principle:
 - there are no in principle objections received in relation to the inclusion of Freightmaster Estate as a Strategic Industrial Location in the Local Plan (one objector considers the extent of the site should be widened)
 - the site is in current industrial/storage use and is privately owned. There is no current intervention planned in relation to this site or intention to incorporate the land into the future conservation park, so use for industrial/storage purposes would likely continue
 - a greater variety of jobs may be created than existing, particularly if the proposal were to include space suitable for high-tech industries and this may weigh in favour of the proposal when assessed against the existing policy position

5.3 Relationship with neighbouring landfill site/London Riverside Conservation Park

- The Rainham Landfill site is due to be completed by 2026 with the land being restored to public open space. The legal agreement in place in relation to the planning permission for the landfill obliges the landowners of the site to offer to the Council a pie crust lease of the site. In contrast to the current landfill operation with associated vehicle activity, stockpiling and earth moving, the area would be totally transformed and become a major recreational asset to the Borough and the wider area. It is therefore important that any redevelopment the Freightmaster site which sits between the southern part of the future conservation park and river takes account of this context, so that it complements the future open space.

5.4 Design quality, quantum and scale of development

- The proposal is for up to 40,000 square metres of floorspace, an increase of approximately 12,000 square metres compared to existing buildings on the site. The buildings currently on site are quite large and utilitarian in appearance as well as there being quite large areas of open storage. The redevelopment of the site provides an opportunity to improve its appearance and compliment both the river setting and future conservation park. A high quality design would be expected.

- The most important considerations for the development of this site, whatever the size of buildings proposed would be the quality of the design in terms of relationship to the river and the future conservation park. The design is evolving in this respect, but officers have expressed an expectation that the development should not be a standard industrial park development but needs to clearly demonstrate a higher quality reflecting its important location. The applicant has started to look at the relationship with the river, proposing a café and landscaping/recreation space and introducing glass to at least one building. The relationship with the future conservation park and wider nature conservation assets should also be considered.
- Given the isolated nature of the site in terms of surrounding occupiers, there may be scope to have reasonably large and tall buildings as part of any proposal, but it is important that any large buildings proposed have a greater quality of design and external finish so that they form important landmark buildings within the riverside setting.

5.5 Traffic generation

- Currently Coldharbour Lane has high levels of HGV traffic associated with the landfill site and to a lesser extent the existing Freightmaster Estate. Due to the increase in floorspace proposed, the proposal has potential to increase the amount of HGV traffic to the subject site, but post 2026 when the landfill is complete, the overall HGV levels on Coldharbour Lane should reduce.
- The proposal indicates a road link west of the site to the current jetty – such a link is encouraged and would allow transportation by river which has potential to reduce HGV traffic.
- Further information on traffic levels is required to assess whether there are any likely impacts on existing junctions. It would also be relevant to assess whether high HGV traffic levels would be detrimental to the character and functioning of the future recreational use of the conservation park and surrounding footpaths/cycleways.
- The proposal includes the provision of 502 parking spaces - it would be expected that this level of parking be justified together with suitable cycle parking and facilities for cyclists being provided.

5.6 Financial and Other Mitigation

- The proposal may attract the following section 106 contributions to mitigate the impact of the development:
 - Apprenticeship scheme for construction jobs
 - Job brokerage for new jobs created
 - Contributions to improved pedestrian/cycle access in vicinity of site
 - Any contributions requested by TfL

5.7 The proposal would attract the following Community Infrastructure Levy contributions to mitigate the impact of the development:

- £200,000 Mayoral CIL towards Crossrail, based on increase in floorspace

5.8 Other Planning Issues

- Archaeology
- Ecological Impact and Mitigation
- Sustainable design and construction measures
- Secured by Design

Conclusions

- 5.9 The proposed development has been considered at two pre-application meetings with officers, and the scheme has been developed as a result. There are some aspects that require further work as identified in this report and Members' guidance will be most helpful to incorporate as the various elements are brought together.

Applications for Decision

Introduction

1. In this part of the agenda are reports on strategic planning applications for determination by the committee.
2. Although the reports are set out in order on the agenda, the Chair may reorder the agenda on the night. Therefore, if you wish to be present for a specific application, you need to be at the meeting from the beginning.
3. The following information and advice only applies to reports in this part of the agenda.

Advice to Members

Material planning considerations

4. The Committee is required to consider planning applications against the development plan and other material planning considerations.
5. The development plan for Havering comprises the following documents:
 - London Plan March 2016
 - Core Strategy and Development Control Policies (2008)
 - Site Allocations (2008)
 - Romford Area Action Plan (2008)
 - Joint Waste Development Plan (2012)
6. Decisions must be taken in accordance with section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires the Committee to have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan, so far as material to the application; any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application; and any other material considerations. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Committee to make its determination in accordance with the Development Plan unless material planning considerations support a different decision being taken.
7. Under Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects listed buildings or their settings, the local planning authority must have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of architectural or historic interest it possesses.
8. Under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development

which affects a conservation area, the local planning authority must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

9. Under Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, in considering whether to grant planning permission for any development, the local planning authority must ensure, whenever it is appropriate, that adequate provision is made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees.
10. In accordance with Article 35 of the Development Management Procedure Order 2015, Members are invited to agree the recommendations set out in the reports, which have been made based on the analysis of the scheme set out in each report. This analysis has been undertaken on the balance of the policies and any other material considerations set out in the individual reports.

Non-material considerations

11. Members are reminded that other areas of legislation cover many aspects of the development process and therefore do not need to be considered as part of determining a planning application. The most common examples are:
 - Building Regulations deal with structural integrity of buildings, the physical performance of buildings in terms of their consumption of energy, means of escape in case of fire, access to buildings by the Fire Brigade to fight fires etc.
 - Works within the highway are controlled by Highways Legislation.
 - Environmental Health covers a range of issues including public nuisance, food safety, licensing, pollution control etc.
 - Works on or close to the boundary are covered by the Party Wall Act.
 - Covenants and private rights over land are enforced separately from planning and should not be considered.

Local financial considerations

12. In accordance with Policy 6.5 of the London Plan (2015) the Mayor of London has introduced a London wide Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to fund CrossRail.
13. Other forms of necessary infrastructure (as defined in the CIL Regulations) and any mitigation of the development that is necessary will be secured through a section106 agreement. Where these are necessary, it will be explained and specified in the agenda reports.

Public speaking and running order

14. The Council's Constitution allows for public speaking on these items in accordance with the Constitution and the Chair's discretion.
15. The items on this part of the agenda will run as follows:
 - a. Officer introduction of the development
 - b. Registered Objector(s) speaking slot (5 minutes)
 - c. Responding Applicant speaking slot (5 minutes)
 - d. Councillor(s) speaking slots (5 minutes)
 - e. Cabinet Member Speaking slot (5 minutes)
 - f. Officer presentation of the material planning considerations
 - g. Committee questions and debate
 - h. Committee decision

Late information

16. Any relevant material received since the publication of this part of the agenda, concerning items on it, will be reported to the Committee in the Update Report.

Recommendation

17. The Committee to take any decisions recommended in the attached report(s).



Application Reference:	P1004.18
Location:	Land bounded by New Zealand Way, Queenstown Gardens and Gisborne Gardens, Rainham.
Ward:	South Hornchurch
Description:	Outline application with all matters reserved for the development of 30 new units of affordable housing comprising 2 bedroom and 3 bedroom houses with associated landscaping and car parking.
Case Officer:	Suzanne Terry
Reason for Report to Committee:	The application is land within the ownership of the Council and is a significant development.

1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Planning permission for residential development on this site was initially sought in December 2015, planning application reference P1536.15. The development sought was for 32 dwellings, comprising a mix of houses and flats. The application was refused in July 2016 for the following reasons:
- The proposal would result in the loss of public open space contrary to Policy DC18 (Protection of Public Open Space, Recreation, Sports and Leisure Facilities) of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.
 - The proposal would cause traffic congestion and consequently would have an adverse impact on the functioning of the road network contrary to Policy DC32 (The Road Network) of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

- The proposal would result in a development which is out of character with the surrounding area and which provides cramped units of accommodation contrary to Policy DC3 (Housing Design and Layout) of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.
 - In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.
 - In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for children's play space arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies CP8, DC30 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.
- 1.2 A second application was received in March 2017, planning application reference P0407.17. This was for a modified scheme, which reduced the number of units to 30 and proposed only houses, with all flats removed from the development. The application was reported to Committee with a recommendation to grant permission but was deferred at Members request for additional information to be provided. The scheme was subsequently withdrawn at the applicant's request and so did not return to Committee for a resolution.
- 1.3 The current application is effectively a re-submission of the scheme that was previously withdrawn. It differs from the first (refused) application in the following key respects:
- The site area is now larger at 0.79 hectares compared to 0.5 hectares previously. Both schemes however utilise the entire amenity green as they retain an undeveloped, community space at the southern end of the site. This is smaller in the current application compared to the refused scheme.
 - The layout of the development has been significantly altered, with all of the flatted units now removed and replaced with two storey housing with private rear gardens. The units are now arranged as a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, arranged around the perimeters of the site.
 - The number of units proposed has reduced by two to a total of 30 units. Parking provision has increased from 48 spaces previously to 55 spaces – a ratio of 1.8 spaces per unit compared to 1.5 per unit previously.
 - All of the dwellings have private rear gardens.

2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 The proposal is for redevelopment of an amenity green to provide 30 residential units of affordable housing. The application follows a refused application for development on this site and consideration must be given as to whether the proposals overcome the previous grounds for refusal. In addition, the proposal raises the following material planning considerations: The principle of development, including the loss of the green space; design, layout and impact on local character; the impact on amenity; environmental considerations; highway and parking impacts and affordable housing provision.
- 2.2 It is considered that the proposed development is acceptable in principle and the loss of the amenity green, which has no statutory designation as public open space, can be justified owing to the provision of other open space in the vicinity of the site and the improvements to the nearest play space which can be secured through a financial contribution towards new play equipment.
- 2.3 The development is considered to be acceptable in terms of the scale, design and layout of the development and will provide good quality, affordable housing within the Borough. Although the scheme is in outline form, two storey housing is indicated, which is judged compatible with local character. Planning conditions can be used to acceptably manage environmental issues arising from the development. No material parking or highway issues are considered to result and the proposal is policy compliant in this respect. The proposals are therefore considered to be acceptable.

3 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

Conditions

1. Reserved matters – details of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale to be submitted prior to commencement; to include minimum floor levels 4.55 metres above Ordnance Datum sea level and footway widths must be a minimum of 1.8m wide
2. Reserved matters time limit – to be submitted within three years
3. Overall time limit – commencement within two years of final approval of reserved matters
4. Accordance with development parameters – detailed proposals to accord with the principles submitted with the detailed drawings and not to deviate in any material way from the submitted proposals including application drawings, flood risk assessment and Design and Access statement.

5. Developer contributions - the development shall not commence on site until the applicant has provided:
 - Additional children's play facilities in the Lessa recreation ground through the payment of £30,000 to the Council
 - An allowance for provision of increased education requirement as a result of the development through payment of £180,000 in accordance with the Policy DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.
6. Affordable Housing – the development shall not commence unless a scheme for the provision of affordable housing, including location plans has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA in accordance with a tenure mix to provide 10 affordable rented units, 10 shared ownership units and 10 London Living rent units. The affordable housing shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme and not occupied until the Affordable Housing is transferred to a Registered Provider and is to be retained as such thereafter in perpetuity unless otherwise approved in writing by the LPA,.
7. Landscaping provision – the development shall not commence until the Local Planning Authority has approved in writing a full scheme of landscaping works including the planting of semi-mature trees in the area to the immediate south of the site, together with details of the maintenance and replacement of any trees and planting which dies, is damaged or diseased within the first 5 years of planting. The occupation of the development shall not begin until those works have been completed in accordance with the Local Planning Authorities approval and certified in writing as complete by the Local Planning Authority.
8. Materials – prior to development above ground level, the submission of a written specification of external walls, window and roof materials.
9. Flank windows - no windows or openings other than as may be shown on approved plans.
10. Refuse/recycling – prior to occupation details for storage of refuse and recycling to be submitted for approval and provided and retained thereafter.
11. Parking provision – area set aside for car parking to be laid out and surfaced prior to occupation and retained thereafter.
12. Hours of construction
13. Construction Methodology – prior to commencement submission of a Construction Method statement for approval, to be complied with throughout construction works.

14. Wheel Washing – prior to commencement submission of a details of vehicle cleansing facilities for approval, to be complied with throughout construction works.
15. Removal of permitted development rights – Classes A, B and E.
16. Sustainable Urban Drainage System – details of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System shall be submitted for approval prior to commencement and installed and retained in accordance with approved details.
17. Boundary Treatment - details of all proposed walls, fences and boundary treatment to be submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to occupation and installed and retained thereafter in accordance with approved details.
18. External Lighting - details of all proposed external lighting to be submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to occupation and installed and retained thereafter in accordance with approved details.
19. Surfacing Materials – Access roads serving buildings to be provided before that building is first used. Surfacing materials for access road and turning head to be submitted to LPA for approval prior to commencement and access road to be constructed with approved materials and thereafter kept free from obstruction.
20. Cycle Storage - No building shall be occupied or use commenced until cycle storage is provided in accordance with details previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Cycle storage provision to comply with current London Plan standards unless otherwise superseded. The cycle storage shall be permanently retained thereafter.
21. Allocation of Parking – Prior to occupation, submission of a parking management scheme to the LPA detailing allocation of parking spaces to individual properties. Spaces to be allocated in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.
22. Water Efficiency – All dwellings to comply with Regulation 36 (2) (b) and Part G2 of the Building Regulations - Water Efficiency.
23. Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings - The dwellings hereby approved shall be constructed to comply with Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations - Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings.
24. Gas Protection Measures – prior to commencement, details of gas protection measures to be submitted for approval. Upon completion of installation a 'Verification Report' to be provided.
25. Trees – Development to be carried out in accordance with the soft felling methodology set out in Section 5.1 of the Aerial Bat Roost Survey dated 26th February 2017. No works to trees between September and February unless a survey for active bird nest undertaken and approved by the LPA.

26. Trenches - Any trenches or other excavations left open overnight should be furnished with gently sloping planks.
27. Memorial Plaque – Existing memorial plaque to be repositioned within the communal amenity area, in accordance with details to be previously submitted to and approved by the LPA.
28. Electric Vehicle Charging Points – Prior to occupation, the fitting of at least 22 Electric Vehicle Charging Points, of which 11 shall be active and the remaining 11 passive.
29. Community Safety – Prior to occupation, submission of details to demonstrate development has achieved a Certificate of Compliance to a Secure by Design Scheme or achieved security standards to the satisfaction of the Metropolitan Police.
30. Archaeology – No demolition of development until a stage 1 written scheme of investigation (WSI) submitted to and approved by the LPA. Depending on outcome of stage 1, a stage 2 WSI may be required to be submitted and approved. Where a stage 2 WSI is required, no demolition or development to take place until at an agreed stage under the approved stage 2 WSI.
31. Air Quality – Prior to commencement, submission of an Air Quality Neutral Assessment (AQNA) to LPA for approval. Prior to occupation all measures in the AQNA to be implemented and written evidence submitted to the LPA for approval.
32. Non-Road Mobile Machinery – Developer to be signed up to the NRMM register and to comply with the relevant EU legislation during the course of development.
33. Use of Ultra-low NOx boilers – Details to be submitted and approved by the LPA prior to occupation and to be fitted in accordance with the agreed details, certificates of boiler emissions to be submitted to verify boiler emissions.

Informatives

1. INF28 – Approval without amendment
2. Highway Informatives
3. Fee informatives for planning conditions
4. Thames Water informatives relating to waste, sewerage, surface water drainage and water supply matters.
5. Planning obligations informative
6. Approval and CIL
7. Street Naming and Numbering
8. Stopping Up informative – the entire site is a highway verge and will therefore, with the exception of the perimeter footway, require stopping up prior to the commencement of development.

4 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

4.1 Proposal

- The application is for outline permission for the erection of 30 No. two and three bedroom dwellings – 22 No. 3 beds and 8 No. 2 beds. Details relating to appearance, siting, landscaping, scale and layout are “reserved” and would be specified in future reserved matters applications.
- The submitted drawings indicate that the development would be arranged with four detached dwellings, one in each corner of the site. Between each of the corner buildings the dwellings would be arranged in terraces of varying length. All of the proposed dwellings would face outwards onto the respective surrounding roads i.e. New Zealand Way, Gisborne Gardens and Queenstown Gardens. A road is shown running across the southernmost part of the site and connecting Queenstown Gardens to the east with Gisborne Gardens to the west.
- There are no detailed elevations given the outline nature of the application. However, the floor plans indicate that living accommodation would be provided only on two floors i.e. ground floor and first floor. Indicative drawings indicate the dwellings would be two storeys.
- Each of the properties is indicated to have private rear amenity space. An area of land at the southern end of the site, covering an area of approximately 0.11 hectares, is proposed to be retained for public use. A total of 55 parking spaces are provided at right angles to Gibson Gardens, New Zealand Way and Queenstown Gardens and within the site on either side of the proposed new road across the site.

4.2 Site and Surroundings

- The application site has an area of 0.79 hectares and is located in the south east corner of a 1950s estate. It comprises an amenity green bounded by New Zealand Way to the north, Queenstown Gardens to the south and east and Gisborne Gardens to the west.
- The surrounding area is residential in nature with two storey semi-detached houses and maisonette buildings facing onto the amenity green. Further to the north and west is the greater part of the rest of the estate; to the south are two 13 storey residential towers (New Plymouth House and Napier House) and beyond them the A1306

4.3 Planning History

The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:

P1536.15 - Outline application with all matters reserved for the development of 32No. new dwellings comprising 2-bedroom & 3-bedroom houses and flats with associated landscaping and car parking. Refused on grounds of loss of public open space, traffic congestion and adverse impact on the road network, cramped development and harm to local character, absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards demand for school places and provision of childrens play space.

P0407.17 - Outline application with all matters reserved for the development of 30no. new dwellings comprising 2-bedroom & 3-bedroom houses with associated landscaping and car parking. Withdrawn.

5 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

5.1 The views of the Planning Service are expressed in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section below.

5.2 The following were consulted regarding the application:

Highways – no objection subject to the footway width being a minimum of 1.8m and conditions relating to cycle storage. The site is a highway verge and will require stopping up, with the exception of the proposed footway [Officer comment: Drawing no. PL001 has been annotated to indicate a 1.8m wide footway and, given the outline nature of the application, a condition can also be imposed to require a 1.8m wide footway width. The stopping up process for the highway is a separate procedure to be undertaken outside of the planning application process.]

Thames Water – no objections. Informatives recommended relating to surface water drainage, groundwater drainage, public sewers and water supply

Essex & Suffolk Water – consulted, no response

Metropolitan Police Designing Out Crime Office – conditions relating to Secure by Design scheme recommended.

Fire Brigade (water office) – no new additional hydrants are required.

GLAAS – no objections, planning conditions recommended.

Waste and Recycling – No objections.

Environment Agency – development is a more vulnerable use in flood zone so should refer to Flood Risk Standing Advice

Environmental Health – no objections with regard to land contamination matters; with regard to air quality, conditions recommended for an Air Quality Neutral Report, non-road mobile machinery requirements, ultra low NOx boilers and provision of electrical vehicle charging points.

6 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

6.1 A total of 99 neighbouring properties were notified about the application and invited to comment. The application has also been publicised by way of a site notices displayed in the vicinity of the application site and has also been

publicised in the local press. At the time of writing this report, the consultation date set out in the individual letters and press advert had passed; however, the consultation period displayed on the site notice has not yet expired. The statutory consultation period will end on 10th August and the Committee will be updated if any further representations are received.

- 6.2 The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 78, of which all objected.

- 6.3 Jon Cruddas MP objects on the grounds that this green space is of integral importance to the local community; that this matters strongly to local residents; significant funds have been spent denying 'Village Green' status; there are a number of new housing development sites in the locality; local green and open space should be protected and the land has historical significance, containing a war memorial plaque.

Representations

- 6.4 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application, and they are addressed in substance in the next section of this report:

Objections

- Proposal will lead to loss of well-used green field and community space
- Loss of public open space and harm to amenity
- Only recreational and amenity space nearby, no other green spaces in safe walking distance
- Increased vehicle traffic and congestion, harm to road safety
- Roads not wide enough for emergency vehicle access
- Insufficient parking
- Impact on wildlife
- Harmful to local character
- Other developments proposed nearby will lead to further loss of open space
- Lack of infrastructure, eg doctors surgeries, schools
- Noise and light pollution
- Loss of trees and foliage
- Loss of light
- Loss of privacy
- Contrary to Human Rights Act, Protocol 1, Article 1 and Article 8
- The land contained a memorial to New Zealand troops
- Previous planning application has been refused

Non-material representations

- 6.5 The following issues were raised in representations, but they are not material to the determination of the application:

- Area already has other residential development sites, including nearby New Plymouth and Napier House and Beam Park, and this development is unnecessary [Officer comment: Housing delivery targets for Havering are set by the Mayor of London. Even with the development of existing identified sites in Rainham and Beam Park the Council would still fall short of its housing targets and so development on other sites will still be necessary].
- Consultation on proposed developments nearby emphasise existence of open space in New Zealand Way [Officer comment: Consideration will need to be given to the wider provision of green space in the locality, including the A1306 corridor when separate development proposals come forward].
- Impacts on rights of way [Officer comment: Legislation relating to rights of way is separate to the planning process. The site is not formally designated as a Right of Way. It is highway verge and a stopping up order would be required to extinguish rights of public access].
- Land has been used as a Village Green and Council has previously acknowledged the land can be used for recreation purposes [Officer comment: The land is not designated as village green and, as such, this does not offer any statutory protection from development].
- Increased smell and environmental issues from additional rubbish [Officer comment: The proposal is for residential development and it could not be demonstrated this would lead to an increase in smells that would create material grounds to refuse permission; refuse storage and collection arrangements would be put in place to enable effective waste management].
- Health implications from loss of land and building works [Officer comment: These are not material planning considerations, public health matters are outside of the planning process and impacts of building works cannot be taken into account as such impacts are transient].
- Impact on local sewers and drainage [Officer comment: These are subject of non-planning legislation so are not material planning considerations].
- Loss of property value [Officer comment: Case law has determined this is not a material planning consideration].
- Money spent by Council on defending village green application [Officer comment: This has no relevance to the planning issues arising from the proposal and cannot be taken into consideration].
- Commitments were given to protect green spaces [Officer comment: This has no material bearing on the planning merits of the application].
- Potential for increased crime [Officer comment: The proposal is for the development of family housing and there is no evidence this would create conditions directly leading to a material increase in crime].
- Impacts of construction on locality [Officer comment: Noise and disturbance during construction is not a material planning issue as impacts are temporary. Planning conditions can be used to help mitigate amenity impacts].

7 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the committee must consider, including whether the previous grounds for refusal have been overcome are:

- The principle of development, including the loss of the green space
- The design and layout of the proposed development
- The visual impact of the development and impact on local character
- The impact on neighbouring amenity
- Highway and parking implications
- Environmental Impacts
- Affordable housing and impact on school places

Principle of Development

7.2 The site lies outside the Metropolitan Green Belt, Employment Areas, Commercial Areas, Romford Town Centre and District and Local Centres and isn't formally designated as Public Open Space in the Local Development Framework. The principle of residential development is considered acceptable in land use terms and the provision of additional housing is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.

7.3 Residents have referred to a Right of Way across the land. However, this is a very specific legal term and there is no formal Right of Way that Staff are aware of. The land subject of this application is highways land and would however require a stopping up order, which is outside of the planning application process. Although a village green application was made in respect of this site, this was unsuccessful and as such there is no statutory bar to redevelopment of the site.

7.4 Many of the representations received comment that the green is well used by local people, particularly children, as an amenity and recreation area. The land is covered by the terms of LDF Policy DC18 and London Plan Policy 7.18. The initial planning application was refused partly on the grounds of loss of this public open space, citing conflict with Policy DC18. In Staff's view, loss of an open space or green such as this one can be justified where it is demonstrated that there would be an improvement to the quality of open space in the vicinity or by remedying qualitative and quantitative deficiencies in open space elsewhere in the Borough. In terms of wider considerations, the proposal also needs to be weighed against the benefits derived from the proposed delivery of affordable housing on the site, in line with the Borough housing targets.

7.5 The proposal would effectively reduce the publicly accessible part of the green to an area of some 0.11 hectares, located at the southern end of the site and which would be landscaped and retained as a communal amenity area. In comparison to the previously refused scheme, the area retained for communal use is smaller and no longer includes the planned provision of children's play facilities.

- 7.6 Policy DC21 of the LDF states that the Council will require major new residential development to include provision for adequate open space, recreation or leisure facilities. The justification states that this should be by increasing the number of facilities or improving existing facilities. An open space assessment has been submitted with the application, which demonstrates the availability and location of open space within the vicinity of the application site. It is noted that while the site, judging from the representations received, has an amenity role for local residents, it currently does not provide any apparatus, facilities or sports provision.
- 7.7 In terms of LDF policy, it should be noted that the evidence base underpinning existing policies dates from 2005. An updated open space assessment has been produced to support the emerging Local Plan. In terms of amenity greenspace, this suggests that there is a good level of coverage within a 10 minute walk time and, where there are gaps in provision, these are served by other open space typologies. Whilst the site is of importance to local residents, particularly owing to its position within the heart of the estate, consideration may be given to the availability of open space within the wider area and within walking distance of the site. The National Planning Policy Framework provides that existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land should not be built upon unless an assessment has been undertaken which clearly shows the open space or land to be surplus to requirements; or that the loss would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location, or the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, which would outweigh the loss of the current or former use. However, it should be noted that the application site is not defined as protected open space nor does the land have a Local Green Space designation as provided for within the NPPF.
- 7.8 Policy 7.18 of the London Plan states that the loss of local protected open spaces must be resisted unless equivalent or better quality provision is made within the local catchment area. Again, it should be noted that the application site is not defined as protected open space.
- 7.9 The open space assessment submitted with the application indicates that there are a number of formal areas of open space within the locality, which are larger or better equipped than the application site. The closest open space to the site is the Lessa site, which is within a 10 minute walking distance of the application site and equipped with some three hectares of open space, a play site and ball court. There are other areas of open space within a greater walking/cycling distance from the site and the site also lies relatively close to Hornchurch Country Park. As such, the locality is considered to be relatively well served in terms of access to public open space.
- 7.10 It is no longer proposed to install play equipment on the communal area at the southern end of the site. This is partly because the current proposals no longer includes flatted development and each dwelling has access to a private rear garden, so play space is not now required on site under the provisions of the Havering Residential Design Supplementary Planning

Document. The applicant has instead agreed to make a financial contribution of £30,000 to be spent on improving play facilities within the nearby Lessa site. Whilst it is acknowledged that the amenity value of the existing site would be diminished, by reason of its reduction in size, it is considered that the locality is well served by publicly accessible open space within reasonable proximity to the site. The proposed financial contribution would enable an improvement to the existing nearby Lessa open space that would have a wider community benefit. In this respect, the proposal is considered to be consistent with the objectives of the London Plan and Policy DC18 by contributing to better quality provision within the local catchment area.

- 7.11 Having regard to the submission of an open space assessment demonstrating the availability of public open space locally and the opportunity to improve the quality of the facilities available in the nearest public open space (Lessa site), Staff are satisfied that the reduction in size of the amenity green would be acceptably mitigated. The proposal also needs to be weighed against the benefits derived from the proposed delivery of affordable housing on the site, in line with the Borough housing targets. The application site will retain some publicly accessible communal space and will enable the improvement of existing amenity provision nearby. Staff therefore consider that the previous refusal reason which focussed on the loss of public open space was not sufficiently justified and that the principle of the development is therefore acceptable.

Density and Site Layout

- 7.12 The Density Matrix in Policy DC2 seeks to guide higher density of development to those parts of the Borough having good access to public transport. Policy DC2 indicates a density requirement of 30-50 dwellings per hectare and the London Plan advises a density of 40-80 dwellings per hectare. The proposal achieves a density of some 38 units per hectare on this 0.79 hectare site, which is comfortably within the range indicated by Policy DC2 and slightly below the London Plan. It is considered that the density proposed is acceptable from a policy perspective.
- 7.13 Policy 3.8 of the London Plan states that DPD policies should offer a range of housing choices, in terms of the mix of housing sizes and types, taking account of the housing requirements of different groups. The proposal would provide 2 and 3 bedroom affordable housing and this mix is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.14 Policy 3.5 of the London Plan requires new development to meet requirements for accessibility and adaptability, minimum space standards and water efficiency. In terms of internal space, the London Plan sets minimum requirements of 79 square metres for 2 bed, 4 person dwellings, 84 square metres for 3 bed, 4 person dwellings and 93 square metres for 3 bed, 5 person dwellings. Although all matters are reserved, the indicative floor plans for each of the three proposed house types indicate that the application will comply with the requirements set out in the London Plan housing standards.

Matters relating to accessibility and adaptability can be controlled by condition.

- 7.15 In respect of amenity space the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for Residential Design places emphasis on new developments providing well designed quality spaces that are usable. Each of the houses proposed is shown on the indicative plans with a rear garden and the smallest of these has an area of 46 square metres. It is considered that the rear gardens and the amenity spaces are acceptable in terms of area and would provide future occupiers with a useable external space for day to day activities such as outdoor dining, clothes drying and relaxation.
- 7.16 As referred to previously, the site will also retain a communal area of some 0.11 hectares to the south of the site for public use and recreation. This is in addition to the proposed contribution towards the improvement of local play facilities.

Design and Visual Impact

- 7.17 The development proposes the construction of family housing on the site. The proposed buildings are a range of detached, semi-detached and terraced housing. They are laid out in linear form around the perimeters of the site and it is considered that the form and layout of development indicated would be compatible with the character of surrounding development. All dwellings are indicated to be set back from the site frontages in a manner that is consistent with local character and setting.
- 7.18 Scale and appearance are reserved matters. The floor plans indicate that the development proposed is for two storey housing. It is considered that it would be possible to design the buildings in such a way that they would be appropriate to the area and that the site can accommodate the density proposed without having an adverse impact on the surrounding built form. Given the staggered building lines within the site and the layout of some of the garden areas, it is considered appropriate to remove permitted development rights for the development.
- 7.19 Staff consider that the current proposals, which have removed the previously proposed flatted elements of the development, and instead create a development solely of family housing, gives rise to a suitably spacious form of development that is compatible with local character. As such, the previous ground for refusal, which was based around harm to local character and cramped development, is judged to be acceptably overcome.
- 7.20 Landscaping is a reserved matter and no detailed landscaping scheme has been submitted. Residents have commented that the loss of a part of the amenity green including existing trees, both mature and recently planted, will be detrimental to local wildlife. An Ecological Survey of the site has been commissioned. The survey identified the largest tree with the most bat roost potential but, following detailed inspection, in the form of an Aerial Bat Roost Survey, it is concluded that there is low risk of use by hibernating bats. The report recommends however that as a precaution felling of trees should only

take place when bats are active and outside the main bird nesting season unless a pre-felling survey has been undertaken. Other precautions are also recommended, which can be secured by condition. The survey also states that badgers and hedgehogs may use the site for foraging and any trenches or other excavations left open overnight should be furnished with gently sloping planks so that any animals which fall into the excavation can make their escape. It is considered that should planning permission be granted, conditions should be imposed to require the development to be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations of the Ecological Appraisal and the Aerial Bat Roost Survey, which would include restriction on the timing of tree works. A condition can be imposed to provide ramps in any trenches left overnight to prevent the trapping of wildlife.

- 7.21 The application would involve the loss of a number of trees from the site, particularly in the north-western and north-eastern corners of the site. Some existing landscaping features will be retained, including at the southern end of the site. In order to help to mitigate the issues of loss of habitat, the applicant has agreed to landscape the part of the amenity green to the south of the proposed development. This landscaping would provide semi-mature trees and grassland to create a landscaped communal amenity area. This can be secured via a Grampian-style planning condition.
- 7.22 It is noted that the site currently contains a memorial plaque to commemorate New Zealand soldiers killed in the First World War. It is located in the north-western corner of the site adjacent to an existing tree. It is not clear how long the plaque has been on the site but it appears to have been installed relatively recently. It is understood that the plaque is in a similar location to a memorial that previously existed on the site but was demolished some time ago. The plaque, in its current position would effectively be within the plot of one of the proposed dwellings. Staff understand that the relocation of the plaque is a sensitive issue. However, given the location of the plaque and that the tree it is adjacent to would be felled by the proposed development, Staff consider that it would be reasonable in this case for the plaque to be re-sited elsewhere on the site in a location where it could be much more widely appreciated by the local community. It is suggested that this might be most appropriately sited within the proposed communal amenity area. The applicant is fully aware of the sensitivities of re-siting the plaque and has given a commitment to its re-provision within the communal area within a high quality landscaped setting, which will enable the plaque to benefit from enhanced prominence in the site and better access for those wishing to commemorate. This matter can be controlled by condition.

Impact on Amenity

- 7.23 It is not considered that the proposal would result in any material loss of amenity to neighbouring properties. The nearest dwellings are some 20 metres from the proposed development and this separation would preclude any significant loss of light or privacy.

- 7.24 Dwellings on New Zealand Way, Gisborne Gardens and Queenstown Gardens face across these respective roads towards the application site. There would be some loss of view across the existing open space from these properties, however private views are not protected by planning legislation and this issue cannot be taken into account when considering the application.
- 7.25 Loss of outlook is a planning consideration and this occurs when new development has the potential to cause a sense of enclosure to occupants of existing buildings - for example, where a wall is proposed to be close to a window. In this case the separation of the new buildings from the existing dwellings is considered to be more than enough to preclude any such loss of outlook.

Highway/Parking Issues

- 7.26 Policy DC2 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document indicates that parking should be provided at a level of 2-1.5 spaces per unit for a site with a PTAL of 1-2. The London Plan provides for parking provision up to 2 spaces per unit but notes that the maximum number of parking spaces for a two bed unit should be less than one space per unit and up to 1.5 spaces per unit for a three bed dwelling. 55 spaces are provided for 30 units - an overall average of 1.8 spaces per unit which exceeds the minimum requirements of the policy. The applicant has indicated that the parking spaces would be allocated so that the three bed houses have 2 parking spaces each, and the two bed houses have 1 space each. A condition could be imposed requiring the submission of a parking allocation plan. The London Plan also requires that 20 percent of all spaces must be for electric vehicles with an additional 20 percent passive provision for electric vehicles in the future. This can be secured by condition.
- 7.27 The proposal now represents an increase in parking provision compared to the previously refused scheme and is judged also to have a more functional arrangement of the parking spaces relative to the individual dwellings they serve. The proposal is entirely consistent with parking standards and it is considered that there are no grounds on which to refuse the application based on parking provision.
- 7.28 The Council's Highways Authority has no objection to the proposal but has requested that the width of the footways are increased to 1.8m minimum. This can be secured by condition. No objections are raised on the grounds of highway capacity or congestion. As such it is now considered that the previous grounds for refusal relating to traffic congestion and impact on road network have been overcome.
- 7.29 Residents have raised concerns that the proposed access road will not be adequate for emergency services access. Highways have raised no objection to the road width and no objections have been raised by the Fire Brigade. The majority of the properties will be accessed from the existing highway. As such, Staff are satisfied that the proposal is acceptable in this respect.

- 7.30 Conditions are recommended to ensure adequate refuse and recycling provision and cycle storage facilities.

Environmental Issues

- 7.31 A part of the site is in Flood Zone 2 and as a result a Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out. The conclusions of the assessment are set out below.
- Although the site is protected by existing flood defences, a precautionary approach is recommended and as a minimum the floor levels should be 4.55 metres above sea level which is 300mm above the 1 in 1000 year flood event level [note: the ground level of the site varies between 5.3 metres above sea level in the north east to 3.9 metres above sea level in the south west];
 - As the development will result in a significant increase in impermeable area it is recommended that sustainable drainage systems are used to manage the increase in surface water runoff. Attenuation of runoff would be achieved through the use of below ground cellular storage.
- 7.32 The minimum floor level suggested can be required to be achieved by the reserved matters application which must be submitted to provide the details of the design of the scheme.
- 7.33 Should the application be approved it is proposed that a condition is imposed to ensure the submission of details of a sustainable drainage system prior to the commencement of development and the subsequent implementation of the system prior to occupation.

Affordable Housing

- 7.34 Under the provisions of Policy DC6 of the LDF and Policy 3.13 of the London Plan affordable housing should be sought on this site. The application proposes that all of the dwellings within the development would be provided as affordable housing. The units would be a mix of affordable rented units, shared ownership units and London Living Rent units. The provision of 30 family homes within the Borough as affordable housing units would represent a significant benefit arising from the development and would make a strongly positive contribution to the type and choice of affordable housing available within the Borough.

Financial and Other Mitigation

- 7.35 As the Council is the applicant it is unable to enter into a legal agreement to secure financial and any other mitigation as part of the development. Such contributions and obligations may however be secured by the use of Grampian-style conditions. The proposal would attract the following financial mitigations, in addition to requirements for affordable housing and landscaping provision on the site:

- £180,000 towards the provision of education infrastructure within the Borough
- £30,000 towards the provision of additional children's play facilities in the Lessa recreation ground.
- The provision of 100% affordable housing on the site in accordance with the submitted Affordable Housing Statement and to include 10 affordable rented units, 10 shared ownership units and 10 London Living Rent units
- Soft landscaping including the planting of semi-mature trees in the area to the immediate south of the site, which is within the applicants' control.

7.36 The proposal would attract the following Community Infrastructure Levy contributions to mitigate the impact of the development:

- Mayoral CIL towards Crossrail – amount of contribution cannot presently be calculated owing to the outline nature of the development and will be determined on submission of reserved matters.


Other Planning Issues

7.37 With regard to the impact of the development on infrastructure, the amount of development proposed is not of sufficient size to justify additional public transport or health facility provision. The proposed development of 30 family units will have the potential to create the demand for additional school places and to mitigate this impact a financial contribution of £6,000 per unit is sought to offset the educational infrastructure impacts of the proposed development.

7.38 Reference has been made in representations to Human Rights legislation, particularly Article 1, Protocol one and Article 8. These rights are not absolute and need to be weighed against the wider issues arising from the application. Staff are satisfied that the impacts of the development are not sufficient that they are considered to represent a material breach of Human Rights legislation that would materially affect the determination of this application.

Conclusions

7.39 All other relevant policies and considerations have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

 Havering LONDON BOROUGH	Strategic Planning Committee 16 August 2018
---	--

Application Reference:	P1229.17
Location:	89-101 New Road, Rainham
Ward	South Hornchurch
Description:	Outline planning application for the demolition of all buildings and redevelopment of the site for residential use providing up to 62 units with ancillary car parking, landscaping and access
Case Officer:	Sunil Sahadevan
Reason for Report to Committee:	The application is by or on behalf of a Joint Venture that includes the Council and is a significant development. The Local Planning Authority is considering the application in its capacity as local planning authority and without regard to the identity of the Applicant.

1 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 The development of the site for residential is acceptable in principle with no policy objection to the loss of the current industrial uses.
- 1.2 The application is submitted in outline with all matters reserved for future approval. The density is within policy range and the layout is considered to be satisfactory and capable of providing a high quality development.
- 1.3 The height proposed is considered appropriate for this part of New Road which is set to be transformed through arrival of station and nearby redevelopments of sites.
- 1.4 Subject to details submitted at reserved matters stage, the impact on the residential amenity of existing occupiers would not be affected to an unacceptable degree.

- 1.5 Given the location of the site close to the proposed new Beam Park Station and applicable maximum parking standards, the level of parking proposed is considered acceptable.
- 1.6 A significant factor weighing in favour of the proposal is the 35% affordable housing proposed across the sites in control of the applicant, meeting the objectives of the Housing Zone and current and future planning policy.

2 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the Committee resolve to grant planning permission subject to the conditions below.
- 2.2 That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to negotiate any subsequent legal agreement required to secure compliance with Condition 31 below, including that:
- All contribution sums shall include interest to the due date of expenditure and all contribution sums to be subject to indexation from the date of completion of the Section 106 agreement to the date of receipt by the Council.
 - The Developer/Owner to pay the Council's reasonable legal costs associated with the Legal Agreement prior to the completion of the agreement irrespective of whether the agreement is completed.
 - Payment of the appropriate planning obligations monitoring fee prior to the completion of the agreement.
- 2.3 That the Assistant Director of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters

Conditions

1. Outline – Reserved matters to be submitted
2. Outline – Time limit for details
3. Outline - Time limit for commencement
4. Details of materials if not submitted at reserved matters stage
5. Accordance with plans
6. Details of site levels if not submitted at reserved matters stage
7. Details of refuse and recycling storage
8. Details of cycle storage
9. Hours of construction
10. Contamination – site investigation and remediation
11. Contamination – if contamination subsequently discovered
12. Electric charging points
13. Construction methodology
14. Air Quality – construction machinery
15. Air Quality – demolition/construction dust control

16. Air Quality – internal air quality measures
17. Air Quality – low nitrogen oxide boilers
18. Details of boundaries if not submitted at reserved matters stage
19. Details of surfacing materials if not submitted at reserved matters stage
20. Car parking to be provided and retained
21. Pedestrian visibility splays
22. Vehicle access to be provided
23. Wheel washing facilities during construction
24. Details of drainage strategy, layout and SUDS
25. Details of secure by design
26. Secure by Design accreditation to be obtained
27. Water efficiency
28. Accessible dwellings
29. Archaeological investigation prior to commencement
30. Bat/bird boxes to be provided
31. To provide the following planning obligations before the commencement of development:
 - a. Pursuant to Section 16 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974, restriction on parking permits
 - b. School places contribution sum of £279,000 or such other figure as is approved by the Council
 - c. Controlled Parking Zone contribution sum of £6944 or such other figure as is approved by the Council
 - d. Linear Park contribution sum of £78,175.61 or such other figure as approved by the Council
 - e. Carbon offset contribution sum of £87,175 or such other figure as approved by the Council
 - f. To provide affordable housing in accordance with a scheme of implementation for all New Road sites controlled by the developer that ensures that individual development sites are completed so that the overall level of affordable housing (by habitable rooms) provided across the sites does not at any time fall below 35% overall. The affordable housing to be minimum 50% social rent with up to 50% intermediate

Informatives

1. Statement pursuant to Article 31 of the Development Management Procedure Order
2. Fee for condition submissions
3. Changes to public highway
4. Highway legislation
5. Temporary use of the highway
6. Surface water management
7. Community safety
8. Street naming/numbering
9. Protected species
10. Protected species – bats
11. Crime and disorder
12. Letter boxes

3 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

- 3.1 The application is for outline permission with all matters reserved seeking approval for the principal of the development quantum with access, layout, appearance, landscaping and scale as reserved matters.
- 3.2 The outline proposals submitted with this application is for the demolition of the existing buildings and redevelopment of the site comprising the erection of a part five, part four-storey high building fronting onto New Road and two buildings up to three storey in height to the rear. The indicative mix proposed across the site includes 16.No. of 1 bedroom apartments, 26.No. of 2 bedroom apartments, 12.No. of 3 bedroom apartments and 8.No. 3 bedroom townhouses.
- 3.3 The proposal also outlines 56.No. dedicated vehicular parking spaces for residents at a ratio of 0.9:1, Secure cycle storage areas are to be provided within the apartment block and suggested that a minimum of 82.No cycle racks spaces will be provided together with internal refuse areas.
- 3.4 Vehicular access to the proposed apartment block and townhouses are proposed from the rear of the site off Askwith Road, this area is also to serve as refuse access.
- 3.5 The application site lies within the Rainham and Beam Park Housing Zone, and is owned by private landowners. The applicant is a joint venture including the London Borough of Havering, although they do not own the land. The Council are seeking to undertake Compulsory Purchase Orders ("CPOs") to help deliver the comprehensive redevelopment of the area which is key to delivering the forecasted rate of house building and quality of development identified in the adopted Rainham and Beam Park Planning Framework. The precursor to a CPO is often to have planning permission in place.

Site and Surroundings

- 3.6 The application site is located north of the New Road (A1306 carriageway), approximately 130 metres east of the major road junction with the Marsh Way flyover. The site is bounded by Askwith Road to the west with the flatted development of 105-109 New Road to the east. To the north the area is characterised by suburban residential development (terraces, detached and semi-detached houses).
- 3.7 The site is within the Rainham and Beam Park Housing Zone and within the area covered by the adopted Rainham and Beam Park Planning Framework. The site does not form part of a conservation area, and is not located within the immediate vicinity or setting of any listed buildings. Site constraints that are of material relevance with the works proposed include potentially contaminated land, Health and Safety Zone, Air Quality Management Area, Flood Zone 1 and area of potential archaeological significance.

- 3.8 The application site relates to a square parcel of land, a site area amounting to approximately 0.45ha and is generally level. The site currently comprises of various industrial, car repair, garage and retail outlets, as well as existing and derelict residential properties. The south-eastern end of the site comprises of a single and two storey building (car sales), to the west of this lies a pair of semi-detached residential properties (derelict), the rest of the southern part of the site consists of derelict properties. Vehicular access to the site lies from Askwith Road to the west and New Road to the south.

Planning History

- 3.9 The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:

P2175.06 - Change of use to provide residential accommodation for 21 dwellings - Refusal and dismissed on appeal, reference APP/B5480/A/07/2042542/NWF

P0961.12 - Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide 2 and 3 storey accommodation comprising 25no. residential units with associated car parking, landscaping, amenity space and highways works. Approved with conditions

P0251.17 - The demolition of all existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide 3 new buildings, ranging from 2 to 5 storeys, comprising 56no. self-contained flats (14 x 1-bedroom, 23 x 2-bedroom, 19 x 3-bedroom), and 3no. 4-bedroom houses, a small commercial unit to ground floor and associated landscaping, vehicle access, cycle and car parking (revised plans received 25/9/17) – Appeal against non-determination submitted.

4 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

- 4.1 The views of the Planning Service are expressed in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section below.
- 4.2 The following were consulted regarding the application:
- 4.3 Essex & Suffolk Water – no objections
- 4.4 Thames Water – recommend an informative
- 4.5 Metropolitan Police (Designing Out Crime) – requested conditions regarding designing out crime
- 4.6 Environmental Protection – recommend conditions regarding contamination and air quality
- 4.7 LBH Waste and Recycling – further details regarding provision and location of waste facilities need to be provided

- 4.8 Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service – require further desk top study regarding archaeology
- 4.9 London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority – no objections
- 4.10 London Fire Brigade – no objection
- 4.11 LBH Street Management [Statutory Consultee] – no objection, subject to suggested conditions and informatives
- 4.12 TfL – consider that the level of parking provision is excessive

5 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

- 5.1 A total of 76 neighbouring properties were notified about the application and invited to comment. The application has been publicised by way of site notice displayed in the vicinity of the application site. The application has also been publicised in the local press.
- 5.2 The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 2 of which 2 objected

Representations

- 5.3 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application, and they are addressed in substance in the next section of this report:

Objections

- Over development of the site
- Houses to rear at 3 storeys would overlook gardens
- Density and height excessive
- Out of character with surrounding properties
- Increased traffic and parking problems
- Excessive noise from too many residents and lack of amenity space

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the committee must consider are:
 - Principle of Development
 - Density/Site Layout
 - Design/Impact on Street/Garden Scene
 - Impact on Amenity
 - Highway/Parking

- Affordable Housing/Mix
- School Places and Other Contributions

Principal of Development

- 6.2 In terms of national planning policies, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, including a set of core land-use planning principles that should underpin decision-taking, one of those principles being:

“Planning decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes.” Para 117

“Planning decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes.” Para 118

- 6.3 Policies within the London Plan seek to increase and optimise housing in London, in particular Policy 3.3 on ‘Increasing Housing Supply’ and Policy 3.4 on ‘Optimising Housing Potential’.
- 6.4 Policy CP1 of the LDF on ‘Housing Supply’ expresses the need for a minimum of 535 new homes to be built in Havering each year through prioritising the development of brownfield land and ensuring it is used efficiently. Table 3.1 of the London Plan supersedes the above target and increases it to a minimum ten year target for Havering (2015-2025) of 11,701 new homes or 1,170 new homes each year. Policy 3 in the draft London Plan sets a target of delivering 17,550 homes over the 15 year plan period, with 3,000 homes in the Beam Park area. Ensuring an adequate housing supply to meet local and sub-regional housing need is important in making Havering a place where people want to live and where local people are able to stay and prosper.
- 6.5 The aspiration for a residential-led redevelopment of the Rainham and Beam Park area was established when the area was designated a Housing Zone. Furthermore the production of the Planning Framework sought to re-affirm this and outlines potential parameters for development coming forward across the area with the aim of ensuring certain headline objectives are delivered. The ‘Rainham and Beam Park Planning Framework’ 2016 supports new residential developments at key sites including along the A1306, and the Housing Zones in Rainham and Beam Park. Therefore the existing business uses are not protected by planning policy in this instance.
- 6.6 Staff, in view of the above raise no in principle objection to a residential-led development coming forward on this site forming part of a development of sites north and south of New Road, in accordance with the policies cited above.

Density/Site Layout

- 6.7 The development proposal is to provide 62.No residential units on a site area of 0.45ha (4500m²) which equates to a density of 137 units per ha. The site is an area with low-moderate accessibility with a PTAL of 2. Policy SSA12 of the LDF specifies a density range of 30-150 units per hectare; the London Plan

suggests a density range of between 35 and 170 dwellings per hectare depending upon the setting in terms of location (suggesting higher densities within 800m of a district centre or a mix of different uses). The Planning Framework suggests a density of between 100-120 dwellings per hectare.

- 6.8 Given the range of densities that could be applicable to this site, a proposed density of 137 units per hectare is not considered to be unreasonable and would be capable of being accommodated on this site given the mixed character of the area and proximity to the future Beam Park district centre and station which would be within very easy walking distance. The proposal therefore complies with Policy DC2 of the LDF on 'Housing Mix and Density'.
- 6.9 Based on the building footprint and the building height indicated on the proposed parameter plans, the proposed apartment block would be detached and five/four storeys tall along the frontage with New Road. Having reviewed the plot width and its depth, the particularly wide nature of New Road, officers consider the height proposed to be appropriate for the site in the context of a changing character to the area as outlined in the Framework and would not be considered unacceptable.
- 6.10 The primary elevation of the proposed apartment block would front onto New Road and be south facing with secondary elevations and entrances facing toward Askwith Road which presents coherency with the street interface. To the rear the dwellings would front onto Askwith Road or to an internal footway within the site. It is considered that the indicative siting and orientation responds positively to the character of the area. The general layout plan of the building would fall in accordance with Policy DC61 of the LDF
- 6.11 The remaining area within the development is largely hard surfacing and consists of the access road and parking provision, although there would also be rear garden areas for the proposed houses. It is considered that the layout of the site is acceptable on its planning merits in accordance with the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document.

Design/Impact on Street/Garden Scene

- 6.12 The proposal would involve the demolition of all buildings on the site, some of which are in a derelict condition. None of the buildings are considered to hold any architectural or historical value, therefore no principle objection raised to their demolition.
- 6.13 Scale is a reserved matter. From the submitted Design and Access Statement and plans it is indicated that the proposed apartment block fronting New Road would not be greater than five storeys in height with the dwellings to the rear at a height up to three-storeys. It is considered that would present a development at a height which does not detract from the current character of the street scene, both old, new and those proposed for the area (as shown from the submitted illustrative masterplan on proposed heights). It is considered that the footprint and siting of the building together with its dedicated parking areas would be acceptable on their planning merits.

- 6.14 Appearance is also reserved matter. From the submitted Design and Access Statement, the agent has not drawn attention to the proposed building design nor specified its intended material use. A condition would be applied to the grant of any permission requiring details of material use for reason of visual amenity.
- 6.15 Landscaping is a reserved matter; it is considered that the proposal can achieve an acceptable level of landscaping given the proposed layout. A condition would be applied to the grant of any permission requiring details of landscaping.

Impact on Amenity

- 6.16 The proposed flatted block together with the dwellings at the rear would not adversely impact on one another. The proposed apartment block and houses facing Askwith Road are sited such that there are no concerns with regard to its overshadowing or overlooking (subject to reserved matters). The proposed dwellings at the rear of the site would be within 8 metres of the rear boundary of the side and face side on to gardens in Askwith Road and Spencer Road. There is a concern that the proximity to the rear gardens to the proposed houses may result in overlooking. This concern could be addressed at reserved matters stage through suitable siting of rear facing habitable rooms and windows. In this respect, the application is considered acceptable at the outline stage.
- 6.17 Officers have further reviewed the external space provided with the proposed development, and the revised plans show both private and communal amenity space for its occupants which appear to be sufficient and in accordance with the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document Policy PG20 on Housing Design, Amenity and Privacy in the Rainham and Beam Park Planning Framework.
- 6.18 From a noise and disturbance perspective, the applicant has submitted a Noise Assessment and Air Quality report which reaffirms that both residents from within and outside the proposal would not be affected by unacceptable levels of noise or air pollution arising from the development. The Councils Environmental Health officers have reviewed the submitted report and concluded that the scheme (subject to conditions imposed) would be compliant with Policy DC52 on Air Quality and Policy DC55 on Noise.
- 6.19 Officers are yet to view further details of how the proposed communal amenity space would be designed to be private, attractive, functional and safe, details of boundary treatments, seating, trees, planting, lighting, paving and footpaths or details of effective and affordable landscape management and maintenance regime are yet to be provided and would be assessed as part of any reserved matter submission. Notwithstanding this, and from a crime design perspective the proposal would present a layout that offers natural surveillance to all open areas. The proposal would accord Policy 3.5 of the London Plan on Quality and Design of Housing Developments and Policy 7.1 on Lifetime neighbourhoods and Policy 7.3 on Designing out crime as well as Policy DC63 of the LDF on Delivering Safer Places.

- 6.20 Officers have reviewed the proposed waste storage areas catering the apartments/dwellings, which have been set to be serviced via Askwith Road and the internal service road. As it stands, there are no overriding concerns with this arrangement as scheme demonstrates a convenient, safe and accessible solution to waste collection in keeping to guidance from within Policy DC40 of the LDF on Waste Recycling.

Highway/Parking

- 6.21 The application site within an area with PTAL of 2 (low-moderate accessibility). The proposal for 62 No. units with a provision of 56 No. vehicular parking spaces, which equates to a parking ratio of 0.9:1. The maximum standards suggested in the Planning Framework (which are based on the London Plan) for a development of this indicative mix would be 64 spaces. Notwithstanding this, officers have to be mindful that the site would be located close to the proposed Beam Park station and accessibility levels would consequently increase. Officers are also mindful that this is submission is an application for outline planning permission and the residential mix is potentially subject to change at reserved matters stage.
- 6.22 Accordingly, officers are content with the provision of parking proposed considering the 56 spaces would allow the applicant at reserved matters to finalise a car parking management plan. This element from the proposal adheres to London Plan Policy 6.13 Parking and Policy DC33 Car Parking of the LDF.
- 6.23 The applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment as part of this application which predicts that the traffic generated from the proposed residential development would have a negligible increase over existing traffic conditions, in peak periods, but a significant reduction over the whole day. The Highways Authority have reviewed the document and consider the development acceptable from a highway perspective and unlikely to give rise to undue highway safety or efficiency implications in accordance with Policy DC32 The Road Network of the LDF.
- 6.24 The Councils Highways Engineer has further reviewed all other highways related matters such as access and parking and raises no objections subject to the imposition of conditions (covering pedestrian visibility, vehicle access and vehicle cleansing during construction), financial contribution to Controlled Parking Zone and limitation on future occupiers from obtaining any permits in any future zone.
- 6.25 The London Fire Brigade has raised no objection in principle.

Affordable Housing/Mix

- 6.26 Policy DC6 of the LDF and Policies 3.9, 3.11 and 3.12 of the London Plan seek to maximise affordable housing in major development proposals. The Mayor of London Supplementary Planning Guidance "Homes for Londoners" sets out that where developments propose 35% or more of the development to be affordable at an agreed tenure split, then the viability of the development

need not be tested – in effect it is accepted that 35% or more is the maximum that can be achieved.

- 6.27 In this respect, the proposal is intended to provide 35% affordable housing across all sites that the applicant is looking to develop along New Road. This could mean less provided on this site if other sites developed prior to this provided more. Due to this and other development proposals coming forward from other applicants with low or zero, affordable housing, officers have sought a viability appraisal from the applicant which has been reviewed. The review concludes that the scheme, based on present day inputs, could not viably support 35% affordable housing, but that it could support circa 20% affordable units. In this case however, the developer is willing to deliver a greater level of affordable housing that can viably be justified based upon its unique nature as an applicant (a joint venture) and its appetite for and ability to spread risk across a portfolio of sites. In this respect, affordable housing provision is being maximised, meeting the objectives of existing policy and future policy in the submitted local plan and draft London Plan as well as the stated ambitions of the Housing Zones and therefore weighs in favour of the proposal.
- 6.28 Policy DC2 of the LDF on Housing Mix and Density specifies an indicative mix for market housing, this being 24% 1 bed units, 41% 2 bedroom units, and 34% 3 bed units. The proposal incorporates an indicative mix of 26% 1 bed units, 42% 2 bed units, and 32% 3 bed units including 8 houses. The proposed mix is and closely aligned with the above policy guidance, officers are content that the mix on offer falls in accordance with policy.

School Places and Other Contributions

- 6.29 Policy DC72 of the LDF emphasises that in order to comply with the principles as set out in several of the Policies in the Plan, contributions may be sought and secured through a Planning Obligation. Policy 8.2 of the London Plan states that development proposals should address strategic as well as local priorities in planning obligations.
- 6.30 Policy DC29 states that the Council will seek payments from developers required to meet the educational need generated by the residential development. Policy 2 of the submitted Local Plan seeks to ensure the delivery of expansion of existing primary schools.
- 6.31 Evidence clearly shows a shortage of school places in the Borough - (London Borough of Havering Commissioning Plan for Education Provision 2015/16-2019/20). The Commissioning report identifies that there is no spare capacity to accommodate demand for secondary, primary and early year's school places generated by new development. The cost of mitigating new development in respect to all education provision is £8,672 (2013 figure from Technical Appendix to S106 SPD). On that basis, it is necessary to require contributions to mitigate the impact of additional dwellings in the Borough. It is considered that, in this case, £4500 towards education projects required as a result of increased demand for school places is reasonable when compared to

the need arising as a result of the development. A contribution of £279,000 would therefore be appropriate for school place provision.

- 6.32 The Rainham and Beam Park Planning Framework seeks to deliver a new Beam Parkway linear park along the A1306 including in front of this site and seeks developer contributions for those areas in front of development sites. The plans are well advanced and costings worked out – based on the frontage of the development site to New Road, the contribution required for this particular site would be £78,175.61. This is necessary to provide a satisfactory setting for the development rather than the stark wide New Road.
- 6.33 Policy DC32 of the LDF seeks to ensure that development does not have an adverse impact on the functioning of the road network. Policy DC33 seeks satisfactory provision of off street parking for developments. Policy DC2 requires that parking permits be restricted in certain circumstances for occupiers of new residential developments. In this case, the arrival of a station and new residential development would likely impact on on-street parking pressure in existing residential streets off New Road. It would therefore be appropriate to introduce a CPZ in the streets off New Road. A contribution of £112 per unit (total £6944) is sought, plus an obligation through the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 to prevent future occupants of the development from obtaining parking permits.
- 6.34 From a sustainability perspective, the proposal is accompanied by a Sustainability Statement and Energy Statement. The reports outline an onsite reduction in carbon emissions by 36%, to include a photovoltaic strategy which aims to further reduce CO2 emissions by a further 35% across the entire site. In assessing the baseline energy demand and carbon dioxide emissions for the site, a financial contribution of £87,660 has been calculated as carbon emissions offset contribution in lieu of on-site carbon reduction measures. The development proposal, subject to contributions being sought would comply with Policy 5.2 of the London Plan.
- 6.35 In respect of all the above contributions, there may be scope to negotiate the overall total figure required if this application were to be one of several sites coming forward from the same developer at the same time – therefore the recommended sums would be subject to subsequent review and approval.
- 6.36 In this case, the applicant currently has no interest in the site. As such, it is unlikely that the current owners of the site would be willing to enter into a legal agreement (which is the usual method for securing planning obligations) as they have no role in the present application.
- 6.37 The NPPG states that in exceptional circumstances a negatively worded condition requiring a planning obligation or other agreement to be entered into before development can commence may be appropriate in the case of more complex and strategically important development where there is clear evidence that the delivery of the development would otherwise be at serious risk. It is considered that this application and its context as part of a large multi-site strategic development presents justifiable basis to impose a

negatively worded condition which would require a s.106 obligation to be provided before the commencement of development. .

Financial and Other Mitigation

6.38 The proposal would attract the following section 106 contributions, to be secured through a negatively worded planning condition (see para 6.35-6.36) to mitigate the impact of the development:

- Sum of £279,000, or such other figure as is approved by the Council, towards provision of school places required as a result of the development
- Sum of £78,175.68, or such other figure as is approved by the Council, towards provision of Linear Park in the vicinity of the site
- Sum of £6,944, or such other figure as is approved by the Council, towards CPZ in streets north of New Road
- Sum of £87,660, or such other figure as is approved by the Council, towards the Council's Carbon Offset Fund

6.39 The proposal would attract Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy contributions to mitigate the impact of the development. As this is an Outline application, CIL would be assessed and applied when a reserved matters application is submitted.

Other Planning Issues

6.40 There is potential that the existing buildings may provide habitat for protected species. Otherwise there is no biodiversity interest in the site. Suitable conditions are recommended.


6.41 Major Hazard Pipelines – to update

6.42 Due to the previous industrial uses on part of the site, the land is likely to be contaminated. Suitable planning conditions are recommended to ensure remediation of the site.

Conclusions

6.43 All other relevant policies and considerations have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted subject to the conditions outlined above for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

This page is intentionally left blank

 Havering LONDON BOROUGH	Strategic Planning Committee 16 August 2018
---	--

Application Reference:	P1242.17
Location:	BEAM PARK, FORMER FORD ASSEMBLY PLANT
Ward:	SOUTH HORNCHURCH
Description:	CONSULTATION ON REVISED PLANS FOR REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE
Case Officer:	MARTIN KNOWLES

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 The proposals for the Beam Park site are the subject of a cross boundary (partly within the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham (LBBD)) hybrid (part outline and part detailed) planning application P1242.17. The application was reported to Regulatory Services Committee on 15th March and 5th April 2018 at which the Committee resolved that planning permission should be refused, contrary to officer recommendation. LBBD had resolved on 19th March 2018 to approve the scheme, but as Havering voted to refuse that became the overall recommendation, as is the case in applications straddling administrative boundaries. The grounds for refusal were as follows:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its overall height would result in a development which would be out of character with the area contrary to the provisions of Policies DC61 and DC66 of the Development Control Policies DPD and the provisions of the Rainham and Beam Park Planning Framework 2016.

2. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure an agreed level of affordable housing; to secure land for new primary schools; to provide and fit out a new healthcare facility; to provide a new rail station; to provide financial contributions for educational purposes, to mitigate the impact of the development upon public transport; towards the provision of off-site sport and leisure facilities, for employment and training purposes, for Beam Parkway improvements, the installation of an air quality monitoring station, the

introduction of new Controlled Parking Zones, the provision of car club spaces, together with the payment of appropriate carbon offset contributions, a restriction on the ability of residents applying for parking permits, the management of open space, the safeguarding of land for a vertical access to Marsh Way and assisting with the planning and implementation of a bus loop and junction modifications, as well as the payment of legal and monitoring costs necessary as a result of the impact of the development, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD.

1.2 As the proposal is for a development of over 150 dwellings the application was referable to the Mayor for London. As a result of the Stage II referral the Deputy Mayor directed under the powers conferred by Section 2A of the 1990 Act, that the Mayor was to act as the local planning authority for the purposes of determining the planning application. The reasons given for this were as follows:

- i) The proposed development would have a significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan: and
- ii) There are sound planning reasons for the Mayor's intervention.

These reasons were expanded upon in the report which accompanied the letter from the Mayor.

1.3 Subsequent to the Mayor taking the application over, and in consultation with the GLA, the applicants have undertaken a design led review of the scheme massing with a view to increasing the density in Phase 1. This has now been completed and a revised set of drawings and appropriate documents were submitted to the GLA on 3rd August. Havering is now a consultee for the revised scheme and the purpose of this report is to advise Committee of the scale and nature of the revisions and to recommend a response to the Mayor based on these revised proposal.

1.4 The Hearing into the Mayor's "call in" has been set for 28th September, Officers will represent any comments at the hearing and there is an opportunity for objectors to address the hearing.

2 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 At the time of writing this report, the revised proposals to the application have only just been received and the Council has not yet officially been consulted by the GLA although this is expected to have been received by the date of this committee. The deadline for consultation responses would be 21 days. Also, as the Mayors Hearing is scheduled for 28th September, it is important that Havering's response is received by the GLA in good time.

- 2.2 Officers are currently formulating their response to the revisions made to the scheme and this will form the basis of an Addendum Report to this Item to be distributed to Members prior to the meeting.

3 DETAILS OF REVISIONS TO SCHEME

- 3.1 When reported to Committee in April the proposals had already been amended in response to requirements of the Mayor and other consultees to increase the level of affordable housing from 35% to 50% and to double the size of the medical centre. This had resulted in the height of Block K3 on the New Road frontage east of Marsh Way increasing by two storeys to 8 storeys. At that time Phase 1 of the development was proposed to deliver 536 new dwellings, with a further 197 dwellings to be built within Havering as part of Phase 2. Building heights ranged from 9 storeys for the tallest element of Block K down to single storey for elements of the block proposed for Block X.
- 3.2 The revised proposals for Phase 1 would increase the number of residential dwellings by 104 to 640, of which 61 are to be affordable. This would be achieved by the following changes to the heights of blocks/plots.
- Plot W located to face New Road on the western side of Marsh Way increased in height from 6 storeys to 8;
 - Plot J on the south western side of the site, the taller element would increase from a stepped 5/8 storeys to 5/11 storeys;
 - Plot H located on an acute angle corner to the west of the Marsh Way flyover would gain one storey across its width increasing from a stepped 3/6 storeys to 4/7 storeys;
 - Block L located immediately to the east of the proposed new station would increase from a stepped 6/9 storeys to 7/12 storeys;
 - Block K is a large podium block defining the western edge of the development adjacent to main north south access road, New Road, Marsh Way to the west and the new station square to the south. Block K comprises five distinct units around a central amenity podium. Units K3 and K4 which define the north east corner of the block are unchanged at 8 storeys, unit K1 would increase from a stepped height of 6/9 storeys to 6/11 storeys with the increase on the southern side adjacent to the station square. Also adjacent to the station square and defining its north eastern corner, unit K5 would increase in height by 7 floors from 9 to 16 storeys. On the western side of the block unit K2 adjacent to the Marsh Way flyover is proposed to increase from a stepped height of 6/9 storeys to 8/12 storeys.
 - The ground floor arrangements for Block K have also been revised both to accommodate necessary changes to the cycle parking and

waste storage and a rationalisation of the support uses. This includes the loss of the previously proposed pharmacy, the provision of which would not be supported by NHS England.

- Other smaller changes proposed include the amendment of 4no houses to give a better relationship and garden sizes; a small reduction in the area identified for the school in LBH, largely as a result of removing the area underneath Marsh Way from the school's demise. This had been identified for the provision of a MUGA but had given rise to concerns from the GLA about management and maintenance.
- Although there is to be some increase in parking to the north of the school through the introduction of parallel spaces, as a result of the increase in unit numbers the car parking ratio overall within Phase 1 will reduce from 0.37 to 0.34 spaces per dwelling. .

4 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- 4.1 In accordance with planning legislation, the GLA are re-advertising the application and carrying out a full re-consultation.

5 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS


- 5.1 As per Section 2, at the time of writing this report, officers are currently assessing the revised proposals against applicable planning policies and this will form part of the addendum report.

6 FINANCIAL AND OTHER MITIGATION

- 6.1 Should permission be granted the section 106 contributions to mitigate the impact of the development would need to be amended, in particular to reflect the higher child yield that the development would generate.
- 6.2 The proposal would attract Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy contributions to mitigate the impact of the development at a rate of £20 per sqm for all new floorspace.

7 Conclusions

- 7.1 Conclusions will be included in the addendum report, including comments on required S106 obligations should the Mayor decide to grant planning permission.

 Havering LONDON BOROUGH	Strategic Planning Committee 16 August 2018
---	--

Subject: Quarterly Planning Performance Update Report.

Report Author: Simon Thelwell, Planning Manager,
Projects and Regulation

1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 This quarterly report produces a summary of performance on planning applications/appeals and planning enforcement for the previous quarter, April to June 2018.
- 1.2 Details of any planning appeal decisions in the quarter where the committee resolved to refuse planning permission contrary to officer recommendation are also given.
- 1.3 The Government has set performance targets for Local Planning Authorities, both in terms of speed of decision and quality of decision. Failure to meet the targets set could result in the Council being designated with applicants for planning permission being able to choose not to use the Council for determining the application

2 RECOMMENDATION

That the report be noted.

3 QUALITY OF PLANNING DECISIONS

- 3.1 In accordance with the published government standards, quality performance with regard to Major (10 or more residential units proposed or 1000+ sq m new floorspace or site area greater than 0.5 hectares), County Matter (proposals involving minerals extraction or waste development) and Non-Major applications are assessed separately. If more than 10% of the total decisions in each category over the period were allowed on appeal, the threshold for designation would be exceeded.

- 3.2 There has been no announcement on what period would be assessed for future designation rounds. Working on the basis that designation would be announced every year, the next period would be decisions between 1 April 2016 and 31 March 2018, with subsequent appeal decisions to December 2018. The current figures are:

Major Applications:

Total number of planning decisions over period: 53
Number of appeals allowed: 3 (of which 3 were committee decisions to refuse contrary to officer recommendation)
% of appeals allowed: 5.7%
Appeals still to be determined: 1
Refusals which could still be appealed: 1

County Matter Applications:

Total number of planning decisions over period: 16
Number of appeals allowed: 0
% of appeals allowed: 0%
Appeals still to be determined: 0

Non-Major Applications:

Total number of planning decisions over period: 3577
Number of appeals allowed: 53 (to date)
% of appeals allowed: 1.5%

- 3.3 Due to the low number of decisions that we take that are majors or county matters, any adverse appeal decision can have a significant effect on the figure. However, for the current monitoring period, the majors category is not considered at risk in respect of the designation threshold of 10% as only a maximum of two more appeal results are expected.
- 3.4 As part of the quarterly monitoring, it is considered useful to provide details of the performance of appeals generally and summarise any appeal decisions received where either the Regulatory Services Committee/Strategic Planning Committee/Planning Committee resolved to refuse planning permission contrary to officer recommendation.

Appeal Decisions Apr-Jun 2018

Total Number of Appeal Decisions - 17
Appeals Allowed - 5
Appeals Dismissed - 12
% Appeals Allowed - 29%

Appeal Decisions where Committee Decision Contrary to Officer Recommendation

Total Number of Appeal Decisions - 4 (details below)
Appeals Allowed - 2
Appeals Dismissed - 2
% Appeals Allowed - 50%

Appeal Decisions Apr-Jun 2018 Decision by Committee Contrary to Officer Recommendation				
Date of Committee	Application Details	Summary Reason for Refusal	Appeal Decision	Summary of Inspectors Findings
13/07/17 (Reg Services)	P1812.16 226-232 Main Road, Romford	Inappropriate design in conservation area	Appeal Dismissed	The scale, height, position and design of the proposal would be substantially detrimental to the historic and architectural significance of the heritage asset. Even taking into account the detracting effect of the existing building, considered overall, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

03/08/17 (Reg Services)	P0732.17 Rodwell House, 199-209 Hornchurch Road, Hornchurch Change of use of first floor of building from Class B1 (business) to create a gym falling within Class D2	1) Insufficient off street parking resulting in inconvenience to existing residents/occu piers in area 2) Increased congestion and danger to pedestrians	Appeal Allowed	Sufficient spaces in the area exist and no evidence of any harm that could be caused. No harm to living conditions giving existing use of building.
21/09/17 (Reg Services)	P0965.17 Rear of 7 Hamlet Close, Dekker Close, Romford Erection of 1 bed detached bungalow	Overdevelopm ent of the site served by inadequate access	Appeal Allowed	Similar proposal to existing bungalows and not appear as overdevelopment. Very little increase in traffic would result and Hamlet Close itself lightly traffic such that conflict would be infrequent.
16/11/17 (Reg Services)	P1390.17 89 Main Road, Romford Change of use from A1 retail to beauty salon	Unacceptable concentration of non-retail uses harming vitality and viability of centre	Appeal Dismissed	Excessive number of non-retail results and no evidence that site has been marketed – the impact on the shopping area is unacceptable.
Appeal Decisions Apr 2018-Mar 2019 As above(1 st quarter)				

4 SPEED OF PLANNING DECISIONS

- 4.1 In accordance with the published government standards, speed of decision applies to all major and non-major development applications, with the threshold for designation set as follows:

Speed of Major Development (and County Matters) – 60% of decisions within timescale (13 or 16 weeks or such longer time agreed with the applicant)

Speed of Non-Major Development - 70% of decisions within timescale (8 weeks or such longer time agreed with the applicant)

- 4.2 As for the quality performance measure, there has been no announcement on future designation round for speed of decision, so it is considered that a two year figure (beginning April 2017) is monitored for the purposes of this report. For the period April 2017 to end June 2018, the following performance has been achieved:

Major Development – 90% in time

County Matter – 100% in time

Non-Major Decisions - 91% in time

5 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT

- 5.1 There are no designation criteria for planning enforcement. For the purposes of this report, it is considered useful to summarise the enforcement activity in the preceding quarter. This information is provided below:

Apr – Jun 2018	
Number of Enforcement Complaints Received: 232	
Number of Enforcement Complaints Closed: 228	
Number of Enforcement Notices Issued: 4	
Enforcement Notices Issued in Quarter	
Address	Subject of Notice
17 Simms Close, Romford	Change of use of annexe to a separate dwelling
East Hall Farm, Rainham	Unauthorised car sales and repairs
18 Sylvan Avenue, Hornchurch	Unauthorised front boundary wall/railings
Bitter End, 15 High Street, Romford	Amenity Notice relating to appearance of front elevation.

This page is intentionally left blank