



Haverling

LONDON BOROUGH

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA

7.30 pm

Thursday
13 September 2018

Council Chamber,
Town Hall, Main Road,
Romford RM1 3BD

Members 8: Quorum 4

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 11 September 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.

DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF



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 16 August 2018 and to authorise the Chairman to sign them.

5 DEVELOPMENT PRESENTATION - ST. GEORGE'S HOSPITAL, SUTTONS LANE, HORNCHURCH (Pages 5 - 14)

6 APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

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

- 7 **P1241.17 - 35-43 NEW ROAD, RAINHAM, SOUTH HORNCHURCH** (Pages 15 - 28)
- 8 **P0835.18 - THE ALBANY SCHOOL, BROADSTONE ROAD** (Pages 29 - 40)
- 9 **P1156.18 - THE ALBANY SCHOOL, BROADSTONE ROAD** (Pages 41 - 52)

Andrew Beesley
Head of Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 4

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
Council Chamber, Town Hall, Main Road, Romford RM1 3BD
16 August 2018 (7.30 - 9.55 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Conservative Group Jason Frost, +Carol Smith, Maggie Themistocli and Melvin Wallace (Chairman)

Residents' Group +Gerry O'Sullivan

Upminster & Cranham Residents' Group Linda Hawthorn

Independent Residents Group Graham Williamson

Labour Group Keith Darvill (Vice-Chair)

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors Ray Best and Reg Whitney.

+Substitute Members: Councillor Carol Smith (for Ray Best) and Councillor Gerry O' Sullivan (for Reg Whitney).

Councillors Damian White, Michael Deon Burton, David Durant, Jeffrey Tucker, Natasha Summers and Paul McGeary were all present for part of the meeting.

Unless indicated all decisions were taken with no votes against.

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

8 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest.

9 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 19 July 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

10 **DEVELOPMENT PRESENTATION - FREIGHMASTER ESTATE, COLDHARBOUR LANE RAINHAM - REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE TO PROVIDE UP TO 11 LIGHT INDUSTRIAL/INDUSTRIAL/STORAGE UNITS**

The Committee received a presentation from Mr James Tipping (Barton Willmore Planning & Design), Mr James Money (CMP Architects) and Mr Peter Jarman (Wrenbridge).

With its agreement Councillors David Durant and Jeffrey Tucker addressed the Committee.

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:

- Levels of car parking provision
- Building heights
- Ensure nearby conservation area was protected
- Increased use of Coldharbour Lane
- Ambitions for future leisure use in the area
- Use of soft landscaping including planting of trees
- Public transport links to the site
- Use of the jetty for river transport
- Ensure there was consultation with RSPB
- External materials used in the building process
- Minimise conflict of interest with conservation park over the 2nd jetty
- Adoption status of Coldharbour Lane
- Current Anti-Social use of roundabout at Coldharbour Lane/Ferry Lane

The Committee **NOTED** the presentation.

11 **P1004.18 - LAND AT NEW ZEALAND WAY RAINHAM - 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**

In accordance with the public speaking arrangements the Committee was addressed by an objector with a response by the applicant's agent.

The Committee was also addressed by Councillors David Durant, Natasha Summers and Michael Deon Burton.

The Committee considered the report and following a motion to defer consideration of the report which was lost on the Chairman's casting vote it was **RESOLVED** on a vote of 4 to 4 and again on the Chairman's casting

vote to agree the recommendation to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

Councillors Darvill, Hawthorn, O' Sullivan and Williamson voted against the resolution to grant planning permission.

12 **P1229.17 - 89-101 NEW ROAD RAINHAM - 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**

The Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to agree the recommendation to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to the prior completion of a legal agreement.

13 **P1242.17 - CONSULTATION RESPONSE - BEAM PARK, FORMER FORD ASSEMBLY PARK SITE, NEW ROAD RAINHAM**


The Committee considered the report and addendum report and **RESOLVED** to agree the recommendation contained within the addendum report.

14 **QUARTERLY PLANNING PERFORMANCE UPDATE REPORT**

The Committee considered the report and **NOTED** its contents.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

 Havering LONDON BOROUGH	Strategic Planning Committee 13 September 2018
---	---

Pre-Application Reference:	PE/00478/18
Location:	ST. GEORGE'S HOSPITAL, SUTTONS LANE, HORNCHURCH
Ward:	HACTON
Description:	PHASE 2 OF PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT
Case Officer:	MARTIN KNOWLES

1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 This proposed development is being presented for a second time to enable Members of the committee to view the changes that have been made 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 redevelopment of the majority of the St. George's Hospital site was granted planning permission on appeal in July 2017 following the refusal of the hybrid (Part detailed part outline) application P0321.15 by Regulatory Services Committee. Permission was granted for partial demolition and partial conversion of existing buildings to provide 290 dwellings. A reserved matters application P0924.18 is currently under consideration for the implementation of the new build element of the planning permission comprising the construction of 194 dwellings behind the buildings due to be demolished and/or converted.
- 1.3 As previously advised in the report to Strategic Committee in July the applicants intend to bring forward proposals for that part of the site closest to Suttons Lane as a fresh full planning application. Following from that earlier report further pre-application discussions with the applicants have taken place along with a site visit by Members and a pre-application meeting with the

GLA. As a result the proposals have been developed further and are being brought to Committee prior to submission of the planning application.

2 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

- 2.1 A detailed structural survey of the buildings that were earmarked by P0321.15 as being suitable for retention and conversion identified significant structural defects. The scale of the defects rendered retention and conversion on the scale envisaged as being both financially unviable and structurally challenging to the point where substantial demolition would be required.
- 2.2 The first proposals tabled by the applicants were for the total demolition of all existing buildings identified for retention. Following initial discussions with staff the proposals the subject of the first report and presentation were to
- retain the central admin block and the frontage sections of the two ward blocks;
 - demolish the rearward sections of the ward blocks and the Ingrebourne block.
 - Extend rearwards the retained frontage sections of the ward blocks
 - Build 3 no. linear 4 storey blocks to the east creating a private residents courtyard between the retained and retained extended blocks and the new build.
 - Replace the existing gatehouse with a semi-detached pair and a mirror image pair to the south of the main central access.
 - Deliver 165 no. residential units, an uplift of 69 units compared to the approved scheme;
 - 35% of the uplift (69 units) would be delivered as affordable housing
 - Not result in an increased footprint of development on the site.
 - Retain existing access points from Suttons Lane.
- 2.3 Members of the Committee then questioned the presenters and raised issues for further consideration

The main issues raised were:

- Members requested a site visit before this comes to SPC again given the complexity of the site and the local heritage assets;
- The need to ensure that as much as possible of the locally listed building is retained;

- Importance of new buildings respecting the architectural character of retained buildings;
- Design of vehicular entrance will be important and the need for two access points
- Housing mix will need to take into account housing need in the area
- Provision of affordable housing will need to be managed properly, ensure affordability is optimised and that an appropriate tenure mix is provided;
- Affordable housing should be distributed throughout the estate where this is possible and should be tenure blind
- The desirability of local marketing of for sale housing was emphasised
- The level of car parking will be important given the quality of public transport locally and the potential to improve bus services should be explored.

2.4 The site visit for members was held on 19th July where members were shown around the site with particular attention to the exterior and interior of one of the frontage ward blocks which was at that time earmarked for retention and conversion. Members were able to appreciate the full extent of the structural defects of the buildings and the difficulties that these would present for a scheme which intended large scale retention whilst still required to meet modern day standards. As a result Members were sympathetic to the idea that the frontage ward blocks be demolished and rebuilt to a near identical design, incorporating as many of the original features and details as possible, but giving the opportunity for the new dwellings to be built to modern standards and to give a full lifetime of use.

2.5 The revised proposals have embraced and developed this approach for the blocks either side of the original central administration block which is still to be retained and refurbished. The revised proposals can be summarised as follows:

- Retain the central admin block only
- Demolish the whole of both frontage ward blocks and the Ingrebourne block
- Redevelop the ward block sites on the same alignment and with a design and layout which replicates the design and features of the existing building frontage and part of the return flanks whilst incorporating a sympathetic but modern rearward section.
- Build 3 no. linear 4 storey blocks to the east creating a private residents courtyard between the retained and retained extended blocks and the new build.

- Replace the existing gatehouse with a semi-detached pair and a mirror image pair to the south of the main central access.
- Deliver 162 no. residential units, an uplift of 66 units compared to the approved scheme, but a reduction of 3 units compared to that previously presented;
- 35% of the uplift (22 units) would be delivered as affordable housing
- Not result in an increased footprint of development on the site.
- Retain existing access points from Suttons Lane.
- Develop a theme for the landscaping of the site which reflects the historic linkage of the site to RAF Hornchurch.
- Provides a permanent home for a museum/exhibition dedicated to RAF Hornchurch

Site and Surroundings

- 2.6 The site is located on the eastern side of Suttons Lane some 800m south of Hornchurch underground station with Hornchurch town centre a similar distance again north of the station.
- 2.7 The site is bound to the north by the part of the hospital site identified for health related purposes, to the east and south by the hospital site the subject of outline planning permission and to the west by Suttons Lane with houses facing the site across the road. Further to the east and south are open areas comprising the Ingrebourne River Valley and Hornchurch Country Park. The site is broadly rectangular and relatively flat but with a perceptible fall from west to east and north to south.
- 2.8 The site lies within the Green Belt and is identified as Major Developed Site within the Green Belt in the LDF. The Ingrebourne Valley to the east and Hornchurch Country Park to the south are identified as Metropolitan and Borough Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) respectively. 800m to the south of the site the Ingrebourne Valley is identified as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).
- 2.9 The site is characterised by large red brick institutional blocks set within their own or shared landscape comprising of lawns, parking, hard standing roads and paths, and groups of trees. The blocks are predominantly two storey but with high ceilings and steeply pitched roofs and are typical of the inter war institutional style.

Planning History

2.10 The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:

P0321.15 - The redevelopment of the St George's Hospital site inclusive of partial demolition and conversion of existing buildings to provide up to 290 dwellings on 10 ha of the wider site, together with associated car parking, landscape and infrastructure works – Refused on grounds that it would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt. It would constitute inappropriate development which would be harmful to the visual amenities of the Green Belt. Four of the proposed units would fail to achieve the minimum Nationally Described Space Standard and the lack of a legal agreement. Appeal allowed and reserved matters under consideration P0924.18.

P0323.15 - The redevelopment of the St Georges Hospital site inclusive of partial demolition of existing buildings to provide up to 3,000m² of new healthcare facilities on 1.74 ha of the wider site, together with the construction of a new vehicular access from Suttons Lane, associated car parking, landscape and infrastructure works – Resolved to approve and currently stalled with the Mayor of London at Stage II.

P0459.16 The redevelopment of the St George's Hospital site inclusive of partial demolition and conversion of existing buildings to provide up to 279 dwellings on 10.1 ha of the wider site, together with associated car parking, landscape and infrastructure works – Resolved to approve, stalled with the Mayor of London at Stage II and subsequently withdrawn when appeal on P0321.15 was allowed.

3 CONSULTATION

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

- Greater London Authority (Statutory Consultee)
- Transport for London (Statutory Consultee)
- Environment Agency
- Historic England -Archaeology
- Thames Water
- Essex and Suffolk Water
- EDF Energy
- National Grid/Cadent – Gas
- LFEPA – Water
- Fire Brigade
- Natural England

- Essex Wildlife

The following consultees have commented as part of the pre-application process:

3.2 None to date

4 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

4.1 The developer has consulted the local community at a well attended public open day at the St. George's site which was held on 26th July with a further day scheduled for September, due to the level of interest shown at the first meeting.

5 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

- Principle of development
- Green Belt impact
- Heritage impact
- Density, scale and site layout
- Housing mix/affordable housing
- Other issues

5.2 Principle of development

As set out in the previous report there is strong support in policy terms for the principle of the redevelopment of the site for residential purposes as well as this being established by the grant of planning permission on appeal.

This is subject to meeting the criteria for suitable Green Belt development set out in the NPPF/NPPG and other relevant policy tests and judgements in relation to other matters set out below.

5.3 Green Belt impact

The NPPF states that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. However, the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites can be considered appropriate development in the Green Belt if it would not have a greater impact upon the openness of the Green Belt and does not undermine the purpose of the site's inclusion in the Green Belt. On the other hand, if it were to be judged that the proposals

would have a greater impact on openness or result in some other harm to the purpose of including the site in the Green Belt, then very special circumstances would have to be demonstrated which clearly outweighed such harm. The impact upon the openness of the site, implicitly intertwined with the visual impact of the proposals, is therefore a key consideration to determining the acceptability of the proposals in Green Belt terms.

Such judgements of Green Belt impact can be assisted by assessments of the quantum of development comparing such aspects as footprint, volume, height, floorspace and development envelope of the existing development to that which is proposed. However, impact upon openness and visual impact cannot be made entirely upon empirical evidence and factors such as ground levels and visibility need to be considered when making judgements about comparative impact.

As yet staff have not come to any provisional judgement on Green Belt impact. When assessing the hybrid application it was demonstrated that there would be reductions in the total footprint and volume as a result of the redevelopment and this together with other factors led to a judgement that the development did not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This empirical evidence has not yet been provided and consideration of this together with other factors will be important in determining whether the revised proposals remain appropriate Green Belt development.

5.4 Heritage impact

There are no listed buildings on the site but the Hospital in its entirety has been identified as a building of local heritage interest and is therefore classified as a non-designated heritage asset. The judgement to be made is whether the scale of loss and the extent of harm proposed is acceptable in relation to the significance of the heritage asset that St Georges Hospital represents.

Policy DC67 provides guidance on dealing with applications which impact upon Listed Buildings and other buildings of heritage interest and Policy 7.8 of the London Plan recognises the importance of heritage assets and requires that development affecting such assets and their settings should conserve their significance by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.

The NPPF reinforces these messages confirming at para 135 that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application and that a balanced

judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

The proposals as revised would entail demolition on an even greater scale than that previously presented which in turn were greater than envisaged by the allowed hybrid application. Whilst this will now only retain one of the existing buildings on the site, members have seen for themselves the very real difficulties that more significant retention and conversion would entail. Loss on the scale proposed, albeit with a new build which replicates the buildings to be lost, would still need to be balanced against the potential uplift in the number of dwellings that further demolition would enable and the justification presented related to the potential difficulties, both physical and financial that larger scale retention and conversion would engender.

5.5 Density, scale and site layout

London Plan Policy 3.4 requires development to optimise housing output for different locations taking account of local context and character, design principles and public transport capacity.

The proposed uplift in unit numbers will increase the density of development across the site to 35.5 units per hectare. However, this figure is well within the range of 30 – 50 units per hectare for suburban areas set out in Policy DC2. What is more important in this case is the scale and layout proposed in order to achieve that higher density. As members previous identified a key judgement to be made is whether the proposed new build will respect the building to be retained and create a character of development which is not at odds with the rest of the development of the site and/or the openness of the Green Belt.

In terms of layout the proposal to create parallel north/south blocks with private landscaped amenity areas between them maximises the opportunity that their orientation presents to provide an attractive, usable, well-lit and overlooked amenity area.

5.6 Housing mix/affordable housing

Policy DC6 of the LDF and Policies 3.11 and 3.12 of the London Plan seek to maximise affordable housing in major development proposals and Policy DC2 has the objective of delivering 50% of new homes across the Borough as affordable. The Mayor of London Supplementary Planning Guidance “Homes for Londoners” (2017) 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, this is known as the “Fast Track Route”.

The revised proposals for this part of the site would deliver 3 units less than previously proposed. Although the mix has yet to be fully established it will be focussed on providing 1 and 2 bedroom flats, currently envisaged as 63 no. 1 bedroom, 95 no. 2 bedroom and 4 no 3 bedroom units. As the majority of the rest of the site in Phase 1 will be developed for family housing no objection is likely to be raised to this mix.

The scheme that was approved at appeal for the site would have seen the delivery of 15% affordable housing across the site split 50% : 50% between intermediate and social rented housing. At this stage it is envisaged that the majority of that 15% (44 no units) would be delivered within Phase 1 of the development, currently the subject of reserved matters application P0924.18. Any uplift in the overall number of units on the overall site achieved by the proposals the subject of this pre-application report is proposed to deliver 35% affordable housing, an additional 22 affordable housing units split 64/36 in favour of affordable rent. Staff would seek to ensure that the mix and tenure of the additional affordable housing was in line with the Council’s identified housing need.

5.7 Additional issues

The applicants indicate that car parking has been retained at a level of 1 space per flat and 2 spaces per house. This would be line with the maximum parking standards set out in the LDF but the GLA did express concern on this aspect at the recent pre-application meeting.

London Plan Policies along with Policies DC49 and DC50 of the Development Control Policies DPD requires all major and strategic developments to meet a high standard of sustainable design and construction. Most recently, Policy 5.2 of the London Plan requires residential buildings to be zero carbon. The applicant will be expected to adhere to this policy framework and the Mayor’s energy hierarchy and if unable to achieve zero carbon development a carbon offset payment would be required as part of any S106 legal agreement.

London Plan Policy 3.18 and LDF Policy DC28 support proposals to enhance the provision of educational facilities. All Local Authorities have a statutory duty to ensure that there are enough school places available in the borough to accommodate all children who live in the borough and might require one. A contribution of £6,000 per dwelling will be sought for all units and would be secured by legal agreement.

6 FINANCIAL AND OTHER MITIGATION

6.1 The proposal would attract the following section 106 contributions to mitigate the impact of the development:

- Up to £948,000 towards education
- Possible carbon offset contribution

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 OTHER PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 The proposal is likely to come forward in the next month and a phasing plan will accompany the application to demonstrate that the proposals the subject of this pre-app report would be developed at the same time that the rest of the site was under development.

Discussions are taking place with Hornchurch Aerodrome Society to ensure that a space/building is reserved for a permanent exhibition dedicated to the former RAF Hornchurch.

8 Conclusions

8.1 The development is still in the pre-application stage and has been further developed following the previous meeting and site visit. This presentation is intended to provide Members with a further opportunity to review and offer opinion on the way the scheme has developed and might be further improved prior to the submission of a planning application which will follow shortly.

 Havering LONDON BOROUGH	Strategic Planning Committee 13 September 2018
---	---

Application Reference:	P1241.17
Location:	35-43 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 identify 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 a 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 £5,600, or such other figure as is approved by the Council
 - d. Linear Park contribution sum of £82,062.80, or such other figure as approved by the Council
 - e. Carbon offset contribution sum of £80,640, 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 40% social rent with up to 60% 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 up to 5 and 4 storey blocks. The indicative mix proposed across the site includes 24.No. of 1 bedroom apartments, 26.No. of 2 bedroom apartments, and 12.No. of 3 bedroom apartments. A total of 62 units would be provided.
- 3.3 The proposal also outlines 50.No. dedicated vehicular parking spaces for residents at a ratio of 1:0.8, Secure cycle storage areas are to be provided within the apartment block and suggested that a minimum of 74.No cycle racks spaces will be provided together with internal refuse areas.
- 3.4 Vehicular access to the proposed apartment blocks are proposed from the sides of the site off Walden Avenue and South Street, 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 site is 0.365ha. It is bounded to the north by residential development, to the west and east by existing industrial and commercial employment sites, and to the south by vacant previously developed land, beyond New Road. The site is rectangular in shape with access from South Street to the west, Walden Avenue to the east and also from New Road to the south. Along the northern edge of the site, there is a footpath separating the site from the residential area to the north. The majority of the site itself is covered by buildings and hardstanding.
- 3.7 To the western end there is a two storey pitched roof industrial property with an MOT centre at ground level, with associated workshop and car parking to both New Road and South Street frontages. Within the middle of the site is a residential three storey property which has been divided into flats, and has an area of hardstanding and access from New Road at the front. Separating this residential property from the surrounding commercial properties are two small advertising hoardings to the west and a larger advertising billboard to the

east. Within the eastern end of the site lies a MOT business which comprises of a single and two storey buildings, with workshop on the ground floor and office on the first floor. There is further hardstanding and parking at the New Road frontage to the south. Beyond this, further to the east is a car repair and car sales business with parking provided under a former petrol station canopy. To the rear on the north eastern part of the site is a single storey building accommodating a car body works business with a small area of hardstanding fronting Walden Avenue.

- 3.8 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.

Planning History

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

A planning history search revealed an extensive planning background, as this application seeks the complete re-development of a particular site, the specific historical permission issued to the land in question are not considered relevant in this instance.

It should however be noted that there are two current applications covering the site:

P1137.17 – 43 New Road (eastern part of this application site). The proposal is for redevelopment of the site to erect a five storey building comprising 18 residential units with associated refuse and cycle storage, car parking, and ancillary works following demolition of the existing buildings. This is an application for full permission and is subject to an appeal against non-determination with a Start Date for the appeal yet to be received.

P0348.17 – 35-87 (inclusive) New Road (includes this application site and the site to the east). Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except means of access) for the demolition of all buildings; development including four buildings comprising of up to 248 residential units (mix of studio, 1 bed, 2 bed, and 3 bed flats), with details of landscaping, appearance, layout and scale being reserved in accordance with the submitted parameter plans (Phase 1 & 2). Demolition of existing buildings and construction of 5 town houses, with all matters reserved (Phase 3). The application remains undetermined at the present time.

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 – Advice provided about surface water drainage and in relation to sewerage infrastructure capacity there would not be an objection.
- 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 Cadent – Considers that there are high and medium pressure gas pipes and electricity overhead lines within the site. It is urged that no decision is undertaken until further advice is provided by the Cadent Pipeline Team. Despite chasing, no further response received from Cadent.
- 4.8 Health and Safety Executive – On safety grounds, do not advise against the grant of planning permission
- 4.9 Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service – require further desk top study regarding archaeology
- 4.10 London Fire Brigade – No objections.
- 4.11 LBH Highways – No objections subject to conditions being included that deal with; i) pedestrian visibility splay, ii) highway agreement for vehicular access, and iii) vehicle cleansing during construction. In addition a S106 contribution is sought seeking funds for a CPZ in the area should it be required in the future. The amount sought is £5,600.
- 4.12 TfL – consider that the level of parking provision is excessive. This objection was later withdrawn.

5 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

- 5.1 A total of 61 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: No responses were received.

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 0.32ha (3,200m²) which equates to a density of 170 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 170 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'. The density is higher than set out in the RBBPF, however this can be justified by being located close to the potential new station where there is opportunities to provide a link between the taller buildings proposed to the south of New Road and the lower-rise residential buildings to the north.
- 6.9 Based on the building footprint and the building height indicated on the proposed parameter plans, the proposed apartment blocks would achieve heights of between 5 and 4 storeys 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 illustrative proposals suggest that the 5 story blocks will be located on the corners of New Road/South Street and New Road/Walden Avenue, stepping down to four storeys in between. The proposed heights are considered to be a response to the proximity of the site to the proposed station and the Beam Park (Countryside) development on the south side of New Road. The layout of the site suggests that the blocks fronting New Road would be separated from the car parking located to the north of the site by an internal walkway and landscaping. Pedestrian and vehicular access is achieved from South Street and Walden Avenue. 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. 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.

- 6.11 The proposal would involve the demolition of all buildings on the site, mainly industrial sheds and canopy structure. None of the buildings are considered to hold any architectural or historical value, therefore no principle objection raised to their demolition.
- 6.12 Scale is a reserved matter. From the submitted Design and Access Statement and plans it is indicated that the proposed apartment blocks fronting New Road would not be greater than five to four storeys in height. 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.
- 6.13 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.
- 6.14 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

- 6.15 The proposed flatted blocks will not adversely impact on one another. The proposed apartment blocks fronting New Road are sited such that there are no concerns with regard to its overshadowing or overlooking (subject to reserved matters). The existing residential properties in South Street and Walden Avenue are located more than 19.8m away. This is considered sufficient distance to limit any issues of overlooking or loss of privacy. However, any remaining concerns 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.
- 6.16 Officers have further reviewed the external space provided with the proposed development, and the 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.

- 6.17 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.
- 6.18 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.
- 6.19 Officers have reviewed the proposed waste storage areas catering the apartments/dwellings, which have been set to be serviced from South Street and Walden Avenue 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

- 6.20 The application site within an area with PTAL of 2 (low-moderate accessibility). The proposal for 62 No. units with a provision of 50 No. vehicular parking spaces, which equates to a parking ratio of 0.8:1. The maximum standards suggested in the Planning Framework (which are based on the London Plan) for a development of this indicative mix would be 56 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 submission is an application for outline planning permission and the residential mix is potentially subject to change at reserved matters stage.
- 6.21 Accordingly, officers are content with the provision of parking proposed considering the 50 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.
- 6.22 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.

- 6.23 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.
- 6.24 The London Fire Brigade has raised no objection in principle.

Affordable Housing/Mix

- 6.25 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.
- 6.26 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, as part of the joint venture Council strategy, are 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 affordable housing, but that it could support 35% level of affordable housing if there were minor changes in costs and values arising in the future, which could come about as a result of improvements in the market and/or construction cost savings being achieved via economies of scale. In this case, 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.
- 6.27 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 38.7% 1 bed units, 41.9% 2 bed units, and 19.41% 3 bed units. The proposed mix is and

reasonably aligned with the above policy guidance, officers are content that the mix on offer falls in accordance with policy.

School Places and Other Contributions

- 6.28 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.
- 6.29 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.
- 6.30 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.
- 6.31 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 £82,062.80. This is necessary to provide a satisfactory setting for the development rather than the stark wide New Road.
- 6.32 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 £6,944) 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.

- 6.33 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 26.2%, across the entire site. In assessing the baseline energy demand and carbon dioxide emissions for the site, a financial contribution of £80,640 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.
- 6.34 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.
- 6.35 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.
- 6.36 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


- 6.44 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 £82,062.80, 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 £80,640, or such other figure as is approved by the Council, towards the Council's Carbon Offset Fund
- 6.45 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

- 6.46 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.
- 6.47 Major Hazard Pipelines – The site is within close proximity of a major hazard pipeline and in accordance with legislation the HSE have been consulted. The HSE have not advised against the grant of planning permission given the distance from the pipeline and nature of development. Cadent, the pipeline operator, indicated that they would make comments, but no response has been received. It is considered that there are no major safety concerns with regard to the presence of nearby pipelines.
- 6.48 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

- 6.49 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.

 Havering LONDON BOROUGH	Strategic Planning Committee 13 September 2018
---	---

Application Reference:	P0835.18
Location:	The Albany School, Broadstone Road.
Ward:	Hylands
Description:	The erection of a two-storey temporary classroom block on part of the north-west playing field of the school, together with the provision of a temporary car park.
Case Officer:	Jacob Lawrence
Reason for Report to Committee:	The application is by or on behalf of the Council and is a significant development.

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 This proposal has been brought forward in conjunction with an application for full planning permission under ref. P1156.18 which seeks approval for development as follows:

Demolition of existing classroom block (part single storey and part three storey) and erection of a replacement two storey classroom block.

1.2 The subject proposal is required to provide temporary accommodation during the period of demolition and construction works required to deliver the permanent accommodation sought through P1156.18. The Applicant has indicated that the proposed temporary structure would be removed from the site on or before 20.03.2020.

1.3 Full details of P1156.18 are provided within the report for this application published as part of the 13 September 2018 Strategic Planning Committee Agenda.

1.4 Both the subject proposal and that being considered under P1156.18 do not seek permission to expand the existing school in terms of pupil numbers but rather are a result of the Priority Schools Building Programme (PSBP) funded by the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA). The PSBP is a condition led programme that seeks to address substandard educational facilities. It has been identified that the existing school building to be demolished as part of the concurrent application under P1156.18 has fallen into disrepair and has surpassed its economic design life.

1.5 Given the above Officers can confirm that there would be no increase in student numbers arising from the proposal.

2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

2.1 The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two-storey temporary classroom block on part of the north-west playing field of the school, together with the provision of a temporary car park.

2.2 The proposed structure is required to facilitate the delivery of a purpose built permanent teaching block within the site which is required to replace an existing block that is no longer fit for purpose. The proposed temporary structure and carpark is sought to ensure continuity of education and car parking provision during planned construction works.

2.3 The proposed temporary building does not possess any architectural merit, however, as a temporary structure it is considered acceptable. The location and massing of the temporary structure would not give rise to any unacceptable impacts on neighbouring residential amenity. Given the proposal would not result in an expansion of pupil numbers officers are satisfied that no adverse impacts in terms of highways and parking impacts, over and above current site conditions, would arise. Conditions are recommended to ensure the temporary structure and carpark area are removed from the site within 6 months of the 20th March 2020. Further conditions are recommended to ensure proposed privacy mitigation measures are implemented. Subject to these conditions the proposal is considered acceptable and policy compliant.

3 RECOMMENDATION

3.1 That the Committee resolve to planning permission subject to the recommended conditions:

3.3 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. Cessation of use, removal of structures and reinstatement of site.
2. In accordance with approved drawings
3. Restricted use
4. Obscure glazing
5. External staircases for emergency use only

Informatives

1. Working with Applicant
2. Fire safety
3. Thames water

4 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

- 4.1 The subject application seeks permission to place a two storey modular structure on the site for a temporary period until 20th March 2020. The proposed structure would be formed by joining modular cabins that would be placed towards the southwestern corner of the existing grassed field area located within the western part of the school site. The specifications of the structure are detailed below:

Building footprint: 504 square metres

Gross internal Area: 982 square metres

Maximum height: 6.785m

Materials: Plastic coated steel sheet, UPVC windows and steel roofing.

- 4.2 Permission is also sought for a temporary car park to provide 50 car parking spaces. The car park would be formed using grasscrete, which is a temporary paving system, across a 910 sq.m area.

- 4.3 The applicant has provided a timeline for the proposed temporary structure and carpark which is as follows:

- 23rd November 2018 Temporary works commencement
- 18th to 22nd February 2019 Temporary structure completed, handover to school & decant from existing
- 24th February 2020 to 20th March 2020 Remove temporary structure and make good area (4 weeks)

Site and Surroundings

- 4.2 Albany School is located approximately 2km south east of Romford Town Centre. The School currently provides education across a range of buildings extending between 1 and 3 storeys in height. The wider school site is

bordered by residential properties to the north, east and west with Harrow Lodge Park to the south.

- 4.3 The application site is an irregularly shaped parcel of land located on the western edge of wider school site and is surrounded by residential properties to the south and west with 2 storey semi-detached and terraced properties representing the prevailing form of development.
- 4.4 The area within which the proposed building is to be located is bordered by an end of terrace property accessed off Adelphi Close to the west and semi-detached properties fronting Broadstone Road to the south.
- 4.5 The proposed temporary car parking area is located to the south of the existing school entrance off Broadstone Road. The rear gardens of the Broadstone Road terraced properties lie to the west of this area.

Planning History

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

Concurrent application under ref. P1156.18 (being considered under the 13 September 2018 committee agenda) which seeks permission for development as follows:

Demolition of existing classroom block (part single storey and part three storey) and erection of a replacement two storey classroom block.

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:

Metropolitan Police (Designing Out Crime)

No objection subject to recommended conditions requiring secure by design principles to be incorporated into proposal.

London Fire Brigade

Hydrant officer confirmed that no new hydrants are required.

Additional correspondence from LFB outlined part B building regulation requirements with respect to fire safety.

OFFICER COMMENT: The comments from LFB are noted and an informative is recommended to ensure the applicant is aware of the building regulation requirements in relation to Fire Safety.

LBH Environmental Health

No objections

LBH Street Management

No objections

Sport England

No objection

Thames Water

No objection. Comments received in relation to surface water drainage and public sewers are noted and informatives are recommended to make the applicant aware of their responsibilities.

6 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

6.1 In accordance with planning legislation, the developer has consulted the local community on these proposals as part of the pre-application process.

6.2 The application has been supported by a Statement of Community Involvement which outlines the pre application public consultation that has taken place. This public consultation was linked to both the temporary development sought under the subject application and the permanent proposals being considered concurrently. The scope of the public consultation has been summarised below.

-The applicant held a public consultation event in the main hall of Albany School on Wednesday 16th May 2018 which ran from 3pm to 7pm.

-The public consultation event was advertised through a leaflet drop and local ward councillors were invited to attend.

-Presentation boards were used to display images which showed the proposal.

-The Applicant has outlined that the event was well attended and 8 members of the public left comments.

6.3 The main issues raised in relation to the subject proposal and the developer's responses are set out below.

-The temporary accommodation block is positioned close to 89 Adelphi Crescent.

-The temporary block would devalue local dwellings

Developer's Response: these comments are addressed through the submitted Planning Statement and the Design and Access Statement

- 6.4 Further consultation was also undertaken by the developer during the course of this application after the applicant became aware that several residents stated they had not received the initial invitation to the Public Exhibition. A second consultation event for the residents of Steed Close, Parish Close & Apollo Close was held on Tuesday 8th August. This consultation was attended by 11 residents, Cllr Ciaran White and Cllr Christine Smith.

7 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

- 7.1 A total of 94 neighbouring properties were notified about the application and invited to comment. The application has been publicised by way of a site notice displayed outside the application site on the 13.08.2018 and a notice in the local newspaper on 29.06.2018.

- 7.2 The number of representations received from neighbours in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 19 objections

Whilst 19 objections were received in response to the consultation carried out for this application 15 of the responses appear to primarily relate to the concurrent proposals being considered under application ref. P1156.18

- 7.3 The following Councillor made representations:

- Councillor Christine Smith reiterated the concerns of an objector residing at 12 Steed Close.

Representations

- 7.4 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

- Lack of community engagement
- Impacts on privacy
- Noise
- Excessive height

- Poorly considered location
- Concerned that temporary structure won't be removed.

Non-material representations

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

- Impact on property value
- Excessive cost to taxpayers

8 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

- The principle of development and the need for school places
- The design and visual impact of the building
- Impact on amenity
- Parking and Highway issues

Principle of Development

8.2 All Local Authorities, including Havering, have a statutory duty to ensure that there are enough school places available in the borough to accommodate all children who live in the borough and might require one.

8.3 The NPPF attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of education facilities are available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local Authorities are encouraged to take a proactive and positive approach to development that will widen choice in education, with great weight given to the need to create, expand or alter education facilities.

8.4 Replicating this, Policy 3.18 of the London Plan details that development proposals which enhance education and skills provision will be supported, including new build, expansion of existing or change of use to educational purposes. Policy DC29 states that the Council will ensure that the provision of primary and secondary education facilities is sufficient to meet the needs of residents by, amongst other things, seeking to meet the need for increased school places within existing sites.

8.5 This application forms part of a wider proposal to deliver a new purpose built 2 storey teaching block to replace an existing structure that is no longer fit for purpose. This application is being considered concurrently under application ref. P1156.18. Should P1156.18 be granted planning permission then the

school will require temporary accommodation to ensure continuity of education during the anticipated 12-14 month demolition and construction period associated with P1156.18.

- 8.6 The policy objectives outlined above place great importance on the delivery of new and improved educational facilities where they meet an identified need. The proposed development is a necessary precursor to the provision of high quality enhanced education facilities on the site and therefore remains in accordance with the relevant development plan objectives. Without the provision of temporary buildings the school would not be in a position to improve the existing facilities without significantly reducing their role size and/or quality of education offered during the construction phase of P1156.18. Given the established nature of the school and identified need for school places in Havering officers acknowledge that this is not a practical or indeed policy compliant option. As such, the provision of enhanced education facilities on this site in the medium term requires the use of temporary buildings in the short term.
- 8.7 Notwithstanding the above, officers have had due regard to the fact that the provision of temporary buildings to serve education needs has in some historic cases extended beyond the initial temporary period anticipated and such form of development does not deliver high quality education provision that accords with the Development Plan. In order to avoid such an outcome it is considered both reasonable and necessary to impose a condition requiring the temporary buildings to be removed by 20 September 2020. This timeframe provides a reasonable buffer for the applicant in the event construction works are delayed, yet retains a sufficient safeguard to ensure the proposal remains temporary in nature. Subject to this condition officers remain satisfied that the proposal can be supported. This in principle support is subject to compliance with design, amenity and transportation based policy objectives. Such matters are considered below.

Design

- 8.8 As outlined above the proposal is temporary in nature and therefore the structures would only be on the site until 20th September 2020 at the latest with this to be secured by way of a recommended condition. Given its temporary nature, officers are of the view that it would be unreasonable to subject the proposal to the same level of design scrutiny that must be given to a permanent proposal.
- 8.9 Within this context, officers are satisfied that the bulk and mass of the proposed temporary structure would not give rise to any harm to the public realm or spatial character of the locality. The detailed design of the structure lacks any architectural merit, however, as a short term temporary feature within the built environment the lack of quality architecture and materiality is not considered harmful.

- 8.10 With respect to the proposed temporary car park this element of the proposal would be located to the south of the existing entrance to the school via Broadstone Road. The proposed car park would occupy an area of 910 sq.m and would be formed by using Grasscrete. Grasscrete is a paving system made from plastic that can be easily removed once it is no longer required. This system is considered to represent a simple yet visually acceptable solution for the proposed temporary car park.
- 8.11 Further to the above it is considered that any isolated and temporary harm that may arise from the design of the proposal would be significantly outweighed by the positive benefits the application offers in terms of continuity of education should the scheme being considered under ref. P1156.18 be approved and delivered.
- 8.12 For the reasons detailed above officers are of the view that the proposal would not conflict with the design based policy objectives of Policy DC61 of the LDF.

Amenity

- 8.13 The location of the temporary structure has been selected as a result of the need to ensure the siting of the structure preserves neighbouring amenity. This approach has ensured separation distances between the structure and nearest neighbouring residential windows of the Broadstone Road properties to the south remains in excess of 30m when considering ground floor openings and in excess of 35m when considering first floor openings. This retained separation distance, combined with the siting of the structure to the north of these properties, maximum height of 6.6m and use of obscure glazed film to the first floor south facing windows, would ensure any impacts on the Broadstone Road properties remain well within acceptable parameters.
- 8.14 Officers acknowledge that the presence of external metal staircases has the potential to give rise to additional overlooking of rear gardens, however, these stairs are for use in emergencies only and a condition is recommended to this effect. Subject to this condition no harm to neighbouring privacy would arise.
- 8.15 The proposed structure would be located 25m to the south east of the northern row of terraced housing accessed off Adelphi Crescent, however, given the orientation of this terrace the structure would not sit directly in front of any openings of these properties. The presence of the structure in angled views from these properties towards the south east is acknowledged, however, this does not represent material harm to the residential amenity afforded to these dwellings.

- 8.16 Officers are cognisant of the fact that the proposed structure would be positioned within 11.2m of the sites western boundary shared with No. 89 Adelphi Crescent. Whilst this separation distance is significantly reduced the orientation of No. 89 Adelphi Crescent, whereby the properties blank gable end directly faces the site, results in a situation in which no harmful loss of daylight/ sunlight, reduced outlook, overbearing impact or loss of privacy would arise as a result of the proposal.
- 8.17 Further to the adjoining properties considered above it is noted that properties fronting Apollo Close adjoin the site to the north. However, a separation distance in excess of 40m would be retained and therefore no harm to the residential amenity afforded to these properties would arise.
- 8.18 Further to the assessment above, due regard has been given the potential for the siting of the temporary structure and associated use to generate additional noise and disturbance over and above existing. With respect to this consideration officers note that the site location is currently a school playing field and therefore a range of noise generating activities could occur in this area. In contrast the use of the building as a classroom, which generally provides a low noise environment, contained within the fabric of the temporary building would not result in any material increase in potential noise generation. Further to this, the teaching times of the school ensure that the structures will not be in use during the early part of the morning, evening or weekend.
- 8.19 The proposal also includes the provision of a temporary car park within the site. The existing car park area will be utilised as a site office/ compound during the construction phase of P1156.18 (should permission be granted). The proposed temporary car park is located 6.4m from the nearest residential boundary and in excess of 25m from the nearest habitable room opening of the Broadstone Road properties to the west. It is noted that some outbuildings to the rear of the Broadstone Road properties are located within closer proximity to the temporary car park, however, given the nature of these structures this proximity is not considered harmful.
- 8.20 As detailed above, officers acknowledge that the car park would be located closer to these adjoining residential properties than the existing car park, however, given the temporary nature of this car park any resultant harm in terms of actual or perceived nuisance would be within acceptable parameters. This position is supported by the fact that Environmental Health Officers have no objection to the proposal. To ensure any residual impacts remain temporary a condition is recommended requiring the cessation of the car park use and removal of the grasscrete on or before 20th September 2020.

- 8.21 Further to the above it is considered that any isolated and temporary harm to neighbouring amenity that may arise from the proposal would be significantly outweighed by the positive benefits the application offers in terms of continuity of education should the scheme being considered under ref. P1156.18 be approved and delivered


Transport and Highways

- 8.23 The subject application would not result in an increase in the capacity of the existing school in terms of student numbers and therefore would not result in any increased trip generation as a result of pick-ups and drop offs. As such, the key transport consideration relates to the acceptability of the short term car park in terms of quantum of parking spaces and safe manoeuvring within this space.
- 8.24 With respect to the proposed quantum of car parking spaces officers are satisfied that the temporary provision broadly reflects the existing quantum of parking available on site and therefore does not encourage the use of a car as opposed to walking or cycling to any further extent than the status quo.
- 8.25 In response to potential manoeuvring concerns LBH Transport Officers have reviewed the application and have confirmed that they have no objection to the proposal.

Conclusions

- 8.7 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.

This page is intentionally left blank

 <p>Havering LONDON BOROUGH</p>	<p>Strategic Planning Committee 13 September 2018</p>
---	--

Application Reference:	P1156.18
Location:	The Albany School, Broadstone Road
Ward:	Hylands
Description:	Demolition of existing classroom block (part single storey and part three storey) and erection of a replacement two storey classroom block.
Case Officer:	Jacob Lawrence
Reason for Report to Committee:	The application is by or on behalf of the Council and is a significant development.

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 This application is linked to an application for full planning permission under ref. P0835.18 which seeks approval for development as follows:

The erection of a two-storey temporary classroom block on part of the north-west playing field of the school, together with the provision of a temporary car park.

1.2 The application being considered under ref. P0835.18 is required to provide temporary accommodation during the period of demolition and construction works required to deliver the permanent accommodation sought through this application.

1.3 The subject application does not seek permission to expand the existing school in terms of pupil numbers but rather is a result of the Priority Schools Building Programme (PSBP) funded by the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA). The PSBP is a condition led programme that seeks to address substandard educational facilities. It has been identified that the existing school building to be demolished has fallen into disrepair and has surpassed its economic design life.

1.4 Given the above Officers can confirm that there would be no increase in student numbers arising from the proposal

2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of an existing classroom block (part single storey and part three storey) and erection of a replacement two storey classroom block.
- 2.2 The proposed two storey classroom block is required to replace an existing block that is no longer fit for purpose. The proposal would enable the school to maintain existing pupil numbers and provide a learning environment that meets current standards and facilitates continued education provision to meet an identified need within the Borough.
- 2.3 The existing part single storey and part three storey structure does not possess any architectural merit and therefore its demolition to make way for the proposed structure is supported.
- 2.4 Due regard has been given to the proximity of the replacement structure to neighbouring residential occupier's, however, officers are satisfied that the location, massing and detailed design of the structure strikes an acceptable balance between preserving neighbouring amenity and enabling the delivery of the block in a similar location to the existing structure.
- 2.5 The height scale and massing of the proposal is considered appropriate given the existing scale of development onsite. The acceptability of the proposed massing is supported by a simple yet effective design response. The use of brickwork across both the ground and first floor of the building has been secured through negotiation by officers and is considered to provide an enhanced level of robustness and aesthetic quality to the finished elevations.
- 2.6 Given the proposal would not result in an expansion of pupil numbers officers are satisfied that no adverse impacts in terms of highways and parking impacts, over and above current site conditions, would arise. Conditions are recommended to ensure any temporary impacts during the construction phase of the development are appropriately mitigated. Further conditions are recommended to ensure proposed privacy mitigation measures are implemented and the positive elements of the proposal advanced by the applicant are carried through to implementation. Subject to these conditions the proposal is considered acceptable and policy compliant.

3 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission
- 3.3 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. 3 year time limit
2. In accordance with approved drawings
3. Construction management plan
4. Material samples
5. Plant machinery
6. Construction hours
7. Tree Protection
8. Landscaping
9. Sustainability
10. Obscure glazing

Informatives

1. Working with Applicant
2. Fire safety
3. Thames water
4. Highways

4 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

- 4.1 The subject application seeks planning permission to demolish an existing part single and part 3 storey teaching block and construct a replacement 2 storey structure.

The proposed building would be located towards the eastern boundary of the school site where it would occupy a similar position to an existing building to be demolished. The building would have a footprint of 780 square metres(sq.m) and extend to a maximum height of 9m above ground level. The building would benefit from a range of fenestration across ground and first floor level with buff brick cladding.

The proposed structure would provide teaching space as follows:

Ground floor

-Two 55 sq.m classrooms

- Two 96 sq.m resistant materials workshops
- One 83 sq.m electronic and controls system teaching space
- Two staff work rooms
- One group room

First floor

- Five 55 sq.m classrooms
- Two general art rooms (97 and 82 sq.m)

Site and Surroundings

- 4.2 Albany School is located approximately 2km south east of Romford Town Centre. The School currently provides education across a range of buildings extending between 1 and 3 storeys in height. The wider school site is bordered by residential properties to the north, east and west with Harrow Lodge Park to the south.
- 4.3 The area within which the proposed building is to be located is currently occupied by a part single and part three storey building to be demolished. The nearest residential properties are located on Steed Close to the east and Apollo Close to the north. Steed Close is characterised by two storey detached dwellings and Apollo Close is characterised by 2 storey terraced dwellings.

Planning History

- 4.4 The following planning applications are relevant to the application:

Concurrent application under ref. P0835.18 (being considered under the 13 September 2018 committee agenda) which seeks permission for development as follows:

Erection of a two-storey temporary classroom block on part of the north-west playing field of the school, together with the provision of a temporary car park.

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:

Metropolitan Police (Designing Out Crime)

No objection subject to recommended conditions requiring secure by design principles to be incorporated into proposal.

London Fire Brigade

Hydrant officer confirmed that no new hydrants are required.

OFFICER COMMENT: The comments from LFB are noted and an informative is recommended to ensure the applicant is aware of the building regulation requirements in relation to Fire Safety.

LBH Environmental Health

No objection subject to recommended conditions

LBH Highways

No objection subject to recommended conditions and informatives.

Thames Water

No objection. Comments received in relation to surface water drainage and public sewers are noted and informatives are recommended to make the applicant aware of their responsibilities.

6 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

6.1 In accordance with planning legislation, the developer has consulted the local community on these proposals as part of the pre-application process.

6.2 The application has been supported by a Statement of Community Involvement which outlines the pre application public consultation that has taken place. This public consultation was linked to both the permanent development sought under the subject application and the temporary proposals being considered concurrently. The scope of the public consultation has been summarised below.

-The applicant held a public consultation event in the main hall of Albany School on Wednesday 16th May 2018 which ran from 3pm to 7pm.

-The public consultation event was advertised through a leaflet drop and local ward councillors were invited to attend.

-Presentation boards were used to display images which showed the proposal.

-The Applicant has outlined that the event was well attended and 8 members of the public left comments.

6.3 The main issues raised and the developer's responses are set out below.

-School bell alarm should be changed to an alternative system to mitigate noise.

- Letter of comfort requested in relation to the temporary building
- Proximity of temporary accommodation to dwellings questioned.

6.4 Further consultation was also undertaken by the developer during the course of this application after the applicant became aware that several residents stated they had not received the initial invitation to the Public Exhibition. A second consultation event for the residents of Steed Close, Parish Close & Apollo Close was held on Tuesday 8th August. This consultation was attended by 11 residents, Cllr Ciaran White and Cllr Christine Smith.

7 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

7.1 A total of 160 neighbouring properties were notified about the application and invited to comment. The application has been publicised by way of a site notice displayed in the vicinity of the application site and has also been publicised in the local press.

7.2 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: 14 objections.

Representations

7.5 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

- Other alternative sites available with less impact and would not require temporary classroom and associated cost.
- Object on the grounds of privacy and loss of sunlight.
- The height should be lowered and the east facing first floor windows obscure glazed.
- A pale neutral colour building would be better than the red originally proposed.
- Additional noise as a result of the proposal.
- Concerns with lack of consultation.
- Mitigation planting would cause additional shadow.
- Existing trees cannot be relied upon for mitigation.
- Rights to light issues and lack of daylight analysis.
- Impact on wind.

- Construction related impacts.
- Reduced quality of life.

Non-material representations

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

- Impact on property value
- Excessive cost to taxpayers

8 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

- The principle of development and the need for school places
- The design and visual impact of the building
- Impact on amenity
- Parking and Highway issues

Principle of Development

8.1 All Local Authorities, including Havering, have a statutory duty to ensure that there are enough school places available in the borough to accommodate all children who live in the borough and might require one.

8.2 The NPPF attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of educational facilities are available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local Authorities are encouraged to take a proactive and positive approach to development that will widen choice in education, with great weight given to the need to create, expand or alter education facilities.

8.4 Replicating this, Policy 3.18 of the London Plan details that development proposals which enhance education and skills provision will be supported, including new build, expansion of existing or change of use to educational purposes. Policy DC29 states that the Council will ensure that the provision of primary and secondary education facilities is sufficient to meet the needs of residents by, amongst other things, seeking to meet the need for increased school places within existing sites.

8.5 This application seeks to deliver a new purpose 2 storey teaching block to replace an existing structure that is no longer fit for purpose. The proposal would not result in an increase in pupil numbers but would enable the existing pupil numbers to be maintained, thereby ensuring the existing education need

in this part of the borough can continue to be met. The location of the building on land previously occupied by an existing building would accord with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which encourages the redevelopment of previously developed land.

- 8.6 In order to ensure continuity of education provision during the construction phase of this proposal and application for a temporary structure has been made by the applicant and is being considered concurrently under application ref. P0835.18.
- 8.7 Both the subject application and the linked application being considered concurrently under application ref. P0835.18 would accord with key education based policy objectives and as such are considered acceptable in spatial planning terms.

Design

- 8.8 The proposed building would replace an existing structure that lacks any significant architectural merit. This existing structure is not subject to any form of protection and therefore its loss would not conflict with design based policy objectives of the development plan.
- 8.9 The proposed provides a relatively simple yet successful design response to the site with the form and fenestration of the building dictated by the proposed usage and need to provide a design response to mitigate potential privacy impacts. When compared to the existing structure in situ the proposal would represent a reduction in the overall height of development in this location. Within this context officers are satisfied that the proposed two storey structure would appear appropriate in its setting where it would be surrounded by a range of existing buildings of various scales and forms.
- 8.10 The acceptable height, bulk and massing is supported by the use of a robust brick façade that would ensure the finished elevations maintain a sense of visual interest through the varied tone and texture offered by the proposed brickwork. The use of brickwork as opposed to the partly rendered building as originally proposed represents a significant positive element of the proposal when considered in design terms and is a result of negotiation by officers during the course of the application. In order to ensure a high quality finish is achieved when the building is constructed onsite a condition is recommended requiring the submission of material samples for approval prior to the commencement of above ground works.

- 8.11 For the reasons detailed above officers are of the view that the proposal would accord with the design based policy objectives of with Policy DC61 of the LDF.

Amenity

- 8.12 As previously stated the proposed 2 storey building would be located in a similar position to an existing part single and part 3 storey structure. This existing structure is located within 2m of the sites eastern boundary where it extends to a single storey and 11m from the eastern boundary where it extends to 3 storeys. The proposed structure would be located between 9 and 10m from this eastern boundary which borders the Steed Close properties. The existing structure is located 19m from the sites northern boundary and the proposal would be set back 26m from this northern boundary where it adjoins the Apollo Close properties.
- 8.13 The key difference between the existing and proposed massing has been demonstrated by the applicant through drawings submitted in support of the application. These drawings provide a visual representation of the key differences between the existing and proposed massing which have been summarised below:
- Reduced maximum height.
 - Rationalised building footprint which occupies a net additional area of 25 square meters.
 - Increased setback from the eastern boundary by at least 7m compared to where the existing building extends to a single storey.
- 8.14 When considered against the existing baseline of development on site the proposal is considered to result in a materially similar and arguably reduced level of impacts to neighbouring residential amenity. This conclusion is supported by the overshadowing study submitted in support of the application following an officer request for this study to be commissioned. The results of the study confirm that the residential gardens of the Steed Close properties to the east would continue to benefit from reasonable levels of sunlight. Specifically, it should be noted that the gardens of 6 and 10 Steed Close would suffer no loss as a result of the proposal whilst number 8 Steed Close would suffer a 1% reduction in garden area that would receive at least 2 hours of direct sunlight when considered on the 21st of March.
- 8.14 Further to the acceptability of the proposal when considered in comparison to the existing structure to be demolished it is noted that the structure would retain separation distances of between 21 and 30m from the nearest neighbouring residential windows. This retained separation is supported by the natural topography of the site which results in a situation in which then

ground level of the proposed area to be built on sits approximately 1m lower than the ground floor level of the Steed Close properties.

- 8.15 In light of the above officers are satisfied that no unacceptable harm to neighbouring outlook, daylight and sunlight would arise as a result of the proposal.
- 8.16 Due regard has also been given to the potential privacy impacts arising from the proposals. With respect to this matter officers note that the separation distance of 21m between upper floor windows would be commensurate with the typical 18-22m separation distances that prevail in urban and suburban settings across the borough. This distance is considered sufficient to mitigate any unacceptable impacts on neighbouring privacy, however, in this case the applicant has offered further protection through the inclusion of obscure glazing to 1.7m above floor level where the separation distances are reduced to 21m. Where the proposal does not incorporate obscure glazing the separation distances are in excess of 22m meters and therefore are sufficient so as to not require further mitigation.
- 8.17 In terms of overlooking across gardens the proposal would result in continued overlooking across residential gardens, particularly the Steed Close properties. However, this represents an acceptable continuation of the existing arrangements in addition to the mutual overlooking across residential gardens that already exists in this residential setting.
- 8.18 Further to the acceptability of the proposals considered above it must be acknowledged that the existing structure provides an established level of overlooking towards residential windows and across rear gardens and therefore the subject application broadly represents a continuation of this. Within this context officers are satisfied that any impacts on neighbouring privacy would remain well within acceptable parameters and does not rely on the existing buffer provided by vegetation along the sites eastern boundary.
- 8.19 Further to the assessment above, due regard has been given to the potential for the siting of the structure and associated use to generate additional noise and disturbance over and above existing. With respect to this consideration officers note that the site location is currently occupied by a teaching block surrounded by school grounds and therefore a range of noise generating activities could occur in this area. In contrast the use of the building as a classroom, which generally provides a low noise environment, contained within the fabric of the proposed building would not result in any material increase in potential noise generation. Further to this, the teaching times of the school ensure that the structures will not be in use during the early part of the morning, evening or weekend. As such, officers are satisfied no long term

noise impacts would arise as a result of the proposals with construction management conditions recommended to mitigate any short term noise impacts.

Transport and Highways

- 8.20 The subject application would not result in an increase in the capacity of the existing school in terms of student numbers and therefore would not result in any increased trip generation as a result of pick-ups and drop offs. It must be acknowledged that the construction phase of the development would give rise to additional construction vehicle movements and would result in the need for short term parking provision. The temporary nature of these impacts ensures that no significant adverse impacts on the highway network would arise as a result of the proposals. Conditions are recommended to ensure the construction phase of the development accords to best practice and any impacts are appropriately mitigated.

Other Planning Issues

- 8.21 The application has been submitted with an extensive suite of supporting information in relation to ecology, arboriculture and sustainability. Officers have considered these elements of the proposals in detail and are satisfied that they demonstrate that the proposal would achieve compliance with key policy objectives. A range of conditions are recommended to ensure the positive elements of the proposal advanced by the applicant and identified mitigation measures with respect to these matters are secured and carried through to implementation.
- 8.22 Due regard has also been given to the representations made against the application. Whilst the core material planning considerations have been considered within the relevant sections of this report, officers note that a significant number of objectors have raised concern with both the subject proposal and that being considered under ref. P0835.18 representing a waste of taxpayer money. The decision of the ESFA to pursue the development as proposed and any associated financial implications on the applicant does not represent a material planning consideration in this instance.

Conclusions

- 8.7 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.

This page is intentionally left blank