



**Havering**  
LONDON BOROUGH

**Strategic Planning  
Committee  
10 January 2019**

<b>Application Reference:</b>	<b>P1292.15</b>
<b>Location:</b>	<b>23-55 North Street, Romford, RM1 1BJ</b>
<b>Ward:</b>	<b>Romford Town</b>
<b>Description:</b>	<b>Redevelopment of 23-55 North Street, including the retention of the part built structure to provide a mixed use development comprising a full planning permission for a building (of 6 and 19 storeys) which includes 100 dwellings (Use Class C3), 842 sq.m. of flexible uses at ground floor including retail, offices and community uses (Uses Classes A1-A4, B1, D1), associated basement car parking, cycle parking, storage and servicing.</b>
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Jacob Lawrence</b>
<b>Reason for Report to Committee:</b>	<b>The application is within the categories which must be referred to the Mayor of London under the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order.</b>

---

## **1 BACKGROUND**

1.1 This application follows an allowed appeal for a mixed use residential proposal (P0403.05) for 86 flats and retail space in a building of between 4 and 16 storeys. Building work commenced on the construction of the appeal scheme but ceased in 2010 and has not resumed. The consent has now lapsed as not all pre commencement conditions had been approved prior to the initial works starting in 2010.

1.2 Following the stalled construction works the current Applicant acquired the site with a view to delivering a scheme through to completion. Since this acquisition the Applicant has engaged with the London Borough of Havering in its role as Local Planning Authority (LPA) since 2014, when initial pre-application discussion begun. Following these initial discussions a formal planning application was submitted in September 2015.

1.3 Given the location of the application site and scale of proposed development this application has been subject to further scrutiny by officers since originally submitted with this reflected by the duration of the determination period. In recognition of the complexities presented by this application both the Applicant and the LPA have agreed an extended determination date of the 14<sup>th</sup> of March 2019. As such, this application is being reported to this committee in accordance with the agreed timeframes.

## **2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 The proposed redevelopment of the long standing vacant site to provide 100 residential units, including 20 affordable units, would make an important contribution to housing delivery within the borough. Furthermore, bringing the vacant site into use for residential development and ground floor commercial use would fully accord with the sustainable development directive provided by the NPPF 2018. The overall quantum of development and associated density reflects national, regional and local level policy objectives that seek to encourage the most efficient use of land within highly accessible urban settings.
- 2.2 The approach to site layout, height and massing represents an acceptable approach given the location of the site which acts as a northern gateway to the Romford Town Centre. The detailed design of the development would provide high quality architecture supported by robust materiality. A full suite of supporting technical information has been submitted which successfully demonstrates that neighbouring amenity would be adequately safeguarded. Policy compliant levels of internal floorspace and amenity space have been incorporated into the scheme.
- 2.4 The recommended conditions and legal agreement heads of terms would ensure the positive elements of the scheme advanced by the applicant are delivered on site in addition to ensuring the impacts of the development would be suitably mitigated.

### **3 RECOMMENDATION**

3.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- Any direction by the London Mayor pursuant to the Mayor of London Order
- The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the following planning obligations:
  1. Affordable Housing 20% to be delivered with a tenure split of 50:50 between affordable rent and shared ownership.
  2. Early and late stage affordable housing review mechanism (any surplus shared 60:40 in favour of LBH)
  3. Contribution of £462,000 towards education.
  4. Contribution of £100,000 towards the improvement of pedestrian and cycle access to Romford town centre
  5. Carbon offset fund contribution (amount TBC)
  6. Contribution of £10,000 for the review of waiting and loading restrictions on Angel Way and changes to them in order to facilitate the development.
  7. Contribution of £15,000 for the provision of on-street cycle parking in the vicinity of the site
  8. Restriction on parking permits for residential occupiers.
  9. Any other planning obligation(s) considered necessary by the Assistant Director Planning

3.2 That the Assistant Director Planning is delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above.

3.3 That the Assistant Director Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions [and informatives] to secure the following matters:

### **Conditions**

1. Time limit
2. In accordance with approved drawings
3. Material samples
4. Landscaping
5. Car parking plan
6. Cycle storage
7. Travel Plan
8. Pedestrian visibility splay to access
9. Highway works
10. Construction Method Statement and Construction Logistics Plan
11. Construction hours
12. Wheel Washing
13. Secured by Design
14. Delivery and Servicing Plan
15. Energy Statement compliance.
16. Details of external lighting
17. Noise protection
18. Surface Water Drainage
20. Wheelchair Adaptable Dwellings
21. Water Efficiency.
22. Window and balcony strategy
23. Contaminated land
24. Landscaping
25. Boundary treatments
26. Air Quality
27. Hours of operation (Commercial Units)
28. Ventilation and Plant (Commercial Units)
29. Restricted use (Commercial Units)
30. Electric charging points

### **Informatives**

1. Fee required for approval of details
  2. Highway approval required
  3. Secure by design
  4. Street naming and numbering
  5. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
  6. Planning obligations
  7. NPPF positive and proactive
- 3.4 That, if by 6 months following the date of the committee resolution the legal agreement has not been completed, the Assistant Director Planning is delegated authority to refuse planning permission.
- 3.5 That the Committee confirms that it has had special regard to the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings and features of special architectural or historic interest as required by Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

- 3.6 That the Committee confirms that it has paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Romford Conservation Area(s) as required by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

## **4 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS**

### **Proposal**

- 4.1 The application is seeking planning permission for the retention of existing part built structure in relation to the provision of a development of 6 to 19 storeys comprising 100 residential units and 842 square metres of flexible uses (A1-A4, B1 and D1) at ground floor facing onto North Street. The ground floor would include 3 units covering 842 sq.m. of floorspace with the applicant seeking flexible uses Class A1, A2, A3 and A4 (retail uses), Class B1 (office) and D1 (non-residential institution). A total of 100 residential units are proposed: 23 x 1 bed; 67 x 2 bed; 9 x 3 bed and 1 x 4 bed.
- 4.2 The proposed building would consist of two elements, a six storey (with 5th and 6<sup>th</sup> floor setbacks) building facing east onto North Street and a 19 storey tower at the north edge of the site facing onto the roundabout. The six storey building would address the North Street and Angel Way frontages, incorporating commercial units at ground floor with residential flats above and would attach itself to the rear of the existing eight storey property to the south of the site. The retailing would be set behind glazing save for a portion along the Angel Way elevation set behind the basement vehicular access.
- 4.3 In terms of appearance, above ground floor the residential will be framed in terracotta cladding for 3 storeys, with the two above successively set back from the front building line and finished in a white stone cladding. Externally fixed metal balconies are proposed to the eastern and western residential elevations with the top 2 floors incorporating glazed balconies within the setbacks. The roof would contain an area of playspace/communal garden and solar panels.
- 4.4 The tower building incorporates glazed balconies attached to the eastern, southern and western elevations. Staggered balconies are proposed at the north eastern elevation in between a double height grid on the north and east elevations. Part of the southern and eastern elevation of the tower will be finished in the terracotta cladding replicating that found on the six storey building. The tower element would be some 60 metres high, about 8 metres taller than the previous approval.

- 4.5 All of the units would have a private balcony or a roof terrace and the larger 3 and 4 bed units are built over two levels. A large proportion of the flats within the lower building are single aspect, set within the existing structure. Two residential access points are proposed on the southern and northern end of the North Street elevation, the latter incorporating a reception lobby and concierge. Both access points have a stairwell and three lifts are provided. The proposal incorporates a single level basement (already constructed) which would accommodate 35 car parking spaces (4 wheelchair accessible), 63 cycle parking spaces and a plant room. Servicing, including refuse collection will take place off Angel Way. A range of passive design features and demand reduction measures are proposed to reduce the carbon emissions of the proposed development. The applicant is proposing to install 28kWp of Photovoltaic Panels (PV) on the roof of the 6 storey element, where in addition a roof top amenity area of approximately 190 square metres is proposed for residents.
- 4.6 In terms of affordable housing, the applicant has offered to provide 10 units for affordable rent and 10 units for shared ownership. The 20 units represent 20% of the total.

#### **Site and Surroundings**

- 4.7 The application relates to the premises at 23-55 North Street, Romford. The site currently consists of a building site with a part built concrete frame of up to 5 storeys in height surrounded by hoarding. Formerly the site had consisted of a number of buildings dating back to the 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> Century through to the 1930's. These were demolished in relation to a development granted at appeal (LBH Ref: P0403.05) to make way for a development of 86 flats and ground floor retail in a building of four storeys in height stepping up to 8 and then 16 storeys at the northern edge of the site adjacent to the junction of Angel Way and St Edwards Way. The developers without securing full consent of the conditions precedent commenced building of the structure however work stalled at the 5<sup>th</sup> floor of the tower element and the site has remained as a building site occupied by unfinished concrete frame surrounded by hoarding for approximately 4 years.
- 4.8 The site abuts the north eastern edge of the Romford Conservation Area which stretches along North Street up to the junction with St Edwards Way. The Romford Conservation Area includes a group of buildings at the central crossroads including St Edward the Confessor's Church in Market Place and the Golden Lion Public House in North Street, which are listed. The site also sits at the northern edge and pedestrianised part of the retail core of Romford town centre. The site lies to the north and adjacent to the 'Rubicon' building. This 8 storey building consists of residential flats and ground floor retail. On the eastern side of North Street opposite the site the buildings are of 20<sup>th</sup>

century origin with ground floor retail frontages. An eleven storey office tower, North House, extends above a podium at the northern end of this group fronting onto St Edwards Way. The eastern side of the site abuts Angel Way a route through to car parking and servicing within the centre. On the other side of the road lies a mostly cleared (but partly implemented) Angel Way development which is surrounded by hoarding.

### **Planning History**

4.9 The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:

P0474.06 – Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 85 apartments over ground floor A1, A2 and A3 commercial units. Refused September 2006

P0403.05 - Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 86 apartments over ground floor A1 (shops) and A3 (restaurants/cafe) uses. Application was refused at Planning Committee in August 2005. The applicant subsequently appealed and the proposal was allowed in October 2006. Work on the approved development was begun, however, the Council considers that the existing structure on site does not have the benefit of planning permission as pre-commencement planning conditions attached to the consent were not discharged in advance of construction.

## **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:

### **Statutory Consultees**

#### Transport for London

No objections. Following comments made:

- Impact of the development on the ring road, notably in respect of servicing and access should be addressed
- 35 car parking spaces welcomed (4 wheelchair accessible spaces should be provided to meet London Plan requirements)
- Total of 20% of spaces (7) must be for electric vehicles with 20% future proof spaces.
- Road and bus capacity can cope with the development.
- Sufficient capacity in existing bus services to meet the requirements of the development but it is recommended that access routes to nearby bus stops are fully accessible.

- 67 cycle spaces do not meet London Plan standards, 177 for residential element plus 2 for visitors and 3 for commercial staff and 6 for visitors required.
- There should be a commitment from applicant to enforce, monitor and review a Travel Plan.

### Greater London Authority

The application is considered to comply with some London Plan policies but not others:

- Principle of Development - Supported.
- Housing – Affordable provision should be shared with the GLA prior to referral back to the Mayor (Officer Comment: GLA officers have been provided with an opportunity to make comments on the affordable housing element of the scheme. GLA officers advised that further affordable housing should be sought. Whilst this is noted, LBH officers are satisfied that the amount and tenure split of the affordable housing proposed is the optimum offer based on viability. Further comment on this matter is provided within the relevant section below.)
- Design – Improvement on previously consented scheme. Does not comply with the Mayor's standards however this is accepted given the constraints of the part built structure
- Sustainability – Performance of the building should be improved to accord with policy requirements in place at the time of response. (Officer Comment: An updated Sustainability and Energy Report and updated roof plan identifying the location of the PVs has been submitted in response to GLA comments)

### **Consultees**

Essex & Suffolk Water No objection subject to compliance with requirements.

- Water connection should be made to E&SW network for revenue purposes.

Thames Water No objections.

Historic England No objections.

NATS Safeguarding No safeguarding objection.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority – No objections subject to:

- firefighting lift in tower
- wet rising main to be provided in the firefighting shaft (within 18 metres of appliance parking position);
- a sprinkler system in accordance with BS9251:2005; dry raising main in south east stairwell (inlet within 18 metre of appliance).



Metropolitan Police Secure by Design Officer No objection subject to:

- Standard secured by design condition.

LBH Flood & Rivers Management No consideration for SuDs in the development.

- Developer could consider a roof garden or rainwater harvesting to reduce surface water run off.

LBH Education The proposed development falls within the Romford primary planning area where there is considerable pressure on demand for school places. There are insufficient places to meet the projected demand. Expected child yield:

- 30 primary age children,
- 20 secondary age and
- 10 early years.

LBH Environmental Health Conditions recommended in respect of:

- land contamination,
- air quality,
- noise; and,
- sound insulation.

LBH Highways – Initial concerns overcome by recommended planning conditions and legal agreement heads of terms.

## **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.

## **7 LOCAL REPRESENTATION**

7.1 A total of 529 neighbouring properties were notified about the application and invited to comment and was advertised via site notices and 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: 9 of which 7 objected and 2 supported.

Petitions received: None.

7.3 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- Gidea Park Civic Society objecting: Height of building out of keeping with surrounding building and set a precedent for this form of development in Romford.

7.4 The following Councillors made representations:

- Councillor Chapman objecting. Excessive height when compared to area and bulk height and masses would not be appropriate and detrimental to the surrounding streetscene and Conservation Area
- Former Councillor Thompson objecting. Excessively tall tower whose bulk and mass would impinge to the Romford skyline and from certain position in the market detract from views of St. Edwards Church.

### **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:

- Creation of overlooking opportunities to neighbouring flats.
- Scheme will add to noise and disturbance in the vicinity of the site which already suffers from the noise from neighbouring nightclubs.
- The 19 storey building would result in the loss of afternoon sun.
- The building would be a blot on the landscape.
- Current hoarding prevents wheelchair access along St Edwards Way and the use of dropped kerbs at junction with Angel Way.
- No need for further retail in area.
- Concern that the development will have a negative impact on micro-climate.
- The building will increase wind velocity in the surrounding area
- Exacerbate existing acute parking and traffic problems in the area.
- What provision has been made for a possible 100 cars?
- What provision has been made for commercial vehicles?
- The proposed tower will not enhance the character or appearance of the Romford Conservation area.
- No buildings in the vicinity exceed 12 storeys.
- The building will create a total lack of symmetry when approaching North Street roundabout.
- Works will leave mud on the road creating potential danger to highway safety.
- Noise and smells from fast food units.
- Scheme would contribute towards an overpopulation of a small area of Romford, unsuited to this part of North Street.

- Three street trees have been removed. No assurance of replanting to soften the arid and aesthetically displeasing aspect of this development.
- Materials proposed will be subject to rapid deterioration and appearance of the building will suffer.
- Building should be no higher than North House
- Will more shops hasten the demise of the market?
- Shortage of school places will be exacerbated and local health services are already struggling to cope with demand.
- Concerns about traffic incidents at the roundabout.
- Scheme does not address problems of expensive accommodation locally and homelessness.
- Views of St Edward's church spire will be destroyed.

#### Supporting comments

- Development will bring much needed investment to the local area
- Turn the area to a modern residential/shopping area for the local community

#### **Non-material representations**

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

- Other London Councils will place difficult tenants in Havering, buying properties for this purpose and turning the area into a ghetto (OFFICER COMMENT: The question of who purchases property is not a material planning consideration).
- The scheme is not 'riverside' as developers claim (OFFICER COMMENT: How properties are marketed is not a material planning consideration).
- Lower sales values on local properties (OFFICER COMMENT: The value of properties following development is not a material planning consideration)
- The scheme will block views of London from Romford. (OFFICER COMMENT: Views from private property are not a material planning consideration).

#### **Procedural issues**

7.7 No procedural issues were raised in representations.

## **8 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

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

- Principle of Development
- Design, Massing and Streetscene

- Heritage
- Density
- Quality of residential accommodation
- Housing Mix
- Affordable Housing
- Neighbouring amenity impacts
- Environmental Issues
- Parking and Highways Issues
- Sustainability
- Flooding and Drainage
- Security by design

## **8.2 Principle of Development**

- 8.3 The site lies within the retail core of Romford Town Centre as identified in the Core Strategy and the Romford Area Action Plan DPD 2008. In seeking to meet the minimum supply of new homes, Policy CP1 supports the increase in the supply of housing in existing urban areas where development is sustainable, promoting mixed use development in town centres and enabling high density in Romford. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes mixed use developments in urban areas and encourages the effective use of land that has been previously developed. London Plan policy 2.15 states that Borough should promote diversification, particularly through high density, residential-led, mixed-use development. Policy ROM19 from the Area Action Plan identifies the location of the site at the junction of North Street and the Ring Road as one which is suitable for tall buildings of exemplary high quality and inclusive design.
- 8.4 The principle of a mixed use development on the site was established by the grant of planning permission on appeal for an 86 residential unit plus retail scheme referred to above (P0403.05). Although building works subsequently took place, the Council consider that the existing structure does not enjoy the benefit of planning permission as pre commencement conditions (requiring discharge prior to development commencing) attached to the consent had not been discharged. However, the redevelopment of this neglected town centre site for a mixed retail and residential use remains acceptable in land use terms subject to the policy considerations below.
- 8.5 Policy CP1 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. 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. The proposal for an additional circa 100 units would be equivalent to 9% of the annual target and

the principle of the development is therefore supported as it would make an important contribution to meeting Havering's housing needs.

8.6 The proposed commercial uses at ground floor level (which does not include A5, hot –food takeaways) are considered to be appropriate to the town centre location.

#### 8.7 **Design, Massing and Streetscene**

8.8 The NPPF 2018 attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Paragraph 124 states *'The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities'*

8.9 Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan state that new development should be complementary to the established local character and that architecture should make a positive contribution and have a design which is appropriate to its context. Policy 7.7 states that tall building should be limited to sites close to good public transport links and relate well to the scale and character of surrounding buildings, improve the legibility of an areas, have a positive relationship with the street and not adversely affect local character.

8.10 Policy DC 61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document states that planning permission will only be granted for development which maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area. Policy DC66 states that buildings or structures of 6 storeys or greater will normally only be granted in Romford Town Centre and should be of exemplary high quality and inclusive design.

8.11 The Romford Area Action Plan notes that the most appropriate location for tall buildings in Havering is within Romford town centre. Policy ROM19 of the plan identifies locations where tall buildings of exemplary quality are considered acceptable, these being locations along key entrances off the Ring Road where tall buildings would help define their status as key gateways to the town centre. This site is identified as being in one such location.

8.12 Further to the Romford Area Action Plan it should be acknowledged that early work has now commenced on the Romford Town Centre Masterplan. Whilst officers are cognisant of the fact that in some instances sites coming forward for development ahead of the masterplan work may be harmful to the overall masterplan, it is not considered that the subject proposal would prejudice the development potential of nearby sites, nor conflict with the wider objectives of the emerging masterplan.

### 8.13 19 storey building

- 8.14 The appeal ruling on the previous scheme is a material planning consideration. The Inspector noted that anything less than a 16 storey building would be unlikely to have sufficient presence on this site to provide the impression of a gateway to the town centre. The Inspector also took the view that the bulk of the 11 storey North House and its uninspiring and wide northern elevation dominated views towards the town centre and the taller and narrower tower proposed for this site represented a landmark development which would create a strong sense of place to define the northern entrance to Romford town centre. Since this decision, the urban context has been subject to some change through the consent and implementation of a proposal for 350 flats, a hotel and retail within buildings ranging in scale from 7 to 16 storeys on the opposite side of Angel Way. Whilst the Angel Way development site is currently stalled, it is under the control of the applicant for the subject application. It is understood that should permission be granted for the subject application it is the applicant's intention to deliver development to completion on both the application site and the stalled Angel Way site.
- 8.15 In the appeal decision (Havering Ref: P2246.07), the Inspector felt that the 16 storey Angel Way tower was "appropriately deferential" to the North Street approval being slightly shorter, reflecting the fact that the latter scheme stands on one of the main axial roads into town. Consequently, the application under consideration would adhere to the precedence established and partly implemented for 2 tall buildings standing either side of Angel Way, the larger being at the entrance to North Street.
- 8.16 At 19 storeys the tower is approximately 8 metres taller than the scheme previously approved and as such would remain the highest of the cluster of 3 towers (including North House) at the northern gateway to Romford town centre. It is considered that the additional height proposed not to be significant in the context of the previous approval, indeed it actually assists in delivering a building of a scale proportional to the rest of the development and the surrounding urban context. Pre-application discussions with Council Officers and the Greater London Authority focussed on a desire to create an elegant and slender tower with an emphasis focussed on verticality in the appearance of the structure. The architect has introduced north and east facing double storey bays and also limited the number of materials to create a structure with definite vertical emphasis. The final tower design is in Officer's view an appropriate development for this prominent and important location that would

present a positive and important statement in the regeneration of Romford town centre in keeping with Havering planning policy. The quality of the finish of the building is key and details and samples of all finishes would be required by reviewed and approved by the Council ahead of the completion of construction works.

#### 8.17 6 storey block

8.18 The podium block is of a scale commensurate with that approved on the opposite side of Angel Way and is two storeys taller than the scheme previously approved, although the top two floors are set back from the building frontage. In its appearance it incorporates elements of the tower but would be distinctive from it, particularly the prominent balcony projections with metal balustrades as opposed to the glazed ones on the tower. At street level the retail units on North Street will be set behind predominantly glazed shopfronts comparable to the existing units opposite. Two entrances to the residential cores will be situated either side of the retail units and the servicing and bin access will be located along Angel Way alongside the vehicle ramp to the basement parking, although much of this elevation will be the glazed frontage to the back of the retail units.

8.19 The retail units will have their primary frontages along the North Street elevation and their presence will hopefully bring increased footfall to this end of the town centre. The servicing for the retail and residential is considered to be discretely formed and will take place along Angel Way.

8.20 It is considered that North Street would benefit from the form of development proposed. The scale of the building would be broadly comparable with the existing properties opposite and re-introduce a high street feel to this location, the building line following as it does the buildings that formed the western side of North Street. The re-introduction of the former established street layout is welcomed. In addition, the appearance to the Angel Way elevation will be substantially improved, although this is the rear of the development would provide a positive frontage to this street with substantial glazing and activity on this street opposite the site of the permitted development opposite.

#### **8.21 Heritage Impact**

8.22 Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("PLBCAA") provides that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 72(1) PLBCAA provides that in the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation

area, of any functions under or by virtue of (amongst others) the planning Acts, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. The South Lakeland District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment case and the Barnwell Manor case (East Northamptonshire DC v SSCLG) establish that “preserving” in both s.66 and s.72 means “doing no harm”.

- 8.23 The NPPF also refers to heritage assets in paragraph 195 which states that where a development will lead to substantial harm to a heritage asset it should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits which outweigh that harm or loss. Paragraph 196 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. London Plan Policy 7.7 states that development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.
- 8.24 DC67 states that planning permission will only be allowed where it does not adversely affect a listed building or its setting, whilst policy DC68 states that the character or appearance of Conservation Areas will be preserved or enhanced.
- 8.25 The North Street frontage of the site abuts the Romford Conservation Area which includes the listed Edward the Confessor’s Church in Market Place and the Golden Lion Public House in North Street. The NPPF states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal and take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting.
- 8.26 The Inspector in the previous decision took the view that the former buildings at this address provided limited contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and their retention wasn’t justified, if replaced by a high quality building. The context has changed as these buildings were demolished and subsequently replaced with the incomplete structure now in place. Evidently, the development of the site with a coherent and complete design would represent an improvement on the current situation and the proposal broadly reflects that previously approved in scale, form and appearance. The lower block which has the majority of the Conservation Area frontage, would follow the building line of the now demolished structures, reflecting the historic street pattern and is considered to be both an



improvement on the structure on-site but also on the northernmost buildings opposite (the base of North House).

- 8.27 The tower faces onto the Ring Road and will be viewed predominately in that context with limited appreciation of it within the heritage asset apart from along North Street where its impact on the Conservation area is considered to be positive. The applicant has submitted wireline drawings to highlight the potential impact of the proposal on the heart of the Romford Conservation Area and the listed buildings present. Views of the top end of the tower will be afforded in the background of the St Edward the Confessor's Church on the southern side of Market Place, however such views are limited by the established trees in the grounds of the church, this together with the distance from the church will mean that the construction will not affect its setting.
- 8.28 In summary, officers are satisfied that the proposal would not harm the setting of any of any listed buildings or designated heritage assets and would respect the character and appearance of the conservation area. It would respect the character, context and form and scale of neighbouring buildings and would sit comfortably within the streetscene and surrounding area. Conditions requiring a full submission of detail of all the materials and also the landscaping to be established on site are considered appropriate to ensure a satisfactory appearance on completion of the development. As such, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Section 66 and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the NPPF and Council policy.

### **8.29 Density**

- 8.30 The application site is ranked as being within a high Public Transport Accessibility Level Zone (PTAL 6). Policy DC2 of the Development Control Policies DPD sets out recommended density ranges for housing schemes in the borough, which in this location corresponds to 240-435 dwellings per hectare. Accounting for the non-residential floorspace (approximately 8% of the site), the density calculation for this mixed use scheme is 770 units per hectare, somewhat greater than the 661 units per hectare previously approved. This higher density need not, in itself, represent a conflict with the Development Plan provided the amount of development being proposed is appropriate to the site under consideration. Whilst providing a guide to realising the potential of sites, density should not be applied mechanically and should take into account factors such as local context, design, transport capacity and social infrastructure.

8.31 The draft London Plan has deleted the density matrix favouring an approach which requires development to make the most efficient use of land and be developed at the optimum density based on a design-led approach to determine site capacity. The draft Plan also notes that decisions in respect of density should have regard to the future provision of planned infrastructure. The forthcoming introduction of Crossrail to Romford will be a key improvement to local infrastructure and will likely be in place by the time this development is occupied. Other regeneration projects are likewise in the pipeline (new local primary school) which taken together enhance the suitability of higher density schemes such as this. Overall, the density and the layout of the scheme is considered to be appropriate to this context. The regenerative and infrastructural benefit provided by the Crossrail service and other developments lends this part of Romford town centre appropriate for greater physical density than approved previously and in that regard it is considered that this site can accommodate the additional 14 units on this site this scheme proposes over the previously consented scheme.

### **8.32 Quality of residential accommodation**

8.33 The 'Technical housing standards - nationally described space standards' document and Policy 3.5 of the London Plan set out requirements for the Gross Internal (floor) Area of new dwellings at a defined level of occupancy as well as floor areas and dimensions for key parts of the home. All the residential flats within the development either meet or exceed the minimum space sizes.

8.34 Havering's Residential Design SPD does not prescribe minimum space standards for private amenity space stating that the fundamental design considerations for amenity space should be quality and usability. Balconies should be incorporated into all developments and should, as a minimum, be 1.5 metres in depth to allow adequate space for a table and chairs and should be secure. All balconies meet this standard. In addition, a total 190 square metres of communal amenity space is also proposed at the roof level of the smaller block for the benefit of the future residents.

8.35 The majority of the flats within the 6 storey building are single aspect which should be avoided where possible. However, in this case the units are not directly north facing and the proposed arrangement reflects the design of the approved scheme and the constraints presented by retaining the partially completed concrete frame as part of this scheme. In a welcome design amendment the applicant has introduced duplex family units within the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> floors of the podium block all with dual aspect. The applicant has provided an internal daylight assessment against BRE guidelines for the lower block, measuring the average daylight factor (ADF) within living rooms to understand the amount of daylight afforded to these spaces. An ADF of 5% is

recommended for a well daylit space, 2% for partly lit, below 2% the room will likely be dull and require electric lighting. As a minimum of 1.5% ADF for living rooms is recommended. The assessment reveals that 100% of the units will meet the required minimum standard with 5 rooms falling short of the 2% recommendation for partly lit rooms. That said, the latter deficit can be resolved to all but one living room through internal design factors (i.e. light coloured walls). Given the site constraints and the benefit in utilising the existing structure the slight shortfall for a small number of flats is accepted, also noting that each of the units have good quality living space, exceeding the minimum space standards by between 6 and 13% and being provided with ample balconies.

- 8.37 In accordance with policy DC7 all the residential units were designed to meet the Lifetime Homes targets then in place. Subsequently, the standards have been consolidated into building regulations. The London Plan policy 3.8 states that 90% of new housing meet the Building Regulation requirement M4(2) and 10% meet M4(3). This scheme meets these requirements. In order to preserve the amenity of the future residents a condition in respect of noise control measures is recommended.

### **8.38 Housing Mix**

- 8.39 The NPPF 2018 seeks to steer development to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. Policy 3.8 of the *London Plan notes that* new developments offer a range of housing choices, in terms of the mix of housing sizes and types, Policy 3.8 comes into effect. The above policy stance is to allow Londoners a genuine choice of homes that they can afford and which meet their requirements for different sizes and types of dwellings in the highest quality environments.

- 8.40 Policy DC2 on 'Housing Mix and Density' of the LBH's '*Development Plan Document*' 2008 sets out an indicative mix for market housing of 24% 1 bedroom units, 41% 2 bedroom units, and 34% 3 bedroom units. DC6 states that in determining the mix of affordable housing, regard should be paid to the latest Housing Needs Survey. The Council's Housing Strategy 2014 which was informed by an extensive Housing Needs and Demands Assessment (2012) suggested that 75% of the rented provision should be one or two bedroom accommodation and 25% three or four bedrooms and for intermediate options, a recommended split of 40:40:20 for one, two and three bedroom accommodation.

- 8.41 The application proposes a total of 100 residential units are proposed: 23 x 1 bed; 67 x 2 bed; 9 x 3 bed and 1 x 4 bed. This compares with the 54 x 2-bed and 32 x 1 bed approved under the appeal. The supporting text to London

Plan policy 3.4 notes that *While there is usually scope to provide a mix of dwelling types in different locations, higher density provision for smaller households should be focused on areas with good public transport accessibility (measured by Public Transport Accessibility Levels [PTALs]), and lower density development is generally most appropriate for family housing.* Given the site's location within Romford situated above shops, immediately adjacent to the busy Ring Road, it is considered that the 10% proportion of family units is appropriate.

## **8.42 Affordable Housing**

- 8.43 London Plan policy 3.11 states that affordable housing provision should be maximised, ensuring an average of 17,000 more affordable homes within London over the course of the Plan period. Policy 3.13 emphasises that Boroughs should normally require affordable housing provision on a site which has capacity to provide 10 or more homes. Policy 3.12 on 'Negotiating Affordable Housing on Individual Private Residential and Mixed Use Schemes' sets out that "negotiations on sites should take account of their individual circumstances including development viability and in support of this, the London Plan requires a tenure split of 60:40 in favour of affordable rented. Currently Havering Council has an aspiration to achieve 50% of all new homes built as affordable and seeks a split of 70:30 in favour of social rented (policy DC6).
- 8.44 The Mayor of London's Supplementary Planning Guidance ("SPG") on '*Homes for Londoners*' 2017 states that it is essential that an appropriate balance is struck between delivery of affordable housing and overall housing development. The preferred tenure split as set out in the SPG is for 30% of affordable housing to be delivered as social/affordable rent, 30% as intermediate, to include London Living Rent and shared ownership. The SPG seeks to maximise the amount of affordable housing and sets guidelines in relation to viability. The SPG specifies that where 35% affordable housing is proposed in accordance the Borough's preferred tenure mix, then a detailed viability appraisal would not be required.
- 8.45 With respect to affordable housing, the applicant submitted a viability appraisal, which originally suggested that the development could support a maximum of 5 affordable units. Following independent review of the schemes viability, and following negotiation by officers, 20 units have been offered as affordable housing. The 20 units would be offered with a 50:50 split between affordable rent and shared ownership. Whilst it is acknowledged that the provision of 20 units of affordable housing would only equate to 20%, due regard has been given to the fact that this offer represents additionally over and above the viability position. It also must be acknowledged that the delivery of an appropriate tenure split reduces the overall number of

affordable units that can be delivered when compared to a scenario where the affordable housing was offered on an all intermediate basis. Furthermore, officers are mindful of the need for development to remain deliverable and any further provision would render the scheme significantly unviable, thereby increasing the risk that the site remains in its current unfinished vacant state for the near future.

- 8.46 For the reasons outlined above officers are satisfied that when considered as a whole, and in the context of the schemes viability and NPPF guidance, which seeks to ensure schemes deliver the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing yet remain deliverable, the subject application would accord with key policy objectives in relation to affordable housing provision.

#### **8.47 Neighbouring Amenity**

- 8.48 The Residential Design SPD states that new development should be sited and designed such that there is no detriment to existing residential amenity through overlooking and/or privacy loss and dominance or overshadowing. Policy DC61 reinforces these requirements by stating that planning permission will not be granted where the proposal results in unacceptable overshadowing, loss of sunlight/daylight, overlooking or loss of privacy to existing properties.

- 8.49 The buildings are situated within the town centre and away from residential dwellings, the predominance of which are to the north on the opposite side of the Ring Road. Objections have been received from residents in Emma House on Market Link in respect of the loss of daylight and overlooking. This development lies at the minimum 60 metres away to the west and on the opposite side of the North House tower. The applicant has demonstrated via an overshadowing study that for a large portion of the year the shadow from the tower would fall over the roundabout and the commercial and retail properties on the eastern edge of North Street. Residential properties north east of the site along St Edwards Way are overshadowed during winter months but the applicant has demonstrated that overshadowing occurs in any case from the existing North Tower and would do from the implemented Angel Way approval. In that sense, this proposal would make no significant difference on neighbouring amenity.

- 8.50 In terms of overlooking, as per the previously allowed scheme, the development is sited away from neighbouring residential units which are for the most part at some distance from the flats proposed. Some long views across buildings will be afforded but the distances are substantial and as such existing occupiers will not be unduly overlooked.

- 8.51 The applicant commissioned a micro climate study to accompany the application which has been reviewed by the Council's Environmental Health

team. The study indicates that the conditions at ground level will be acceptable for both residents of the block and pedestrians at street level. Mitigation in the form of taller 1.5 high balustrades at the upper levels is suggested as is a small area of landscaping adjacent to the north-west corner of the tower to restrict access to this area where wind levels could create problems for pedestrians. These elements have been incorporated into the proposal.

- 8.52 In summary, it is considered that the impact of the development in terms of neighbouring residential or indeed business occupiers would not be significant in terms of loss of residential amenity including daylight, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

### **8.53 Environmental Issues**

- 8.54 Environmental Health have raised no objections in relation to any historical contaminated land issues. A condition requesting the submission of a remediation strategy should contamination during construction be found is recommended.

- 8.55 The site is located close to the River Rom and a flood risk assessment has been carried out and submitted with the application. The site is within Flood Zone 1, having a low probability of flooding (1 in 1000 annual probability of flooding). Foul water will discharge to Thames Water's sewer network. Surface water is also proposed to be discharged into existing sewers which outfall to the River Rom. Policy 5.13 of the London Plan states that development should utilise sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) unless there are practical reasons for not doing so and applicant's should aim for greenfield run-off rates. This is backed up by policy 48 of the Core Strategy. The applicant has not given any consideration for SUDs in their submission contrary to the policy requirements, accordingly a condition in that regard is recommended to ensure a surface water strategy is in place prior to the completion of the development which incorporates measures such as rain water harvesting.

- 8.56 The proposed development is located within a poor air quality area and a designated Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) due to high concentrations of nitrogen dioxide. To safeguard against additional unnecessary impacts to air quality conditions are recommended to mitigate impacts during the construction and operational phases of the development, including details to protect the internal air quality of the buildings as well as a requirement for ultra-low carbon dioxide boilers.

8.57 The proposal is not considered to give rise to any significant noise issues. Conditions in respect of internal noise standards are recommended to ensure residential amenity of the future occupiers is safeguarded.

### **8.58 Parking and Highways Issues**

8.59 Policy CP9, CP10 and DC32 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD requires proposals for new development to assess their impact on the functioning of the road hierarchy. The overriding objective is to encourage sustainable travel and reduce reliance on cars by improving public transport, prioritising the needs of cyclists and pedestrians and managing car parking. A Transport Assessment has been submitted with the planning application as is required for all major planning applications.

8.60 Policy DC33 seeks to ensure all new developments make adequate provision for car parking. In this instance the application site is located within an area with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 6a where 6b is the highest. The site lies with easy access of numerous bus routes and Romford train station, as well as being accessible to the wide range of retail and leisure facilities in the town centre.

8.61 The application utilises the basement constructed for the 86 unit scheme and will be laid out to accommodate 35 cars of which 4 are wheelchair accessible. This is considered appropriate to the location and scale of the development and the quantum of accessible spaces meets London Plan standards. A condition requiring 7 of the spaces have electric charging points is recommended.

8.62 The applicant has proposed 63 cycle spaces, a significant shortfall on that required by the London Plan which is a minimum of 188 for the residential and commercial units. To some extent a shortfall on the minimum could be excepted given the existing basement structure and the amount of car parking proposed, however, given the high PTAL rating and the greater emphasis now placed on sustainable transport (as compared to the time of the previous submission) such a shortfall is not considered acceptable. The applicant should consider the use of wall racks and two tier cycle stands to create further spaces and also to provide changing facilities and lockers for the commercial operators. A condition in this regard is recommended to be attached. The applicant has provided a Travel Plan with the application which is welcomed. The applicant will appoint a Travel Plan Co-ordinator prior to occupation with the aim of encourage sustainable methods of transport for occupiers and visitors. The Travel Plan will be reviewed annually for a period of five years following occupancy.

- 8.63 In terms of the safe operation of traffic in the vicinity of the site, concern was expressed by both TFL and Council Highways that the proposal could have an impact on the ring road in relation to the access and servicing arrangements to the site. The access to the site is considered to be tight and will be controlled, however given the proximity to the Ring Road roundabout any waiting could lead to queuing which jeopardise the free flow of traffic. Recognising the particular constraints of the site and the previously approved scheme and existing structure, a condition on delivery, servicing etc is recommended so that any concerns about potential highway impacts can be mitigated. Likewise a condition requiring the submission and approval of a Construction Management Plan is required. Other conditions in respect of a pedestrian visibility splay and vehicle cleansing during construction are proposed.
- 8.64 In recognition of the impacts of the proposal on existing pedestrian and cycle routes a contribution of £115,000 on projects to improve accessibility and cycle parking around the site and also the links in and Romford Town Centre. An addition £10,000 is sought in respect of a Traffic Management Order Review on Angel Way to review loading and unloading restrictions and changes to them following development on Angel Way.
- 8.65 The Local Highway Authority has raised no objection subject to the applicant entering into a legal agreement to prevent future occupiers from applying for parking permits. Subject to the completion of this agreement and the attached planning conditions, the proposal would be acceptable in highway terms and it is not considered that the proposed development would result in parking or highway safety issues. The legal agreement would be consistent with the other residential developments within this area.
- 8.66 In terms of refuse collection, this would be collected would be collected from 3 separate stores for refuse and recycling storage set within the basement. The method of it getting to the refuse vehicles was subject to a planning condition. It is considered appropriate to apply the same condition as well as one pertaining to how delivery and servicing to both residential and retail units. In addition a Construction Management Plan condition is recommended to be attached to ensure neighbouring amenity is safeguarded and the highway network is not prejudiced.

### **8.67 Sustainability**

- 8.68 In recognising the importance of climate change and meeting energy and sustainability targets and the statutory duty to contribute towards the mitigation under the Greater London Authority Act 2007, Policy 5.2 on 'Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions' of the '*London Plan*' 2016 seeks all major developments to meet targets for carbon dioxide emissions reduction in



buildings, leading to zero carbon residential buildings from 2016 and zero carbon non-domestic buildings from 2019. The policy requires all major development proposals to include a detailed energy assessment to demonstrate how the targets for carbon dioxide emissions reduction outlined above are to be met within the framework of the energy hierarchy. The Mayor of London's SPG on '*Housing*' 2016 applies a zero carbon standard to new residential development, and defines 'Zero carbon' homes as homes forming part of major development applications where the residential element of the application achieves at least a 35 per cent reduction in regulated carbon dioxide emissions (beyond Part L 2013) on-site. Furthermore, the Mayor of London's SPG on '*Sustainable Design and Construction*' 2014 provides guidance on topics such as energy efficient design; meeting carbon dioxide reduction targets; decentralised energy; how to off-set carbon dioxide where the targets set out in the London Plan are not met.

- 8.69 In terms of local plan policy, Policy DC50 on 'Renewable Energy' of LBH's '*Development Plan Document*' 2008 stipulates the need for major developments to include a formal energy assessment showing how the development has sought to ensure that energy consumption and carbon dioxide emissions are minimized applying the principles of the energy hierarchy set out in the London Plan.
- 8.70 Following negotiation with officers and in light of comments made by the GLA the applicant has submitted an updated Sustainability and Energy Report and updated roof plan identifying the location of the PVs. This sustainability and energy appraisal has been undertaken to satisfy the following requirements:
- To demonstrate how the development shall reduce the carbon emissions by at least 35% over a similar gas heating system in relationship to Building Regulations Part L1A 2013 as required by the London Plan.
- 8.71 The approach to sustainable development is to improve the energy efficiency of the building beyond the requirements of Building Regulations. This follows the most recognised method of achieving sustainability through the energy hierarchy:
- Energy conservation – changing wasteful behaviour to reduce demand.
  - Energy efficiency – using technology to reduce energy losses and eliminate energy waste.
  - Exploitation of renewable, sustainable resources.
  - Exploitation of non-sustainable resources using CO2 emissions reduction technologies.
  - Exploitation of conventional resources as we do now.

- 8.72 To demonstrate viability the appraisal highlights that at this stage a 35% carbon reduction can be achieved on average across the whole development through the improvements to fabric efficiency, energy reduction measures and provision of onsite low carbon technologies and renewable energy in line with the requirements of the GLA London Plan. Given the specific nature of the proposals, whereby the existing concrete frame structure is to be strengthened and retained (which in itself result in other related environmental benefits concerted to the construction phase of development), officers are satisfied that the approach to sustainability would not conflict with relevant London Plan policy objectives.
- 8.73 Policy 5.3 on 'Sustainable Design and Construction' from the '*London Plan*' 2016 seeks that developers utilise the highest standards of sustainable design and construction to be achieved to improve the environmental performance of new developments. This is supplemented under Policy DC49 on 'Sustainable Design and Construction' of LBH's '*Development Plan Document*' 2008 which requires for all major new development to a high standard of sustainable construction.
- 8.74 Guidance of how to meet the requirements as presented from the above policy is further discussed within LBH's SPD on '*Sustainable Design Construction*' 2009 which encourages developers to consider measures beyond the policy minimum and centred around development ratings, material choice, energy and water consumption.
- 8.75 Policy 5.9 on 'Overheating and Cooling' from the '*London Plan*' 2016 emphasises that major development proposals should reduce potential overheating and reliance on air conditioning systems.
- 8.76 In recognising the need to protect and conserve water supplies and resources a series of measure and guidance has been provided under Policy 5.15 on 'Water Use and Supplies' from the '*London Plan*' 2016 where it is stressed that planning decisions should seek development to minimise the use of mains water by incorporating water saving measures and equipment and designing residential development so that mains water consumption would meet a target of 105 litres or less per head per day. This is supplemented under Standard 37 from the Mayor of London's SPG on '*Housing*' 2016, the target set out in this standard is in line with the lower optional maximum water consumption requirement which is set out in Part G of the Building Regulations from October 2015.
- 8.77 Policy DC51 on 'Water Supply, Drainage and Quality' Sustainable Design and Construction' of LBH's '*Development Plan Document*' 2008 highlights that applicants are required, as a minimum, to incorporate a high standard of

water efficiency which can include greywater and rainwater recycling to help reduce water consumption.

## **8.78 Education**

- 8.79 Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (CIL Regs) states that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is:
- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
  - (b) directly related to the development; and
  - (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 8.80 Policy DC72 of the Council's LDF states 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 Further Alterations to the London Plan states that development proposals should address strategic as well as local priorities in planning obligations.
- 8.81 In 2013, the Council adopted its Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document which sought to apply a tariff style contribution to all development that resulted in additional residential dwellings, with the contributions being pooled for use on identified infrastructure.
- 8.82 There has been a recent change to the effect of the CIL Regs in that from 6th April 2015, Regulation 123 of the CIL Regs states that no more than 5 obligations can be used to fund particular infrastructure projects or infrastructure types. As such, the SPD, in terms of pooling contributions, is now out of date, although the underlying evidence base is still relevant and up to date for the purposes of calculating the revised S106 contributions.
- 8.83 The evidence background to the SPD, contained in the technical appendices is still considered relevant. The evidence clearly show the impact of new residential development upon infrastructure - at 2013, this was that each additional dwelling in the Borough has a need for at least £20,444 of infrastructure. Therefore, it is considered that the impact on infrastructure as a result of the proposed development would be significant and without suitable mitigation would be contrary to Policy DC72 of the LDF and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.

8.84 Furthermore, evidence clearly shows a shortage of school places in most parts of the Borough - (London Borough of Havering Draft Commissioning Plan for Education Provision 2015/16-2019/20). The Commissioning report shows need for secondary places and post-16 places which due to their nature would serve all parts of the Borough. The Commissioning report identifies that there is no spare capacity to accommodate demand for primary and early years 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 SPD). On that basis, it is necessary to continue to require contributions to mitigate the impact of additional dwellings in the Borough, unless the development is within an area of the Borough where there is a surplus of school places. Previously, in accordance with the SPD, a contribution of £6,000 per dwelling was sought. That has been amended to cover units of 2 bed and larger to reflect the likely child yields from such sized dwellings. It is considered that this is reasonable when compared to the need arising as a result of the development.

8.85 It would therefore be necessary to require a contribution to be used for educational purposes. Separate monitoring of contributions would take place to ensure that no more than 77 contributions are pooled for individual projects. It is considered that a contribution equating to £6,000 per dwelling for educational purposes would be appropriate. Given the scheme incorporates 77 units with 2 bedrooms or more this contribution equates to £462,000.

#### **8.86 Security by Design**

8.87 In terms of national planning policy, paragraphs 58 from the “*NPPF*” 2012 emphasise that planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion. Paragraphs 69 from the document then accentuates that planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments create safe and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas.

8.88 The above strategic approach is further supplemented under Policy 7.3 on ‘Designing out Crime’ from the ‘*London Plan*’ 2016 which indoctrinates measures to designing out crime so to ensure that developments reduce the opportunities for criminal behaviour and contribute to a sense of security without being overbearing or intimidating. In local plan policies terms, Policy CP17 on ‘Design’ and Policy DC63 on ‘Delivering Safer Places’ from LBH’s ‘*Development Plan Document*’ 2008 falls in line with national and regional

planning guidance which places design at the centre of the planning process. The above mentioned policy piece together reasoned criteria's for applicants to adopt the principles and practices of SBD. More detail on the implementation of the above policy is provided from LBH's SPD on '*Designing Safer Places*' 2010, this document which forms part of Havering's Local Development Framework was produced to ensure the adequate safety of users and occupiers by setting out clear advice and guidance on how these objectives may be achieved and is therefore material to decisions on planning applications.

- 8.89 The Metropolitan Police reviewed the submitted application have made a recommendation that a condition is attached which stipulates that prior to the commencement of development the applicant shall be required to make a full and detailed application for the Secured by Design award scheme and thereafter adhere to the agreed details following approval. This condition is added.

#### **8.90 Financial and Other Mitigation**

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

- Affordable Housing 20% to be delivered with a tenure split of 50:50 between affordable rent and shared ownership.
- Affordable Housing Review Mechanism (any surplus 60:40 in favour of LBH)
- Contribution of £462,000 towards education.
- Up to £115,000 towards an active transport contribution to review and improve cycling access and parking and pedestrian access around the site and in Romford town centre (£115,000)
- Up To £10,000 towards a Traffic Management Order Review on Angel Way to review current waiting and loading restrictions and undertake changes to accommodate this development
- Contribution of £15,000 for the provision of on-street cycle parking in the vicinity of the site
- Future occupiers, businesses and residents, should be prevented from obtaining parking permits.

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

- Up to £204,100 Mayoral CIL towards Crossrail

## **Conclusions**

8.93 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 recommended decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.