

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE  
Council Chamber, Town Hall, Main Road, Romford RM1 3BD  
28 February 2019 (7.30 - 10.40 pm)**

**Present:**

**COUNCILLORS 8**

<b>Conservative Group</b>	+John Crowder, Jason Frost (Chairman), Timothy Ryan and Maggie Themistocli
<b>Residents' Group</b>	Reg Whitney
<b>Upminster &amp; Cranham Residents' Group</b>	Linda Hawthorn
<b>Independent Residents Group</b>	Graham Williamson
<b>Labour Group</b>	Keith Darvill (Vice-Chair)

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

+ Councillor John Crowder substituted for Councillor Best.

Councillors Robert Benham, Michael Deon Burton, Paul McGeary, Jan Sargent and Damian White were also present for the meeting.

There were about 30 members of the public present for the meeting.

Unless otherwise indicated all decisions were taken with no votes against.

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

**49 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

There were no disclosures of interest.

**50 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 7 February 2019 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

51     **SP1694.18 - REDDEN COURT SCHOOL, COTSWOOD ROAD**

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

The Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** that **PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED** subject to additional condition in relation to hours of use of the car park and inclusion of replacement tree planting within landscaping condition as set out in the report.

52     **P0947.17 - 49 - 87 NEW ROAD, RAINHAM**

The Committee received a developer presentation from Tom Morgan and Steve Walters.

The initial proposal was to demolish the existing buildings and structures on the site and construct a residential development to comprise the following:

- Three distinct blocks of varying heights (between 3/5/6 storeys)
- 207 homes proposed providing 35% affordable and 65% market housing.
- 154 car parking spaces
- 261 cycle parking spaces
- Amenity provision including three courtyard gardens

The main issues raised by Members for further consideration prior to submission of a planning application were:

- Detail and justification on why there has been an increase in storey height and units numbers from the original submission.
- What was the consequence of this in terms of traffic flows and wider environmental impact? What are the traffic management proposals?
- The value of comparison with Beam Park. Consider the justification for the heights carefully.
- Whether a tunnel effect would be created along both sides of the A1306 given the heights approved/proposed.
- What was the thinking on the transport strategy?
- How was the applicant working through the potential tensions between growth in housing numbers and car ownership?
- What was the typical car club cost? Annual membership and per rental cost.
- What was the basis/applicants' justification for rigidly following the GLA comments.
- Further detail was sought on how the scheme responds to the Rainham and Beam Park Planning Framework and where it was contrary, what the justification was for that? Particular reference was made to height and density.
- The applicant was invited to consider the context of the borough.

- Further detail was sought on the unit mix.
- Sustainability credentials and environmental standards to be employed.
- Modern methods of refuse and recycling storage are encouraged.
- Assurances are sought regarding design quality.
- Further exploration of the height was invited given the relationship with the properties to the rear

**53 P1604.17 - 148 - 192 NEW ROAD, RAINHAM**

The Committee received a developer presentation from Tom Morgan and Steve Walters.

The initial proposal was to demolish the existing buildings and structures on the site and construct a residential development to comprise the following:

- Distinct blocks of varying heights (between 2/3/4 storeys)
- 187 homes proposed providing 35% affordable and 65% market housing.
- 223 car parking spaces
- Unknown cycle parking spaces
- Amenity provision including courtyard gardens between the blocks

The main issues raised by Members for further consideration prior to submission of a planning application were:

- Detail and justification on why there has been an increase in storey height and units numbers from the original submission.
- What was the consequence of this in terms of traffic flows and wider environmental impact? What are the traffic management proposals?
- The value of comparison with Beam Park. Consider the justification for the heights carefully.
- Whether a tunnel effect would be created along both sides of the A1306 given the heights approved/proposed.
- What was the thinking on the transport strategy?
- How was the applicant working through the potential tensions between growth in housing numbers and car ownership?
- What was the typical car club cost? Annual membership and per rental cost.
- What was the basis/applicants' justification for rigidly following the GLA comments.
- Further detail was sought on how the scheme responds to the Rainham and Beam Park Planning Framework and where it was contrary, what the justification was for that? Particular reference was made to height and density.
- The applicant was invited to consider the context of the borough.
- Further detail was sought on the unit mix.

- Sustainability credentials and environmental standards to be employed.
- Modern methods of refuse and recycling storage are encouraged.
- Assurances sought regarding design quality.
- Further exploration of the height was invited given the relationship with the properties to the rear.
- Assurances were sought regarding the proposed CHP solution.
- Specifically in relation to the Framework and the location of the site, why have the houses been removed from the scheme?

**54 PE/00492/18 - WATERLOO ESTATE AND QUEEN STREET, ROMFORD**

The Committee received a developer presentation from Paul Zara and Lia Silva.

The proposal was to demolish the existing buildings and structures on the site and construct a residential led development currently proposed to comprise the following:

- Flatted residential buildings of varying heights up to a maximum of 16 storeys.
- 1402 homes proposed with the current proposed mix to provide 40% affordable and 60% market housing.
- A mix of unit sizes proposed with the current proposed mix of 608 one bedroom units, 620 two bedroom units, 170 three bedroom units and two 4 bedroom units.
- New and enhanced public space across the site.
- Community facility floorspace comprised of a church hall in the vicinity of St Andrew's Church and a community centre fronting the focal point of the development.
- Commercial floorspace proposed on the ground floor of the blocks fronting along Waterloo Road.
- On site car parking and cycle storage
- Significant amenity space provision
- New opportunities for play space within planned green spaces
- Enhanced for sustainability and biodiversity.

The main issues raised by Members for further consideration prior to submission of a planning application were:

- Further detail sought on the unit/tenure mix proposed relative to what exists at present.
- Further detail also sought on the nature of the private rental product and the management thereof.
- Underground refuse storage welcomed.
- Give consideration to 'neighbour contracts' to prevent anti-social behaviour and encourage positive relationships between neighbours.

- What was the allocation policy for returning residents?
- Would CCTV going to be included?

**55 PE/00095/19 - QUARLES CAMPUS, HAROLD HILL**

The Committee received a developer presentation from Steve Mitchell and Garry Green.

The proposals were still being developed but likely to comprise up to 145 residential units, together with open space. The proposals would include a mix of houses and flats, with apartment blocks of up to four storeys in height.

The main issues raised by Members for further consideration prior to submission of a planning application included:

- Fully consider the access options into and across the site (by foot and vehicle). Members were keen to see a worked through solution in relation to Tring Gardens, given the road width and the number of vehicles that park along it.
- Understand how the footprint of the proposal works relative to the footprint of the school complex.
- Further detail was sought on the tenure mix of the affordable units, including what nomination rights the borough would have. Ideally, the AH should be Council owned AH
- Detail on the community engagement strategy.
- Infrastructure impact, particularly school places. Further details sought
- Sustainability credentials and environmental standards to be employed
- Opportunity to add/create social value through the development.
- Specifically in relation to Dagnam Park:
  - Assurance sought that the development would not encroach into it
  - Site security
  - What would the impact be upon the boundary landscaping to the park? Need to ensure appropriate protection measures are included
- Ecological assessment was sought.
- Further detail on the height of blocks and the unit mix.
- Opportunity to consider perimeter landscaping/planting for the properties on Tring Walk.
- Need for appropriate street lighting.
- Consider including a turning circle for emergency service vehicles on Tring Gardens.

---

**Chairman**