



# Haverling

LONDON BOROUGH

## STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA

7.00 pm

Thursday  
5 November 2020

VIRTUAL MEETING

Members 8: Quorum 3

**COUNCILLORS:**

**Conservative Group  
(4)**

Dilip Patel (Chairman)  
Timothy Ryan (Vice-Chair)  
Ray Best  
Maggie Themistocli

**Independent Residents  
Group  
(1)**

Graham Williamson

**Residents' Group  
(1)**

Reg Whitney

**Labour Group  
(1)**

Keith Darvill

**Upminster & Cranham  
Residents' Group  
(1)**

Linda Hawthorn

**For information about the meeting please contact:  
Taiwo Adeoye - 01708 433079  
[taiwo.adeoye@onesource.co.uk](mailto:taiwo.adeoye@onesource.co.uk)**

**To register to speak at the meeting please call 01708 433100  
before Tuesday 3 November 2020**



DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF



## **AGENDA ITEMS**

### **1 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman will make his announcement including the protocol for the meeting during the Covid-19 pandemic restrictions.

#### **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 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.

### **2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

(if any) - receive.

### **3 PROTOCOL ON THE OPERATION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC RESTRICTIONS (Pages 1 - 6)**

Protocol attached to be noted by the Committee

### **4 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

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

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

### **5 MINUTES (Pages 7 - 8)**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 13 August 2020 and to authorise the Chairman to sign them.

### **6 APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION (Pages 9 - 12)**

Report attached for Noting.

**7 P0108.20 - 307-309 SOUTH STREET, ROMFORD, RM1 2AJ** (Pages 13 - 34)

Report attached.

**8 P0109.20 - 307-309 SOUTH STREET, ROMFORD, RM1 2AJ** (Pages 35 - 70)

Report attached

**Andrew Beesley  
Head of Democratic Services**

This page is intentionally left blank



## LONDON BOROUGH OF HAVERING

### PROTOCOL ON THE OPERATION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC RESTRICTIONS

#### 1. Introduction

In accordance with the Local Authority and Police Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panels Meetings (England and Wales) Regulations 2020, all Strategic Planning Committee hearings held during the Covid-19 restrictions will take place using a 'virtual' format. This document aims to give details on how the meetings will take place and establish some rules of procedure to ensure that all parties find the meetings productive.

#### 2. Prior to the Hearing

Once the date for a meeting has been set, an electronic appointment will be sent to all relevant parties. This will include a link to access the virtual meeting as well as guidance on the use of the technology involved.

#### 3. Format

For the duration of the Covid-19 restrictions period, all Strategic Planning Committee meetings will be delivered through a video conference facility, using Zoom software. This can be accessed using the standard Council laptop or, for registered public speakers, a PC, laptop or mobile/landline telephone etc. and the instructions sent with meeting appointments will cover how to do this.

#### 4. Structure of the Meeting

Although held in a virtual format, Strategic Planning Committee Meetings will follow the standard procedure with the following principal stages. Committee Members may ask questions of any party at any time. Questions are however, usually taken after each person has spoken.

- The Planning Officer presents their report (no time limit).
- Objectors to the application make their representations. Parties who are speaking should not repeat the information, which they have already given in writing in their representation. However, they will be able to expand on the written information given, provided the information remains relevant (5 minutes per registered objector).
- The applicant responds to the representations made (5 minutes).

- The Councillor who has called in the application may speak (5 minutes).
- Ward Councillors for the area affected by the application may speak (5 minutes per Councillor).
- The Planning Officer will then present a summary of the material planning considerations (no time limit).
- The Planning Committee members will then debate the item.
- Voting will be undertaken using the voting function within Zoom.

All speakers and registered attendees, both Councillors and members of the public, are welcome to remain on the Zoom call until the conclusion of the meeting. The meeting will also be webcast so that it can be viewed by non-participants.

## **5. Technology Issues**

An agenda setting out the items for the meeting will be issued in advance, to all parties in accordance with statutory timetables. This will include details of the applications together with all representations on the matter. The agenda will also be published on the Council's website – [www.havering.gov.uk](http://www.havering.gov.uk) in the normal way.

As with any virtual meeting, there is a small possibility that Zoom meetings may experience intermittent faults whereby participants lose contact for short periods of time before reconnecting to the call. The guidance below explains how the meeting is to be conducted, including advice on what to do if participants cannot hear the speaker and etiquette of participants during the call.

Remote access for members of the public and Members who are not attending to participate in the meeting, together with access for the Press, will be provided via a webcast of the meeting at [www.havering.gov.uk](http://www.havering.gov.uk).

If the Chairman is made aware that the meeting is not accessible to the public through remote means, due to any technological or other failure of provision, then the Chair shall temporarily adjourn the meeting immediately. If the provision of access through remote means cannot be restored within a reasonable period, then the remaining business will be considered at a time and date fixed by the Chairman. If he or she does not fix a date, the remaining business will be considered at the next scheduled ordinary meeting.

## **6. Management of Remote Meetings for Members**

The Chairman will normally confirm at the outset and at any reconvening of a Strategic Planning Committee meeting that they can see and hear all participating Members. Any Member participating remotely should also confirm at the outset and at any reconvening of the meeting that they can see and hear the proceedings and the other participants.



The attendance of Members at the meeting will be recorded by the Democratic Services Officer. The normal quorum requirements for meetings as set out in the Council's Constitution will also apply to a remote meeting.

If a connection to a Member is lost during a meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee, the Chair will stop the meeting to enable the connection to be restored. If the connection cannot be restored within a reasonable time, the meeting will proceed, but the Member who was disconnected will not be able to vote on the matter under discussion, as they would not have heard all the facts.

## **7. Remote Attendance of the Public**

Any member of the public participating in a meeting remotely in exercise of their right to speak at a Strategic Planning Committee or other meeting must meet the same criteria as members of the Committee (outlined above) in terms of being able to access and, where permitted, speak at the meeting. The use of video conferencing technology for the meeting will facilitate this and guidance on how to access the meeting remotely will be supplied by the clerk.

## **8. Etiquette at the meeting**

For some participants, this will be their first virtual meeting. In order to make the hearing productive for everyone, the following rules must be adhered to and etiquette observed:

- The meeting will be presided over by the Chairman who will invite participants to speak individually at appropriate points. All other participants will have their microphones muted by the Clerk until invited by the Chairman to speak;
- If invited to contribute, participants should make their statement, then wait until invited to speak again if required;
- If it is possible, participants should find a quiet location to participate in the Zoom meeting where they will not be disturbed as background noise can affect participants.
- The person speaking should not be spoken over or interrupted and other participants will normally be muted whilst someone is speaking. If there are intermittent technological faults during the meeting then the speaker will repeat from the point where the disruption started. Whilst intermittent disruption is frustrating, it is important that all participants remain professional and courteous.

## **9. Meeting Procedures**

Democratic Services Officers will facilitate the meeting. Their role will be to control conferencing technology employed for remote access and attendance and to administer the public and Member interaction, engagement and connections on the instruction of the Chairman.

The Council has put in place a technological solution that will enable Members participating in meetings remotely to indicate their wish to speak via this solution.

The Chairman will follow the rules set out in the Council's Constitution when determining who may speak, as well as the order and priority of speakers and the content and length of speeches in the normal way.

The Chairman, at the beginning of the meeting, will explain the protocol for Member and public participation and the rules of debate. The Chairman's ruling during the debate will be final.

Members are asked to adhere to the following etiquette during remote attendance of the meeting:

- Committee Members are asked to join the meeting no later than fifteen minutes before the start to allow themselves and Democratic Services Officers the opportunity to test the equipment.
- Any camera (video-feed) should show a non-descript background or, where possible, a virtual background and members should be careful to not allow exempt or confidential papers to be seen in the video-feed.
- Rather than raising one's hand or rising to be recognised or to speak, Members should avail themselves of the remote process for requesting to be heard and use the 'raise hand' function in the participants field.
- All participants may only speak when invited to by the Chair.
- Only one person may speak at any one time.
- When referring to a specific report, agenda page, or slide, participants should mention the report, page number, or slide so that all members have a clear understanding of what is being discussed at all times

The Chairman will explain, at the relevant point of the meeting, the procedure for participation by registered public objectors, which will reflect the procedures outlined above. Members of the public must adhere to this procedure otherwise; they may be excluded from the meeting.

The Democratic Services Officer will clearly announce the result of all votes and the Chairman will then move on to the next agenda item.

Any Member participating in a remote meeting who declares a disclosable pecuniary interest, or other declarable interest, in any item of business that would normally require them to leave the room, must also leave the remote meeting. The Democratic Services Officer or meeting facilitator, will confirm the departure and will also invite the relevant Member by link, email or telephone to re-join the meeting at the appropriate time, using the original meeting invitation.

**10. After the Hearing - Public Access to Meeting Documentation following the meeting**

Members of the public may access minutes, decisions and other relevant documents through the Council's website. [www.havering.gov.uk](http://www.havering.gov.uk)

For any further information on the meeting, please contact [taiwo.adeoye@onesource.co.uk](mailto:taiwo.adeoye@onesource.co.uk), tel: 01708 433079.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE  
VIRTUAL MEETING  
13 August 2020 (7.00 - 9.20 pm)**

**Present:**

**COUNCILLORS 8**

<b>Conservative Group</b>	Dilip Patel (Chairman), Ray Best, Maggie Themistocli and +Nisha Patel
<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

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Tim Ryan.

+ Councillor Nisha Patel substituted for Councillor Ryan.

Also in attendance were two members of the public.

**72    PROTOCOL ON THE OPERATION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC RESTRICTIONS**

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

**73    DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

There were no disclosures of interest.

**74    MINUTES**

The minutes of the meetings held on 9 July and 16 July 2020 were agreed as a correct record and would be signed by the Chairman at a later date.

75 **P0094.20 - NEOPOST HOUSE, SOUTH STREET, ROMFORD**

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

The report recommended that planning permission be granted however, following a motion to refuse the granting of planning it was **RESOLVED** that **PLANNING PERMISSION BE REFUSED** on the grounds of:

- 1) The proposal includes single aspect units where noise conditions would be unsatisfactory resulting in the need to keep windows/doors closed and limiting the use of balconies. Overall, the proposed private and communal amenity space provision on site is considered to be insufficient in terms of quantity and quality, particularly given the poor accessibility from the site to quality public open space. In these respects, the proposed development is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site, providing poor quality accommodation and resultant poor living conditions for future occupiers. The proposal would be contrary to Policies 3.5 (quality and design of housing developments) and 7.15 (addressing noise) of the London Plan, and the London Plan Housing SPG standard 29, and Policies DC3, DC21, DC55 and DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies adopted 2008 and The London Borough of Havering Design for Living Residential Design, Supplementary Planning Document adopted 2010.
- 2) For the reasons stated above the proposal is not considered to be sustainable development and the adverse impacts identified outweigh the titled balance in favour of development based on housing delivery as set out in Paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The vote for the resolution to grant planning permission was lost by 6 votes to 2.

Councillors Dilip Patel, Nisha Patel, Hawthorn, Themistocli, Whitney and Williamson voted against the resolution.

Councillors Best and Darvill voted for the resolution.

The substantive vote to refuse planning permission was carried by 6 votes to 2.

Councillors Dilip Patel, Nisha Patel, Hawthorn, Themistocli, Whitney and Williamson voted for the resolution.

Councillors Best and Darvill voted against the resolution.

---

**Chairman**

## **Applications for Decision**

### **Introduction**

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

### **Advice to Members**

#### Material planning considerations

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

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

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

#### Non-material considerations

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

#### Local financial considerations

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



### **Public speaking and running order**

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

### **Late information**

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

### **Recommendation**

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

This page is intentionally left blank

 <p><b>Havering</b> LONDON BOROUGH</p>	<p><b>Strategic Planning Committee 5 November 2020</b></p>
---	--

<b>Application Reference:</b>	<b>P0108.20</b>
<b>Location:</b>	<b>307-309 South Street, Romford, RM1 2AJ</b>
<b>Ward:</b>	<b>Romford Town</b>
<b>Description:</b>	<b>Redevelopment of existing commercial site to provide a new commercial single storey building providing 1,260sqm of Sui Generis Builders Merchants with external storage/racking. (AMENDED PLANS SUBMITTED)</b>
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Nanayaa Ampoma</b>
<b>Reason for Report to Committee:</b>	<b>The application is of strategic importance and has been subject to pre-application presentation to Members of the committee.</b>

---

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

- 1.1 The application provides a comprehensive redevelopment of the existing Jewson site and re-provides a warehouse building in a location further away from residential dwellings. It would continue to provide employment opportunities within the Borough and ensure the continued long-term usage of the site by the existing business.
- 1.2 As well meeting the Council's current site allocation as a Secondary Employment Area, the development directly responds to Havering Council's emerging Local Plan Policy 19, which seeks to protect existing designated

locally significant sites in B1(b, c), B2 and B8 uses. Therefore, complying with the emerging policy aims.

- 1.3 The development would result in a good quality design that has been the subject of several pre-application discussions, presentations to Members and Quality Review Panel. All these processes have ensured that the development resulted in a building that was context driven by way of its scale, location and exterior detailed design. These have also been reviewed by the design team and officers, to ensure that good quality design and materials would be employed throughout the scheme.
- 1.4 Therefore, subject to the recommended conditions and Heads of Terms, the development would not result in any additional harm to the surrounding area.

## **2 RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to the completion of a legal agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) based on the Heads of Terms below:
- Employment and Skills: 4 Apprenticeships for every 10,000sqm + Job Brokerage (Job Brokerage is a dedicated skills, training and employment service for local people).
  - Travel Plan with £5000 monitoring fee
  - Carbon off set fund in respect of the commercial units to achieve a 35% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions compared to Part L of the Building Regulations 2013, such sum calculated at sixty pounds (£60.00) per tonne that falls below the 35% threshold, for a period of 30 years, duly Indexed
  - Reasonable legal fees for the drafting and negotiation of the deed whether or not it goes to completion
  - Monitoring fee towards the Council costs of monitoring compliance with the deed £8640
- 2.2 That the Assistant Director of Planning is delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above and that if not completed by the 5<sup>th</sup> May 2021 the Assistant Director of Planning is delegated authority to refuse planning permission or extend the timeframe to grant approval.
- 2.3 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. Commercial unit opening hours.
5. BREEAM – Development to meet ‘ Very Good’
6. Secured by Design
7. Construction Management Plan and Demolition Plan
8. Delivery and Servicing
9. Landscaping Details
10. Boundary Details
11. External Lighting Scheme
12. Ecology appraisal mitigation
13. Biodiversity method statement
14. Biodiversity Enhancement Layout
15. Contaminated Land
16. Noise mitigation (Commercial)
17. Noise insulation of commercial use
18. Noise protection Plant machinery
19. Noise sound insulation
20. Refuse and Recycling Details
21. Surface Water Drainage Strategy
22. Final SUDs Strategy
23. Green travel Plan
24. Final Energy Statement
25. Cycle Parking facilities
26. Cycle Parking Management Plan
27. Car Parking Management Plan and Design
28. Electrical Charging Points
29. Construction Hours
30. NRMM (non-Road Mobile Machinery)
31. No Pilling
32. Levels
33. Vehicle Cleansing

### **Informatives**

1. NPPF positive and proactive
2. Secure by design
3. Planning obligations
4. Changes to the public highway
5. Highway approval required
6. Temporary use of the public highway
8. Street naming and numbering
10. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
11. Thames Water groundwater Risk Management Permit
12. Thames Water underground waste water asserts

### **3. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 3.1 The application site lies to the west of the Borough, approximately 0.4 miles from Romford Town Centre and a 10 minutes' walk to Romford Train Station. The site falls within the Romford Town Ward.
- 3.2 The square shaped site covers an area of 0.49 hectares and forms the rear part of the existing Jewson site on the corner of South Street and Lyon Road. The site is currently used as a builder's merchant's warehouse. The topography of the site is flat and mostly free of vegetation aside from the very front of site facing South Street and at the shared boundary with the properties on Dymoke Road to the north. At these positions there are some low category trees and soft landscaping. The remaining area of the Jewson site (part fronting South Street) relates to an existing application for the redevelopment to provide for a mixed use residential lead scheme (P0109.20).
- 3.3 The area surrounding the site has a mixed residential and industrial character with the commercial industrial units and business on either side of Lyon Road. However the prevailing character is residential properties of two and three storeys. To the immediate north of the application site is a three storey purpose built block of flats at 281-305 South Street built in the 1980s and residential houses on Dymoke Road. Commercial units align the east and south of the site, while west of the site and across the road are typical two storey Victoria semi-detached and terrace properties. There is also another three storey purpose built block of flats opposite the front of the proposed new development (St David's Court). This also appears to have been built in the 1980s.
- 3.4 The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 5(Good). The immediate area directly in front of the site falls under 6a. Here there is a bus stop served by several buses (252, 248) with services to Romford Station, Upminster Station, Elm Park Station, Hornchurch Town Centre and Collier Row. Also, Romford Trains Station is 10 minutes' walk away with train services to Liverpool Street, Shenfield and Upminster.
- 3.5 The application site does not fall within a conservation area. There are also no listed buildings on or near the site and no protected trees under a Tree Preservation Orders (TPO). The site falls within the Secondary Employment Areas under policy DC10 of the London Borough of Havering's LDC Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD 2008. Lastly, the application site falls within Flood Zone 1 of the Environment Agency's Flood Zone map.

### **4 PROPOSAL**

- 4.1 The application seeks detailed planning permission for the redevelopment of the rear part of the existing Jewson site to provide a large single storey

commercial building of 1,260sqm floor space for use as sui generis builder's merchants. Associated works include general landscaping and parking.

4.2 The proposed building would measure:

- Overall height 10.7m
- Eaves height 8.6m
- Width 23.8m
- Length 55m

4.3 Refuse and recycling details to be submitted via condition.

4.4 Cycle parking facilities are proposed to the front of the building and site.

4.5 Materials to be agreed by condition. However the application proposed a mix of cladding in navy, yellow and green.

## 5 PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 The following planning decisions are relevant to the determination of the application:

- **P0109.20:** Redevelopment of site to provide mixed-use scheme with 47 self-contained apartments, ground floor commercial space (Use Classes B2/B8 with trade counter) built over 4-7 storeys, and associated car parking and landscaping: *Pending Consideration*.
- **P1555.01:** Part change of use to waste transfer site. *Refused 17/12/2001*.
- **P1405.90:** Proposed timber store - showroom and offices (revised plans received 06/11/90 and 07/02/91): *Granted, 21/3/1991*

## 6 STATUTORY CONSULTATION RESPONSE

6.1 A summary of consultation response are detailed below:

- ***The Environment Agency:*** No objection.
- ***Essex and Suffolk Water:*** No comment received.
- **Historic England (Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service):** No objection.

- **Thames Water:** No objection to use of waste water network and sewage treatment works subject to Ground Water Risk Permit informative and a condition on pilling and their underground waste water asserts.
- **Transport for London:** No objection.
- **London Fire Brigade:** No objection. No further fire hydrants required.
- **London Fire Commissioner:** No objection.
- **National Air Traffic Services:** No objection to development.
- **Natural England:** No comment.
- **Metropolitan Police Secure by Design Officer:** No objection subject to the attachment of secured by design conditions and informative.
- **LBH Ecology:** No objection subject to conditions.
- **LBH Education Services and Skills:** No objection. Economic Development requiring Job brokerage provisions to be secured under S106 x1 roles or £3526 for each role in lieu to be indexed or figure.
- **LBH Environmental Health (Air Quality):** No objection subject to conditions governing BREEAM, electric vehicle charging points, Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM).
- **LBH Environmental Health (Noise):** No objection subject to conditions governing final details regarding noise and sound insulation mitigation measures.
- **LBH Environmental Health (Contamination):** No objection subject to conditions governing contaminated land.
- **LBH Flood Officer:** No objection. The proposed Flood Risk Assessment and Strategy is acceptable.
- **LBH Flood & Water Management:** No objection. FRA and Drainage Strategy acceptable.
- **LBH Highways:** No objection subject to conditions governing works to the public footpath, highways works and vehicle cleansing. Also, the following legal heads of terms are required:



- Travel Plan (including the appointment of a Coordinator) submitted to be secured and monitoring fee of £5000
- **LBH Refuse and Recycling Officer:** No objection.
- **LBH Travel Plan:** No objection. However it would be useful to be provide with the contact details of the Travel Plan Coordinator for the scheme.

## 7 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

7.1 In accordance with planning legislation, the developer has undertaken a public consultation exercise with the local community on these proposals as part of the pre-application process. A public consultation exercise was undertaken as follows:

- Public exhibition on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2019 4pm-8pm, following distribution of leaflets to 1,184 homes 2 weeks prior. The exhibition was held at the YMCA, 29 Rush Green Road, Romford RM7 0PH. This was attended by 17 members of the public.

## 8 PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS

*Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) (8<sup>th</sup> September 2019 and 7<sup>th</sup> November 2019)*

8.1 The development proposals evolved over a number of pre-application discussions with the applicant. As part of this process the evolving designs were presented to Members of the SPC twice. However it should be noted that these discussions included the residential sister application (P0109.20). The vast majority of the comments received from Members were in response to that element. However the below tables captures the full response from Members and how the applicant has addressed these.

*Comments made by Members September 2019*

SPC COMMENT	APPLICANT RESPONSE
A keenness to understand in more detail the relationship between the residential units and the proposed/retained commercial use. What are the impacts and how could these be managed?	Further drawings have been submitted to better demonstrate this relationship.
The trading hours of the proposed/retained commercial use.	Further evidence has been submitted to demonstrate existing Screwfix hours elsewhere. Opening hours have been agreed with officers.

An opportunity to improve outlook from residential units with additional landscaping (as opposed to a view of a Jewson yard).	The internal layouts have been reviewed and dual aspect units have been maximised. Including the use of obscure glazing where there may be sensitive amenity concerns.
How the traffic movements would be managed on site 1) within the mixed use component to the front and 2) within the yard to the rear.	A Transport Pre-application note has been submitted to officers for review by the Transport Officer showing tracking for residential and commercial parking at the mixed use block as well as the movement of cars within the Commercial Jewson site.
How would any parking overspill be managed on the surrounding streets	The part of South Street the site is located has a no waiting or parking restriction. However in regards to the wider area options are being explored for securing the scheme as car free.
Further detail should be provided to explain the rationale behind the unit mix. Could more family units be provided	Family units increased from 8 to 11 and now represent 23% of the overall units.
Potential to improve the quality of the frontage on to Lyon Road	Further progress has been made to the design of this frontage.
Details were sought about the refuse and recycling arrangements	Two locations at either side of the block have been provided for refuse and recycling.
Sustainability credentials of the buildings	Sustainability Statement submitted as part of application.
Further consideration was invited on whether 7 storeys was contextually appropriate	The design has progressed further with three main palettes of materials introduced to help soften the appearance of the block and the 7 <sup>th</sup> floor has been stepped back from the main facade to reduce the appearance of bulk.

*Comments made by Members November 2019*

<b>SPC Comment</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
Consideration of the flexible allocation of the parking spaces proposed to the rear of the mixed use block to the front, depending upon the division of the non-residential floorspace on the ground floor.	Commercial parking spaces have been reduced from 11 to 9 to enable an increase in residential spaces. The applicant is currently in discussions with an operator to take the whole ground floor and whose minimum requirement is 9 spaces. Use of spaces to be monitored during the term of the

	commercial lease and with potential to allocate additional spaces to residential should they prove surplus to commercial requirements..
The applicant was invited to fully justify the height of the proposal within any future planning application.	Following the presentation to Havering's Design and Quality Review Panel, the proposals (with a maximum height of 7 storeys) were considered appropriate. This is dependent upon a well designed building in which the mass is broken into well-proportioned elements and uses high quality detailing and materials. In addition, it was felt that the location of the site as the road bends, would enable a taller building to act as a marker between Romford Town Centre (Telephone Exchange) and Vickers and Neo Post House (7 to 9 storeys). The applicant scheme has been refined in accordance with the above advice as illustrated within the submission documents. A condition will be applied to safeguard design and material quality.
The need to provide good quality landscaping which is robust and that would have longevity.	Full detailed Landscape proposals including plans, soft and hard landscaping schedules and maintenance/management strategy has been submitted as part of the application. A condition will be applied to safeguard implementation of these strategies.
Further detail should be provided to show how the lay-by to the front of the	Proposals include the front layby being restricted to 20 minutes unloading/loading with no return in

<p>site would be managed and whether its overall length could be increased.</p>	<p>2hrs to enables short term parking for the proposed commercial operator and servicing for the residential. A commercial Travel Plan has been submitted and conditioned for the application ensuring where possible, sustainable methods of transport are provided. The length of the layby has been maximised whilst still enabling safe access for pedestrians and avoiding traffic conflict with Lyon Road.</p>
<p>Ensure that full details of the sustainability credentials of the building are provided within any future planning application.</p>	<p>A full Energy and Sustainability report was prepared by AES Sothern and submitted with the application for both the residential and commercial elements. Proposals contain brown roofs, photovoltaic cells, communal boiler, increased thermal insulation with an energy strategy being Carbon Zero. Furthermore, a bio diversity report was prepared by Aspect Ecology and submitted as part of the application. Proposals see an enhanced provision of biodiversity from existing and include provision of bat boxes, stag beetle loggeries, bird boxes and native planting species as has been detailed in the landscaping proposals.</p>

## 9 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

- 9.1 The application was advertised via a Site Notice displayed at the site for 21 day between 14/2/2020-06/03/2020. The application was also advertised via a Press Notice 28/2/2020 – 20/03/2020.
- 9.2 Direct neighbour letters were sent to 21 neighbouring properties. Four neighbour responses have been received as follows:

- 4 objectors
- 0 in support.
- No petitions have been received.

9.3 A summary of neighbours comments are given as follows:

- The height of the existing building is 7 metres this proposes 10 which is out of keeping with the character of the site.
- The proposed colours especially the green is out of keeping with the area.
- The acoustic fence should run the full length of the boundary
- The boundary on the site is not accurate
- Proposed tree choice would not provide shading all year round and instead Silver Birch or an evergreen should be proposed to provide year round camouflage.
- Building works should stop at weekends
- The existing building may have asbestos and so careful consideration should be given to its removal.
- The removal of the building would result in security issues. How will intruders be prevented?
- How will maintenance of the strip of land at the shared boundary be maintained?

9.4 *Officer's response: The acoustic fence now runs along the full length of the residential boundary; although the proposed building is around 3 metres higher the site is industrial and this would still be lower than the residential blocks to the front of the site; the submitted building colours are indicative and full detail have been secured via condition. Officers would look to complement the existing character of the site in terms of colour finishes; a condition to control the building hours has been attached in keeping with the Environmental Health Legislation; Any removal of asbestos must comply with the Control of Asbestos Regulations (2006); should intruders enter the site this would fall under the control of Metropolitan Police Service; the maintenance of the green strip at the boundary of the residential properties has been secured under the landscape condition.*

9.5 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- None.

9.6 The following Councillors made representations:

- None.

### **Procedural issues**

9.7 No procedural issues were raised in representations.

## **10 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

10.1 The main planning considerations are considered to be as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Trees
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenity
- Environmental issues
- Highways
- Cycle parking
- Refuse
- Sustainability
- Flooding and Drainage
- Security by Design

### **Principle of Development**

10.2 Under policy CP3 of the current LDF, the Council will ensure that there are a range of employment sites across the Borough by: securing the most efficient use of land; prioritising particular uses within certain areas; and seeking contribution towards future employment training schemes. This followed the Havering Employment Land Review (2006) which predicted the likely future employment and skills demands and shortages based on realistic future business growth numbers. This also provided an assessment of the likely business infrastructure and land use requirements to inform the provisions of sufficient employment land within the Borough. It concluded that there are significant skills shortages within the current employment force which may increase over time if not addressed.

10.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) places significant weight on the need to support the economic growth for local businesses as well as the wider environment. Through the planning system, emerging policies should operate to encourage a vision for the wider employment and not to impede or stunt sustainable economic growth within these areas. To help achieve economic growth the NPPF expects local planning authorities to plan proactively yet flexibly, and be driven by local opportunities within particular areas.

10.4 Under the current Adopted Policy Framework, the application site is incorporated into the Secondary Employment Area. Under adopted policy CP3, these site areas are to be protected to ensure the future provision of these land

uses. The LBH's emerging Local Plan under Policy 19, further states that land within B2 and B8 uses falling under a designated allocation must be protected. The proposed development although sui generis is similar to a Class B8 type of use. Additionally, emerging Policy 19 seeks to support "development proposals that improve the physical appearance, attractiveness and competitiveness of employment areas". The proposed development represents a further investment within the employment site as well as the Borough in keeping with this policy.

- 10.5 In addition, as stated above, the proposal is primarily a replacement of the existing arrangements within the site. Therefore, the principle of development is established, and subject to all other policies being met, the proposals are acceptable.

### **Design**

- 10.6 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'*.
- 10.7 Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan states 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 buildings 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.
- 10.8 Policies CP17 and DC61 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. It is also required that these developments provide a high level of inclusion and accessibility.
- 10.9 As detailed above, the application site is currently used as a large industrial site. The existing building on site is of no architectural merit. As such, the demolition of this building and its replacement would have no adverse impact on the character of the area. The detailed design of the proposed unit has been guided by the officers and SPC Members. However comments have been received by neighbours on the grounds that the scale and materials are unacceptable.

10.10 The existing building measures 7.4 metres in overall height, 20.52 metres in width and 65.25 metres in length. The proposed building would be 10.7 metres in overall height, have a width of 23.8 metres and 55 metres in length. However while this is around 3 metres higher than existing, the neighbouring residential blocks are of similar height. The proposed height increase is not considered significant against the existing building. However, the proposals would result in the re-positioning of the building on site, where it would be turned in 90 degrees removing it from the shared rear boundary with the properties in Dymoke Road and more appropriately locating it along the boundary with the existing warehouse building on the adjoining industrial site to the east. The scale and bulk of the building is considered to be in keeping with that of the other industrial buildings within the wider industrial site and context in general. The resulting materials would be secured by officers to ensure its final appearance is in keeping with the buildings around it.

10.11 In light of this officers consider that the proposal is acceptable on design grounds.

### **Trees**

10.12 Policy DM01 (Trees and Woodland) requires that development proposals are assessed through the following vehicle:

- where appropriate, retaining trees of nature conservation and amenity value and making tree preservation orders
- ensuring that adequate measures are put in place when granting planning permission to protect trees during construction works
- supporting the implementation of the Thames Chase Plan and ensuring that, development within the area makes a positive contribution towards its implementation
- not granting planning permission for development that would adversely affect ancient and secondary woodland.

10.13 It is important that developments properly consider the impact of any trees that may be lost as a result of the proposals and any protection measures for trees to be retained. Trees and woodland act as an important visual amenity to the quality of the wider green space and local environment. They also help soften the character of an area, while providing shading and privacy. Where possible, the Council will look to retain existing trees of high quality to help retain biodiversity especially where they contribute positive contribution to the surrounding area. Existing trees should be safeguarded and when protected trees are to be felled the Council will, where appropriate, require replanting with trees of an appropriate size and species.



10.14 The application is supported with a landscaping strategy for the development. There are no significant trees on the site. Therefore, there would be no harm to the existing species. The existing trees at the shared boundary would be retained, and the application proposes further trees at the shared residential boundary, which will be secured under condition.

#### **Impact on Neighbouring Amenity**

10.15 Policy DC61 states 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.

10.16 Owing to the location and position of the site especially in relation to the warehouse building any amenity impact would only be experienced by those properties at the shared boundary, with properties in Dymoke Road. At this boundary the proposed building will measure 10.7 metres to the ridge, 8.6 metres at the eaves and have a width of 23.8 metres. However the proposed building would be sited some 6 metres away from the rear garden boundary fences of these properties. In addition, as cited above the proposal re-positions the building within the site so that it will no longer run along the rear boundaries of these properties but would be perpendicular to them, substantially reducing the overall built form facing the rear of these properties which is considered to be an improvement.

10.17 The submitted Sunlight and Daylight Assessment confirms that there would be no loss of light or increased overshadowing from the proposal. Officers also consider that that given the position of the building there would be no loss of outlook. There are no side windows proposed, so no loss of privacy. In addition, to safeguard future amenity officers have placed restrictions on the opening times of the unit as follows:

- Monday to Friday 07:00-18:30
- Saturday max 5 hours
- Bank Holidays max 5 hours (no deliveries)
- Sunday None

10.18 In summary, it is considered that the proposals would not have an adverse impact in terms of loss of residential amenity including daylight, outlook, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

#### **Environmental Issues**

10.19 The Environmental Health Officer has stated that it is unclear whether there is some contamination on site. Therefore has recommended a relevant condition to address this. The Environment Agency has also been consulted and have made no objection by way of environmental matters.

- 10.20 A Contaminated Land study was undertaken and submitted with the application. This concluded that there was no significant levels of contaminants and therefore any associated risk levels were likely to be moderate or low. It should also be noted that the site is brownfield land and currently benefits from use for car parking in association with the existing Jewson's site. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has commented that the proposed location is suitable for commercial use and only standard conditions are required to safeguard any contaminations found on site at a later date. These will be attached.
- 10.21 The proposed development is located within an area of poor air quality which suffers from high concentrations of nitrogen dioxide. Therefore, it has been designated as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The Environmental Health Officer has commented that the proposal are acceptable.
- 10.22 A noise assessment has been submitted by the applicant. The report demonstrated that together with the acoustic fence the proposed development should safeguard the amenity of existing occupiers. The Environmental Health Officer has raised no objections to these findings.
- 10.23 The application site falls under Flood Zone 1. Flooding and drainage strategies have been submitted with the application and will be discussed in later sections. However, the proposed methods have been accepted by the LBH's Flood Officer.

### **Highways**

- 10.24 Policies CP9, CP10 and DC32 require that proposals for new development 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.
- 10.25 Policy DC33 seeks to ensure all new developments make adequate provision for car parking. The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 5(Good). Access to the site is predominantly by motor vehicle. At present there is an informal parking arrangement which makes it difficult to ascertain the exact number of spaces.
- 10.26 The London Plan Policy 6.13 sets out the Mayor's maximum standards based on the PTAL rating for a site. It states under point D of Policy 6.13 that developments must:

*a. ensure that 1 in 5 spaces (both active and passive) provide an electrical charging point to encourage the uptake of electric vehicles*

- b. provide parking for disabled people in line with Table 6.2*
- c. meet the minimum cycle parking standards set out in Table 6.3*
- d. provide for the needs of businesses for delivery and servicing.*

10.27 In light of this, it is required that 20% of all spaces be allocated for electric vehicle use with an additional 20 per cent passive provision for electric vehicles in the future. Officers will secure this under condition together with the required disabled parking spaces.

10.28 There have been no objection by TfL or the highways officer regarding the proposed parking for the proposed commercial use.

10.29 Conditions ensuring that the proposed development is deliverable in an environmentally friendly and highways safe way will also be attached. This includes the provision of a Construction Management Plan and a Delivery and Servicing statement. Subject to this the proposal is acceptable.

### **Cycle Storage**

10.30 Policy DC35 of the Council's adopted policy framework looks to encourage sustainable modes of transport through improved cycle routes and cycle parking within the Borough. Largescale major applications are required to create routes to link to any existing cycle ways and where appropriate contributions towards the management of cycle routes will be required. This is in particular regard to the London Cycling Action Plan 'Creating a chain reaction' and the London Cycle Design standards and other relevant documents.

10.31 In line with London Plan policy 6.13 and policy CP10 and DC35, the Council will require the provision of secure and adequate cycle parking spaces as identified in Annex 6 of the adopted Local Plan DPD. The applicant has indicate the location of the cycle provisions. However the final position and design layout will be secured under condition. The proposed cycle provision meet the TfL standard.

### **Refuse Storage**

10.32 Under policies CP11 and DC40 it is required that new development ensure that waste is managed in the most environmentally friendly way in order to protect human health and the environment from pests and other environmentally damaging effects. Waste and recycling provisions should therefore be clearly stated on a plan.

10.33 From the details submitted it is unclear exactly what the waste provisions would be, however officers consider that there is sufficient space for the provision.

Therefore the details and management of these provisions will be secured via condition.

### **Sustainability**

- 10.34 In recognising the importance of climate change and the need to meet energy and sustainability targets, as well as the Council's statutory duty to contribute towards the sustainability objectives set out within the Greater London Authority Act (2007), Policy 5.2 of the London Plan requires all major developments to meet targets for carbon dioxide emissions. This is targeted the eventual aim of zero carbon for all 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.
- 10.35 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.
- 10.36 In terms of the LDF policy DC50 (Renewable Energy), there is a 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.
- 10.37 Following negotiation with the GLA the applicant has submitted an updated Sustainability and Energy Report that demonstrate that the development shall reduce its carbon emissions by at least 35% over in relationship to Building Regulations Part L1A 2013 as required by the London Plan.
- 10.38 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 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction technologies.
  - Exploitation of conventional resources as we do now.

- 10.39 Policy 5.3 of the London Plan seeks that developers utilise the highest standards of sustainable design and construction to be achieved to improve the environmental performance of new developments. Guidance of how to meet the requirements as presented from the above policy is further discussed within SPD Sustainable Design Construction (2009). This encourages developers to consider measures beyond the policy minimum and centred around development ratings, material choice, energy and water consumption.
- 10.40 Details submitted demonstrate that the development would meet the 35% required for commercial builds. The proposed 35% carbon reduction will be secured via S106. The applicant has agreed to this.
- 10.41 The proposed development would need to demonstrate compliance with the Mayor's Sustainability Strategy for reducing carbon emissions and the buildings energy demand through the use of sustainable design strategies. The development would normally be expected to achieve BREEAM 'Very Good' in accordance with the requirement of Policy 5.2 of the London Plan and policy DC49 of the Council's adopted policies (See also Sustainable Construction SPD). A condition has been attached to this effect.

#### **Flooding and Drainage**

- 10.42 The site is within Flood Zone 1 - having a low probability of flooding (1 in 1000 annual probability of flooding). The Environment Agency have raised no objection to the development. Thames Water have also confirmed its acceptability and that the development does not affect existing flood defences or increase the risk of flooding.
- 10.43 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 applicants should aim for greenfield run-off rates. Submitted details state that the proposed development would decrease the water runoff from the site. Surface water drainage would be collected from the roof and filtered through downpipes. SUDs Provisions further include the installation of petrol interceptors at the wash-bays to the northeast of the site. These aim to separate the oil from the surface water to hold back pollutants from going into the drainage system. The existing drainage system would otherwise be utilised.
- 10.44 The applicant has given due consideration to SUDS. These details have been assessed by the Council's SUDS officer. The Council's SUDS officer has stated that the applicant's Drainage Strategy is acceptable. However further detailed plans for these provision demonstrating the final engineering drawings are required and will be secured by condition.

## **Secured by Design**

- 10.45 In terms of national planning policy, paragraphs 91-95 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) 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 the quality of life or community cohesion. In doing so, planning policy should emphasise 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.
- 10.46 The above strategic approach is further supported by Policy 7.3 of the London Plan which encompasses measures to designing out crime to ensure that developments reduce the opportunities for criminal and anti-social behaviour, instead contributing to a sense of security without being overbearing or intimidating. Adopted policies CP17 and DC63 are consistent with these national and regional planning guidance. The SPD on Designing Safer Places (2010), forms part of Havering's Local Development Framework and ensures 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.
- 10.47 In keeping with the above policy context, officers have consulted the Metropolitan Police to review the submitted application. They have commented that there is no objection subject to a condition ensuring final details are agreed with officers. This condition has been attached.

## **11 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)**

### *Mayoral CIL*

- 11.1 Policy DC72 of the havering Adopted policies framework states that where appropriate, the Council will use planning obligations to support the delivery of infrastructure, facilities and services to meet the needs generated by development and mitigate the impact of development. Furthermore, pursuant to Table 2: Mayoral CIL Charging Rates of the Mayor's April 2019 SPG 'Use of planning obligations in the funding of Crossrail, and the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy', a flat rate charge of £25 per square metre applies in LBH for new developments. The proposed development would be liable for this charge. The final CIL charge will be calculated by the CIL officer when final figures are provided. However the officers calculate that the preliminary figure is £32,725. This is subject to additional reliefs.

### *LB Havering CIL*

- 11.2 The LB Havering charging rates are due to be adopted by the 1<sup>st</sup> of September 2019. However this specifies £0 charge for industrial uses, so a CIL payment would not be necessary.

## **12 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY**

- 12.1 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which came into force on 5th April 2011, imposes important duties on public authorities in the exercise of their functions, including a duty to have regard to the need to:

- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

- 12.2 For the purposes of this obligation the term “protected characteristic” includes:- age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; and sexual orientation.

- 12.3 Officers have fully assessed the accessibility of the proposed industrial building. A condition on levels has also been attached to ensure that the gradients across the site can be navigated by those in a wheelchair. There would not be any disproportionate harm to any protected group under the above legislation.

- 12.4 Therefore in recommending the application for approval, officers have had regard to the requirements of the aforementioned section and Act and have concluded that a decision to grant planning permission for this proposed development will comply with the Council’s statutory duty under this important legislation.

- 12.5 In light of the above, the proposals are considered to be in accordance with national regional and local policy by establishing an inclusive design and providing an environment which is accessible to all.

## **13 CONCLUSIONS**

- 13.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) requires the Council to determine any application in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. All relevant policies contained within the Mayor’s London Plan and the Havering Development Plan, as well as other relevant guidance and material

considerations, have been carefully examined and taken into account by the Local Planning Authority in their assessment of this application.

- 13.2 The design of the development is considered appropriate for its location and would not compromise any residential amenity or impede the development of other commercial uses in the location. With all other matters conditioned more detailed assessments pertaining to materials and other matters will be undertaken. The development would meet all other relevant legislation.
- 13.3 Officers have fully reviewed the details submitted and concluded that as conditioned, the proposal would not compromise the locality of the industrial site and would accord with all relevant Development Plan policies.
- 13.4 In light of the above, the application is **RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL** in accordance with the resolutions and subject to the attached conditions and completion of a legal agreement.



 <p><b>Havering</b> LONDON BOROUGH</p>	<p><b>Strategic Planning Committee 5 November 2020</b></p>
---	--

**Application Reference:** P0109.20

**Location:** 307-309 South Street, Romford, RM1 2AJ

**Ward:** Romford Town

**Description:** Redevelopment of site to provide mixed-use scheme with 47 self-contained apartments, ground floor commercial space (Use Classes B2/B8 with trade counter) built over 4 – 7 storeys, and associated car parking and landscaping

**Case Officer:** Nanayaa Ampoma

**Reason for Report to Committee:** The application is of strategic importance and has been subject to pre-application presentation to Members of the committee. A Councillor call-in has been received which accords with the Committee Consideration Criteria.

---

## 1 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 There are no in principle objections to the proposals and through the application of conditions and a legal agreement, officers consider that they are able to secure a good level of design and high quality materials. There have been no objections received from statutory or internal consultations, subject to

recommended conditions and heads of terms. Objections have been received from neighbours, however these objections have been fully reviewed by officers as part of the assessment and it has been concluded that the quality and merits of the proposals outweigh any likely harm in scale (which forms the main reason for objections). In addition, the proposals would result in no significant harm to neighbouring amenity.

- 1.2 The approach to site layout, height and massing represents an acceptable form given the location of the site being on the corner of a junction and facing onto a main road. 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, amenity space and light have also been incorporated into the scheme.
- 1.3 The proposals as they progressed were presented to Members at the Strategic Planning Committee on the 8<sup>th</sup> September 2019 and 7<sup>th</sup> November 2019. During the initial SPC Members sought clarification on a number of issues including the rationale for seven storeys at the site. However, they raised no significant issues regarding the scale or general principle of the development on the second presentation to SPC. The proposals were also reviewed by the Council's Quality Review Panel who supported the scheme in general.
- 1.4 The development would make an important contribution to housing delivery within the Borough by securing 47 residential units with 35% by habitable rooms (14 units) affordable housing units. The proposed density would be within the parameters of the Density Matrix. Overall the 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 accessible urban settings and the residential development would accord with the sustainable development directive provided by the NPPF (2019). Additionally, it should be noted that the new Draft London Plan notes that the Density Matrix is a restricted and arbitrary means of assessing the acceptability of developments within a location and more bespoke methods of assessment in keeping with local needs should be applied. The emerging London Plan is moving to a 'design-led approach' to optimise site capacity.
- 1.5 The recommended conditions and Heads of Terms would secure future policy compliance by the applicant on the site and ensure any unacceptable development impacts are mitigated. Therefore, officers consider that all matters have now been sufficiently addressed and the application for detailed planning consent is recommended to Members for approval.

## **2 RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to the following:

Legal Agreement pursuant to s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and other enabling provisions, with the following Heads of Terms:

- Affordable Housing 35% to be delivered with a tenure split of 64%:36% between affordable rent (9) and shared ownership (5).
  - Affordable housing early stage review mechanism, if an agreed level of progress is not achieved within 2 years.
  - Job Brokerage x 1 roles or £3526 for each role in lieu to be indexed
  - Traffic Management contribution of £4,794 (£102 per unit) Indexed.
  - Travel Plan (including the appointment of a Co-ordinator) submitted to be secured and monitoring fee of £5000
  - Restriction on obtaining parking permits for occupiers – car free scheme pursuant to Section 16 Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974
  - Contribution to Transport for London for the re-location of the bus stop – maximum £15,000. With final figure to be agreed.
  - Controlled Parking Zone contribution (£112 per unit) to be determined dependent on extent of zone expansion required (contribution to be indexed).
  - Carbon offset fund contribution in respect of shortfall of the residential units to achieve a 100% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions compared to Part L of the Building Regulations 2013, such sum calculated at sixty pounds (£60.00) per tonne that falls below the 100% threshold, for a period of 30 years, duly Indexed, and the commercial units;
  - Reasonable legal fees for the drafting and negotiation of the deed whether or not it goes to completion
  - Monitoring fee towards the Council costs of monitoring compliance with the performance and discharge of the planning obligations in the deed £8640
- 2.2 That the Assistant Director of Planning is delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above and that if not completed by the 5<sup>th</sup> May 2021 the Assistant Director of Planning is delegated authority to refuse planning permission or extend the timeframe to grant approval.
- 2.3 That the Assistant Director Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose/negotiate conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

### **Conditions**

1. Time Limit
2. In Accordance With Approved Drawings
3. Material Samples
4. B1/B8 restricted change of use under permitted development.
5. Commercial unit opening hours.
6. Accessibility and Adaptability
7. Secured by Design
8. Construction Management Plan and Demolition Plan
9. Delivery and Servicing
10. Landscaping Details
11. Landscape Management Plan (including use of amenity spaces)
12. Boundary Details
13. Ecology appraisal mitigation
14. Biodiversity method statement
15. Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy
16. Contaminated Land Investigation 1
17. Contaminated Land Investigation 2
18. Living Roofs Details
19. Low Emissions Boilers - Residential
20. Noise mitigation (Residential)
21. Noise insulation of commercial use
22. Noise protection Plant machinery
23. Noise sound insulation
24. Photovoltaic Panel Details
25. Water efficiency
26. Refuse and Recycling Details
27. Surface Water Drainage Strategy
28. Final SUDs Strategy
29. Cycle Parking facilities
30. Cycle Parking Management Plan
31. Car Parking Management Plan and Design
32. Electrical Charging Points
33. Construction Hours
34. NRMM (non-Road Mobile Machinery)
35. No Pilling
36. Levels
37. Vehicle Cleansing
38. Pedestrian Visibility Splays To Access
39. Removal of satellite dish Permitted Development

### **Informatives**

1. NPPF positive and proactive
2. Secure by design
3. Planning obligations

4. Changes to the public highway
5. Highway approval required
6. Temporary use of the public highway
8. Street naming and numbering
10. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
11. Thames Water groundwater Risk Management Permit
12. Thames Water underground waste water asserts

### **3. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 3.1 The application site lies to the west of the Borough, approximately 0.4 miles from Romford Town Centre and a 10 minutes' walk to Romford Train Station. The site falls within the Romford Town Ward.
- 3.2 The rectangular shaped site covers an area of 0.23 hectares and is located on the corner of Lyon Road and South Street. The site is currently part of the external storage area of the existing Jewson's site (B2/B8), which is a commercial builder's merchant's warehouse. The specific area the subject of this application is also partly used for the parking of customer vehicles. The topography of the site is flat and free of vegetation aside from the very front of site facing the main South Street bus stop and at the shared boundary with the properties on Dymoke Road to the north. At these positions there are some low category trees and soft landscaping. The remaining rear part of the Jewson site currently has an application for a more comprehensive Commercial warehouse building (P0108.20).
- 3.3 The area surrounding the site has some mix residential and industrial character with the commercial industrial units and business on either side of Lyon Road. However the prevailing character is residential properties of two and three storeys. To the immediate north of the application site is a three storey purpose build block of flats at 281-305 South Street built in the 1980s. Commercial units align the east and south of the site, while west of the site and across the road are typical two storey Victoria semi-detached and terrace properties. There is also another three storey purpose build block of flats directly in front of the proposed new development (St David's Court). This also appears to have been built in the 1980s.
- 3.4 The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of between 5(Good) and 6a (Excellent). The immediate area directly in front of the site falls under 6a. Here there is a bus stop served by several buses (252, 248) with services to Romford Station, Upminster Station, Elm Park Station, Hornchurch Town Centre and Collier Row. Also, Romford Trains Station is 10 minutes' walk away with train services to Liverpool Street, Shenfield and Upminster.

3.5 The application site does not fall within a conservation area. There are also no listed buildings on or near the site and no protected trees under a Tree Preservation Orders (TPO). The site falls within the Secondary Employment Areas under policy DC10 of the London Borough of Havering's LDC Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD 2008. Lastly, the application site falls within Flood Zone 1 of the Environment Agency's Flood Zone map.

#### 4 PROPOSAL

4.1 The application seeks planning permission for the redevelopment of the existing brownfield area to the front of the existing Jewson warehouse site fronting South Street. Part of the site is used for the parking of cars in association with the commercial use and the other part is unused landscaping at present. The proposed development would section off part of this wider site to provide 47 residential units built over three blocks of 4, 5 and 7 storeys and commercial space at ground floor of 554sqm.,10% of the units would be wheelchair accessible.

4.2 The proposed development would have two main cores internally with shared amenity at the podium roof level of the site. This would be to the rear of the building looking onto the commercial warehouse at the rear. There would be 547square metres (sqm) of outdoor communal amenity space and private amenity space would be provided through inset and projecting balconies and terraces. 172sqm is allocated to child play spaces.

4.3 The application proposes 35% (14 units) affordable housing based on habitable rooms. This would be a split of 64% (9) affordable rent and 36% (5) shared ownership. The buildings would have an overall height as below:

	4 storey	5 storey	7 storey
Block 1	15.4m		
Block 2		18.6m	
Block 3			24.5m

4.4 29 car parking spaces are proposed with a breakdown as below:

##### **Parking**

<b>Type</b>	<b>Proposed No.</b>
Residential Spaces	18
Residential Disabled Spaces	5
Visitor/Commercial Spaces	7
Large lorry Spaces	2
Front Large Lorry Loading Bays	2

4.5 Cycle parking is proposed as follows:

<b>Cycle</b>	
<b>Type</b>	<b>Proposed No.</b>
Residence Cycle Spaces	81
Visitor Cycle Spaces	4

4.6 Refuse and recycling facilities are also proposed at ground floor with further details to be required by condition. The development is projected to reduce carbon emissions by 44%.

4.7 In terms of material finish, renders have been providing illustrations of the imagined finishes. However final material details would be secured via condition.

## 5 PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:

**P0108.20:** Redevelopment of existing commercial site to provide a new commercial single storey building providing 1,260 square metre of Sui Generis Builders Merchants with external storage/racking. (AMENDED PLANS SUBMITTED): *Pending Consideration.*

**P1555.01:** Part change of use to waste transfer site. *Refused 17/12/2001.*

**P1405.90:** Proposed timber store - showroom and offices (revised plans received 06/11/90 and 07/02/91): *Granted, 21/3/1991*

## 6 STATUTORY CONSULTATION RESPONSE

6.1 A summary of consultation response are detailed below:

- **Transport for London:** No objection to proposed development and movement of bus stop position subject to conditions. Two disabled parking spaces for the residential element should be provided from the offset with charging facilities. With evidence that this could be extended to 4 or 5. 20% active with all remaining spaces passive. The proposed car parking spaces should be provided as part of the purchase of the units and not sold separately. The development should also be car free.
- **Essex and Suffolk Water:** No comment received.
- **The Environment Agency:** No comment received.

- **Thames Water:** No objection to use of waste water network and sewage treatment works subject to Ground Water Risk Permit informative and a condition on pilling and their underground waste water asserts.
- **National Air Traffic Services:** No objection to development.
- **London Fire Brigade:** No objection. No further fire hydrants required.
- **London Fire Commissioner:** No objection.
- **Natural England:** No comment.
- **Metropolitan Police Secure by Design Officer:** No objection subject to the attachment of secured by design conditions and informative.
- **Historic England (Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service):** No objection subject to condition.
- **LBH Ecology:** No objection subject to conditions.
- **LBH Flood & Water Management:** No objection. FRA and Drainage Strategy acceptable.
- **LBH Environmental Health (Air Quality):** No objection subject to conditions governing BREEAM, Boiler NO<sub>x</sub>, electric vehicle charging points, Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM).
- **LBH Environmental Health (Noise):** No objection subject to conditions governing final details regarding noise and sound insulation mitigation measures.
- **LBH Environmental Health (Contamination):** No objection subject to conditions governing contaminated land.
- **LBH Highways:** No objection subject to conditions governing works to the public footpath, highways works and vehicle cleansing. Also, the following legal heads of terms are required:
  - Traffic Management contribution of £8979 (£102 per unit) Indexed. For the review of waiting and loading restrictions on loading restrictions on London Road. To be provided at the start of development
  - Travel Plan (including the appointment of a Coordinator) submitted to be secured and monitoring fee of £5000
  - Restriction on obtaining parking permits for occupiers.



- Controlled Parking Zone contribution £112 per unit to be indexed
- **LBH Education Services and Skills:** No objection. Economic Development requiring Job brokerage provisions to be secured under S106 x1 roles or £3526 for each role in lieu to be indexed or figure.
- **LBH Flood Officer:** No objection. The proposed Flood Risk Assessment and Strategy is acceptable.
- **LBH Refuse and Recycling Officer:** No objection.
- **LBH Travel Plan:** No objection. However it would be useful to be provide with the contact details of the Travel Plan Coordinator for the scheme.

## 7 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

7.1 In accordance with planning legislation, the developer has undertaken a public consultation exercise with the local community on these proposals as part of the pre-application process. A public consultation exercise was undertaken as follows:

- Public exhibition on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2019 4pm-8pm, following distribution of leaflets to 1,184 homes 2 weeks prior. The exhibition was held at the YMCA, 29 Rush Green Road, Romford RM7 0PH. This was attended by 17 members of the public.

## 8 PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS (SPC/QRP)

*Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) (8<sup>th</sup> September 2019 and 7<sup>th</sup> November 2019)*

8.1 The development proposals evolved over a number of pre-application discussions with the applicant. As part of this process, the evolving designs were presented to Members of the SPC twice. Comments received by Members are detailed below.

*Comments made by Members September 2019*

SPC COMMENT	APPLICANT RESPONSE
A keenness to understand in more detail the relationship between the residential units and the proposed/retained commercial use. What are the impacts and how could these be managed?	Further drawings have been submitted to better demonstrate this relationship.
The trading hours of the proposed/retained commercial use.	Further evidence has been submitted to demonstrate existing Screwfix

	hours elsewhere. Opening hours have been agreed with officers.
An opportunity to improve outlook from residential units with additional landscaping (as opposed to a view of a Jewson yard).	The internal layouts have been reviewed and dual aspect units have been maximised. Including the use of obscure glazing where there may be sensitive amenity concerns.
How the traffic movements would be managed on site 1) within the mixed use component to the front and 2) within the yard to the rear.	A Transport Pre-application note has been submitted to officers for review by the Transport Officer showing tracking for residential and commercial parking at the mixed use block as well as the movement of cars within the Commercial Jewson site.
How would any parking overspill be managed on the surrounding streets	The part of South Street the site is located on has a no waiting or parking restriction. However in regards to the wider area options are being explored for securing the scheme as car free.
Further detail should be provided to explain the rationale behind the unit mix. Could more family units be provided	Family units increased from 8 to 11 and now represent 23% of the overall units.
Potential to improve the quality of the frontage on to Lyon Road	Further progress has been made to the design of this frontage.
Details were sought about the refuse and recycling arrangements	Two locations at either side of the block have been provided for refuse and recycling.
Sustainability credentials of the buildings	Sustainability Statement submitted as part of application.
Further consideration was invited on whether 7 storeys was contextually appropriate	The design has progressed further with three main palettes of materials introduced to help soften the appearance of the block and the 7 <sup>th</sup> floor has been stepped back from the main facade to reduce the appearance of bulk.

*Comments made by Members November 2019*

<b>SPC Comment</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
Consideration of the flexible allocation of the parking spaces proposed to the rear of the mixed use block to the front, depending upon the division of the non-residential floorspace on the ground floor.	Commercial parking spaces have been reduced from 11 to 9 to enable an increase in residential spaces. The applicant is currently in discussions with an operator to take the whole ground floor and whose minimum requirement is 9

	spaces. Use of spaces to be monitored during the term of the commercial lease and with potential to allocate additional spaces to residential should they prove surplus to commercial requirements..
The applicant was invited to fully justify the height of the proposal within any future planning application.	Following the presentation to Havering's Design and Quality Review Panel, the proposals (with a maximum height of 7 storeys) were considered appropriate. This is dependent upon a well designed building in which the mass is broken into well-proportioned elements and uses high quality detailing and materials. In addition, it was felt that the location of the site as the road bends, would enable a taller building to act as a marker between Romford Town Centre (Telephone Exchange) and Vickers and Neo Post House (7 to 9 storeys). The applicant scheme has been refined in accordance with the above advice as illustrated within the submission documents. A condition will be applied to safeguard design and material quality.
The need to provide good quality landscaping which is robust and that would have longevity.	Full detailed Landscape proposals including plans, soft and hard landscaping schedules and maintenance/management strategy has been submitted as part of the application. A condition will be applied to safeguard implementation of these strategies.

<p>Further detail should be provided to show how the lay-by to the front of the site would be managed and whether its overall length could be increased.</p>	<p>Proposals include the front layby being restricted to 20 minutes unloading/loading with no return in 2hrs to enables short term parking for the proposed commercial operator and servicing for the residential. A commercial Travel Plan has been submitted and conditioned for the application ensuring where possible, sustainable methods of transport are provided. The length of the layby has been maximised whilst still enabling safe access for pedestrians and avoiding traffic conflict with Lyon Road.</p>
<p>Ensure that full details of the sustainability credentials of the building are provided within any future planning application.</p>	<p>A full Energy and Sustainability report was prepared by AES Sothern and submitted with the application for both the residential and commercial elements. Proposals contain brown roofs, photovoltaic cells, communal boiler, increased thermal insulation with an energy strategy being Carbon Zero. Furthermore, a bio diversity report was prepared by Aspect Ecology and submitted as part of the application. Proposals see an enhanced provision of biodiversity from existing and include provision of bat boxes, stag beetle loggeries, bird boxes and native planting species as has been detailed in the landscaping proposals.</p>

8.2 Progress of development:

Unit Type	SPC 1	SPC 2	Current App
1 B	14	13	13
2B	25	23	23
3B	8	11	11
Residence Parking Spaces	30	14	18

8.3

Visitor/Commercial unit Parking Spaces	0	9	9
Affordable Housing	32%	35%	35%
Total units	47	47	47

The application was also presented to the Quality Review Panel on 18<sup>th</sup> September. Comments received are summarised below:

**QRP COMMENT**

- The panel recognises that the residential buildings around the site lack coherence and are uninspiring, and it feels that the design team have drawn as much as is possible from this architectural context.
- Given that this is currently a poor piece of townscape, the attempt to improve it and enhance its coherence is to be welcomed.
- However, it suggests that an alternative approach, taking inspiration from the industrial language of the site and its immediate neighbours, could produce something that genuinely enhances that neighbourhood.
- The panel notes that the location of residential entrances on South Street, with circulation cores backing onto the podium garden, appears inefficient.
- However, it recognises that this approach has arisen from the requirement for a viable commercial space at the ground floor, when it is not possible to create entrances on Lyon Road, because of the lack of clarity about its ownership and access rights.
- This arrangement provides an opportunity to design the cores with views out towards the generous podium amenity space.
- Locating family units where they can open directly onto the podium garden would also be encouraged
- The panel wonders if the south west corner of the building would be the ideal location for the retail entrance, because of its prominence. The panel therefore recommends that the design team considers how the layout could be adapted to achieve this, if in future it becomes possible to relocate the residential entrance to Lyon Road.
- Challenges faced by this development, because of the ambiguous status of Lyon Road will also affect future development on neighbouring sites. The panel would support Havering, working with the landowner and other stakeholders, seeks to resolve the issue.
- It further recommends that the design team builds in some flexibility to the layout in case the ambiguity is resolved, making pedestrian and vehicular entrances off Lyon Road a possibility.
- The narrow alley to the north of the building, at the boundary with the neighbouring mansion block, is problematic. This could very easily become unpleasant, and the panel feels that this should be considered further.

- The panel feels that the edge treatment of the podium, for example along Lyon Road, would benefit from further thought, to make a positive street edge.
- While not expressly within the scheme as presented, the impact of the reconfigured builder's yard will have an impact on views from residential neighbours to the north. Consideration will need to be given to screening their back gardens.
- While the scale of development is markedly different from the scheme's immediate neighbours, the panel feels this could be justified by a high-quality building.
- However, the panel feels there is scope to refine the massing of the development, to create a more coherent architectural form, and does not find the argument for a marker building on the corner of Lyon Road convincing.
- A more straight forward approach to the building's massing may be more successful – rather than stepping up in height from north to south.
- The panel feels that the building's form is not yet resolved and is caught between a single slab and three distinct elements. To be successful, the design team will need to pursue fully one of these two routes.
- It will be important that the scheme provides sufficiently generous pavements on South Street and Lyon Road.
- While the increased space along the South Street frontage is welcome, the panel would like further thought about how the layby could be designed to feel like part of the pavement, when not in use for deliveries.
- Further thought is also needed on Lyon Street, where the panel is not convinced it is necessary to fence in access to the bin and bike stores, and substation.
- The panel welcomes the generous amenity space at podium level, which is a significant asset to the scheme. To make the most of this, the panel suggests that the three-bed family units should be arranged to provide easier access to the space, or at the very least to overlook it.
- The panel trusts that vents from the car park will not be located in the podium garden.
- The impact of noise from the adjacent builder's yard could impair the quality of the amenity space, and the panel feels that this needs to be taken into consideration when designing the planted screening along that boundary.

## 9 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

- 9.1 The application was advertised via a Press Notice and Site Notice displayed at the site for 21 days.

- 9.2 A formal neighbour consultation was also undertaken with 45 neighbouring properties notified of the application and invited to comment. Comments have been received from 4 neighbours (Including a Councillor).
- 9.3 The following local groups/societies made representations:
- Romford Civic Society: *The Society strongly objects to the application by virtue of its scale, bulk and massing as well as its impact on the streetscene of South Street. A lower scaled design should be introduced that respects the 1930s Victorian heritage of the area. If approved, the development would set a precedent for this form of scale in the area turning the area into “an unattractive monoculture, with all of the negative social and health consequences ...associated with a poor environment.”*
- 9.4 The following Councillor(s) made representations:
- Councillor Judith Holt: Object to development on scale, height failure to relate to wider character of the area. Also, insufficient parking. Therefore the Councillor has called in the application.
- 9.5 The following neighbour representations were received:
- 3 objectors
  - 0 support
  - No petitions have been received.
- 9.6 A summary of neighbour comments is given as follows (as only material comments can be considered as part of the application assessment, these comments have been divided into “material” and “non-material” comments):

### **Material Representations**

#### *Objections*

- Scale of development is out of keeping with prevailing character of area. Thereby failing to comply with policy CP2. 7 storeys is too large.
- The proposed retail outlets are likely to be food outlets which would harm the area by attracting youngsters who cause trouble, increase rubbish and attract vermin.
- Development would result in increased traffic
- Development represents an overdevelopment of the site
- Development would lead to loss of neighbour amenity by way of increased noise, loss of light and loss of privacy. For example, there would be increased overlooking to the properties at Dymoke Road

- Insufficient amount of car parking spaces proposed leading to increased overspill and pressure on wider parking infrastructure
- Unclear whether the application was properly advertised

*Support*

- None.

*Officer Response: The above comments are addressed within the Design, Amenity and Highways sections of this report. However please note that the applicant was properly advertised in keeping with legislation.*

**Non-material representations**

9.7 Below is a summary of comments received from neighbours that do not represent material planning considerations for the determination of the application. This is because they fall outside of the remit of planning. This includes the marketing of properties, purchases of the properties, neighbour disputes and the value of properties.

- None.

**Procedural issues**

9.8 None.

**10 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

10.1 The main planning considerations are considered to be as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Housing Mix
- Affordable Housing
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenity
- Environment Issues
- Parking and Highways Issues
- Sustainability
- Flooding and Drainage
- Community Infrastructure Levy

**Principle of Development**

10.2 Firstly, the existing site is used for storage and car parking in conjunction with the existing commercial warehouse use of Jewson. The application site is designated as a Secondary Employment site. Under policy DC10 there is an



obligation for the development to re-provide commercial floor space on the ground floor. The wording of the policy states:

*Planning permission for B1 (b) (c), B2 and B8 uses will be granted within Secondary Employment Areas provided that they do not adversely affect the amenity of adjoining residential areas.*

*Planning permission for other uses will only be granted in exceptional circumstances. In these cases the applicant will need to demonstrate that:*

- *the site is not needed to meet future business needs with regard to the difference between the current supply of employment land and the demand for employment land over the plan period*
- *the site is not considered fit for purpose when assessed against the economic, planning and property market criteria provided in Appendix A of Havering's Employment Land Review 2006*
- *the site has proved very difficult to dispose of for B1 (b) (c), B2 and B8 uses.*

10.3 The above policy seeks to ensure that there is no significant net loss of B1/B8 use at the site. Officers have worked closely to ensure that the acquisition of part of the site for use as residential would not adversely impact the future of the warehouse use to the rear of the site. In addition, that only the minimum space required is used for residential at ground floor. There would be no loss of employment from the proposed use in general and the resulting amount of commercial land for the continuation of the Jewson business is considered sufficient so as not to adversely impact the viability of the existing business.

10.4 The proposed application makes provision for a commercial trade counter use similar to the Jewson use. The applicant has sought to confirm the likely occupants of the B2/B8 space and are presently in the process of agreeing a contract with Screwfix. Screwfix has a very similar business model to Jewson although are able to operate from smaller commercial units. Therefore, officers consider this use suitable. Notwithstanding this, a condition will be attached to restrict any change of use under Permitted Development. A condition also limiting the operation hours have also been recommend to help safeguard the amenity of existing and future occupiers. Subject to these mechanisms, the proposed scheme would not lead to any significant loss of land for the protected B2/B8 use in accordance with the above policy.

10.5 The application was original submitted with the potential for a Class D1 use. However given the various uses falling within this Class and the future planning Use Class changes, together with the requirement of policy DC10 it was not considered suitable to include the D1 Use as it would fail to comply with policy.

As such, reference to this Use Class has been removed from the application description.

- 10.6 Secondly, the area around the site is mixed use in character with a number of residential streets nearby. Therefore, the proposed use would complement these residential uses, especially since it would look towards a road that is mostly residential. Therefore, subject to the compliance of all relevant policies the development is acceptable in principle.
- 10.7 In addition, policy CP1 of the adopted Core Strategy aims to meet a minimum 535 of new homes being built within the Borough each year by enabling high density residential developments within Romford and by bringing vacant property or sites into use. To this end, the development would be in compliance with the aims and objectives of this policy.
- 10.8 In light of the above officer consider that the division of the site together with its proposed use for mixed use residential is acceptable in principle.

## **Design**

### *Scale, massing and streetscene*

- 10.9 The National Planning Policy Framework (2019) 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'*
- 10.10 The London Plan also contains a number of relevant policies on character, design and landscaping. Policy 7.1 of the London Plan further emphasizes the need for a good quality environment, with the design of new buildings supporting character and legibility of a neighbourhood. 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 area, have a positive relationship with the street and not adversely affect local character.
- 10.11 Policy DC61 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.

- 10.12 The building would be 4-7 storeys in height. There have been a number of neighbour comments objecting to the scale of the proposed building and this height. The seven storey proposed at the corner is not seen within the immediate area. The character is predominantly 2 and 3 storey buildings. However officers consider that the gradual stepped designed approach to the highest point at the corner, would help to break up the overall massing and bulk. Such corner locations are often suitable for such increases in height as they help mark the edges and entrances into new roads. The seventh storey is set back.
- 10.13 Given the need for additional housing in the Borough, a balanced approach is required. The need to maximise the quantum of development and affordable housing provision means that it is reasonable to test heights and forms of development which do not necessarily follow the established scale. In this case, it is considered that the seven storey maximum height helps define the corner of this junction. The proposed block would help anchor this edge although 7 storeys is unlikely to be acceptable throughout the road. Therefore, the height of the block is considered to be a positive contributor at that corner. The distribution of height and massing throughout the three blocks is well balanced and together with the details design is considered appropriate. It should also be noted that the proposed development would fall within the required density matrix for the area.
- 10.14 The proposed materials are reflective of the character of the wider area. The use of the materials to create the appearance of three units only helps lend the development character and visual interest instead of a monotonous wide modern motif facade. Instead brick features are incorporated. Further details are required regarding mortar types, exact brick and renders and metalwork samples, officers consider that the details currently presented provide sufficient to demonstrate that a high quality finish can be achieved. These would be secured via condition.
- 10.15 Owing to the ambiguity of the ownership of Lyons Road, while officers have pushed for access from here it has not been possible. Entrance into both the residential and commercial elements are therefore via South Street.
- 10.16 The building roof has been utilised for green and brown roofs and would house a number of PV (photovoltaic) panels. Details of which is to be secured via condition. There are also play areas at podium level. As such, it is important that officers understand the safety treatments proposed at the boundary of these areas. Therefore, a condition is required to secure the detailed design of these to be presented to officers for approval.

10.17 Overall, the development would contribute positively to the surrounding area and would enhance the area visually subject to securing high quality finish through the details required by condition.

#### *Trees*

10.18 Policy DM01 (Trees and Woodland) requires that development proposals are assessed through the following vehicle:

- where appropriate, retaining trees of nature conservation and amenity value and making tree preservation orders
- ensuring that adequate measures are put in place when granting planning permission to protect trees during construction works
- supporting the implementation of the Thames Chase Plan and ensuring that, development within the area makes a positive contribution towards its implementation
- not granting planning permission for development that would adversely affect ancient and secondary woodland.

10.19 It is important that developments properly consider the impact of any trees that may be lost as a result of the proposals and any protection measures for trees to be retained. Trees and woodland act as an important visual amenity to the quality of the wider green space and local environment. They also help soften the character of an area, while providing shading and privacy. Where possible, the Council will look to retain existing trees of high quality to help retain biodiversity especially where they contribute positive contribution to the surrounding area. Existing trees should be safeguarded and when protected trees are to be felled the Council will, where appropriate, require replanting with trees of an appropriate size and species.

10.20 The application is supported with a landscaping strategy for the development. The majority of the amenity landscaped areas are at podium level. There are no trees at the site. Therefore, there would be no harm to the existing species. In light of this, the proposals are acceptable.

#### *Quality of residential accommodation*

10.21 Policy 3.5 of the London Plan states that new residential units should provide the highest quality internal environments for their future residents by meeting minimum floor areas in accordance with the Government's technical housing standards set out in Table 3.3. These requirements are also further elaborated within the Mayor's London Housing SPG (Technical housing standards - nationally described space standards). Together these form the pivotal backbone for the quality of any future residential accommodation. The SPG details specific space standards for communal areas, storage, bathrooms and corridor widths.

10.22 All units comply with the London Plan and the National Technical Housing Standards in terms of overall size, storage, communal space and bathroom size. Therefore it is considered that all units are of an acceptable quality.

#### *Amenity Space*

10.23 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. However, 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 in keeping with the London Plan. The development proposed balconies or terraces in all units. In addition, a total of 547sqm of communal amenity space is also proposed across the development. This is significantly higher than the required outdoor amenity space stated under the London Plan of 246sqm.

10.24 There are areas specifically designated for play totally 172sqm which is significantly below the required 284sqm stated by the London Plan calculator. Officers have reviewed the details and note that while the designated play space is below the standard, there is 547sqm of overall amenity space that could be utilised. However details regarding the exact play area treatment and equipment are required to be secured by condition. It will be required that they comply with the most up to date advice on children's play areas. However, the position and space given to play is suitable and considered safe by officers.

#### *Sunlight and Daylight to Proposed Units*

10.25 The applicant has provided an internal and external sunlight, daylight and overshadowing assessment against the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines for these forms of development, measuring the average daylight factor (ADF), Vertical Sky Component (VSC) and No Sky Line (NSL) within living rooms to understand the amount of daylight afforded to these spaces.

10.26 The assessment considers the likely levels of sunlight, daylight and views of the sky for possible future residents as well as the possible loss of light to existing occupiers from neighbouring properties.

10.27 The proposed development would meet a very high standard for sunlight and daylight for the external amenity arrangements as well as for all units internally. The applicant's submitted report states that the internal daylight analysis confirmed that of the 139 rooms tested, 135 meet the standard and of those that failed this was only slightly below the standard. It also confirms that 98.2% of the podium amenity space would receive at least 2 hours of direct sunlight

on March 21<sup>st</sup> in keeping with the BRE standard and would receive a good level of sunlight throughout the remainder of the year. In addition, officers note that there is a good level of outlook from all the proposed units.

10.28 The assessment on the wider location looked at the below properties:

1. 2 Dymoke Road	7. 310 South Street
2. 4 Dymoke Road	8. 312 South Street
3. Copeland 281-305 South Street	9. 314 South Street
4. Beech Court 298-304 South Street (Care Home)	10. 316 South Street
5. 306 South Street	11. 318 South Street
6. 308 South Street	12. 320-322 South Street

10.29 It found that properties 1-3 would not be impacted by way of loss of sunlight and daylight by the development. Of the remaining properties the assessment demonstrated that overall while there is likely to be some loss of sunlight to some of the existing neighbouring windows, these would be minimal even to those at Dymoke Road. In all cases, all areas around the site would meet the BRE standard for overshadowing.

10.30 In light of the above, the overall development would provide a good quality of accommodation for future occupants in terms of daylight and sunlight, and would not have an adverse impact on surrounding properties.

*Access/Disabled Units*

10.31 Policy 3.8 of the London Plan states that 10% of new units within a development should be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users. Provision should also be made for affordable family housing, wheelchair accessible housing and ensure all new housing meets parts M4 (2) and (3) of the Building Regulations as follows:

*Part M4(2)*

- 90% of the dwellings shall be designed to be Category 2 'Accessible and adaptable'

*Part M4(3)*

- 10% of the dwellings shall be designed to be Category 3 'Wheelchair user dwellings'

10.32 Details submitted with the application demonstrate that the development would comply with these requirements by providing 5 wheelchair adoptable homes. In addition, the applicant has accepted a condition to ensure that the development

would be in full compliance with the provision of M4(2). As such, the relevant condition will be applied. The development makes provision for policy M4(3) also.

#### *Secured by Design*

- 10.33 In terms of national planning policy, paragraphs 91-95 of the National Planning Policy Framework (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. In doing so planning policy should emphasise 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.
- 10.34 The above strategic approach is further supplemented under Policy 7.3 of the London Plan which encompasses measures to designing out crime 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 policy terms, policies CP17 and DC63 are consistent with these national and regional planning guidance. The SPD on Designing Safer Places (2010), forms part of Havering's Local Development Framework and ensures 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.
- 10.35 In keeping with these policies, officers have consulted the Metropolitan Police to review the submitted application. They have commented that the application is acceptable subject to conditions stipulating 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. These conditions will be attached.

#### *Density*

- 10.36 The development proposal is to provide 47 residential units with commercial at ground floor on a site area of 0.23ha which equates to a density of 204 units per ha. The site is an area with a high accessibility rating of PTAL 6a (Excellent). It is considered that the site falls within the urban range of Romford. Policy DC2 of the LDF specifies a density range of 165-275 units per hectare; the London Plan suggests a general density range of between 70-260 dwellings per hectare depending upon the setting in terms of location. Therefore, the development falls within the policy scope.
- 10.37 The resulting density is therefore considered appropriately located being close to transport links and shopping areas. Also, the proposal makes provision for

good quality homes with 35% affordable units, 10% disabled and a good level of family units

### **Housing Mix**

- 10.38 The NPPF (2018) seeks to steer development to deliver a wider choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. Policy 3.8 of the London Plan encourages new developments offer in a range of housing mix choices. 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.
- 10.39 Policy DC2 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.
- 10.40 The current application proposes a total of 47 residential units with a division of 28% one beds (13 units), 49% 2 beds (23 units) and 23% 3 beds (11 units). This mix results in 23% family units (including 3bed and 4bed units). This is a much lower number of family units when reviewed against policy. However, on balance, this is acceptable as 64% of the affordable rented units would be family units, which would go some way to helping address the much needed family units identified in the LBH's housing needs survey.
- 10.41 While the policy mix identified in policy DC2 is the Council's preferred approach, the supporting text requires that any short comings in these mixes could be mitigated with other benefits. It should also be noted that the supporting text to London Plan Policy 3.4 states "*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.*" The development leans towards the higher density development. However, does still fall within the policy scope. Officers consider that there are a number of benefits to the scheme which far outweigh its exact mirroring of the policy mix table. As detailed above the development provides a high number of family units (as defined by the London Plan) and meets the affordable housing criteria.



### **Affordable Housing**

- 10.42 Currently, the 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). All major developments should meet at least 35% affordable unless they are able to demonstrate that this is not possible. 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 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.
- 10.43 The Mayor of London’s Supplementary Planning Guidance, Homes for Londoners (2017), states that it is essential that an appropriate balance is struck between the delivery of affordable housing and overall housing development. Under its “Fast Track Route” policy, it is required that development land not in public ownership or public use should be expected to deliver at least 35 percent affordable housing without a grant in order to benefit from the Fast Track Route (i.e. no need to test the viability of the proposal) as in this case.
- 10.44 The preferred tenure split as set out under policy CP2 of the London Borough of Havering’s Local Development Framework (2008) is for 70% of affordable housing to be delivered as social/affordable rent and 30% intermediate, to include London Living Rent and Shared Ownership.
- 10.45 The proposed development would result in 35% affordable housing (14 units) with a split of 64% (9 units) social rented and 36% (5 units) shared ownership. This provision is in keeping with the minimum affordable housing units to be secured under such schemes. The proposed tenure mix is also largely policy compliant. Therefore the development would meet both LBH policies and the London Plan’s. See below table:

<b>Proposed</b>	<b>1+</b>	<b>2+</b>	<b>3+</b>	<b>Total</b>
Market	11	20	2	33
Affordable	2	3	9	14
<b>Totals</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>47</b>

- 10.46 As the development would meet the required 35% only an early stage review mechanism is required should the progress of the development not achieve the agreed level within two years of the permission.

### **Impact on Neighbouring Amenity**

- 10.47 The Residential Design SPD states that new development should be 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.
- 10.48 The amenity context of the site is that it sits at the corner of South Street and Lyon Road. Directly behind the development, at its east elevation is the commercial unit of Jewson. Although there is an existing application to redevelop the site and move the building over 50 metres away from the boundary of the proposed residential unit, at present the existing Jewson building would share a boundary wall with the proposed development. There are also commercial units to the south of site across Lyon Road. Residential houses and purpose built blocks across the road to the west of the site, while north of the site at its shared boundary is 281-305 South Street. This is a purpose built three storey block of flats.
- 10.49 Neighbour objections have been received regarding the proposed impact on the properties on Dymoke Road. The proposed development has been designed to step the height away from these properties and towards the corner of the road. There is also more than two metres between this property and the development block. 4 storeys is then proposed at this shared boundary. The building line of the development has also been designed to carefully follow that of the block at 281-305. Therefore, officers do not consider that there would be any significant loss of light, outlook, overshadowing or an overbearing relationship between the two properties. As there would also be no side windows proposed as well as there being none at this neighbouring property, there would be no loss of privacy.
- 10.50 Objections have been received regarding the low number of car parking spaces to residential units. However the standard according to the London Plan policies is that all developments within areas of 6a PTAL should be car free. Further discussion of this is contained within the Highways section of this report. However, it is considered that the provision of 18 spaces for residences is appropriate.
- 10.51 Whilst the development would represent an intensification of the use at the site, the proposed residential use is consistent with the prevailing character of the area. A noise assessment was submitted with the application and this has been reviewed by the Council's Environmental Health Officer who has raised no objections. Any additional noise generated from the development would be controlled via conditions and further details.

10.52 In light of the above, details submitted with the application demonstrate that the development would not result in significant harm to the amenity of existing nearby residents in such a way as to be unacceptable. No unacceptable or cumulative operational noise impacts are identified for neighbours as a consequence of the proposed development. To further safeguard the existing amenity experienced by neighbours, the opening hours of the commercial units have been restricted to: Monday –Friday 7am-8am with no deliveries before 8am; Saturdays 8-6 and; Sunday and Bank Holidays 10-4. Therefore, subject to the recommended conditions and S106 HoTs the development is considered to be acceptable.

### **Environmental Issues**

10.53 The Environmental Health Officer has stated that it is unclear whether there is existing contamination on the site. Therefore relevant conditions to are recommended. The Environment Agency has also been consulted and have made no objection by way of environmental matters.

10.54 A Contaminated Land study was undertaken and submitted with the application. This concluded that there was no significant levels of contaminants and therefore any associated risk levels were likely to be moderate or low. It should also be noted that the site is brownfield land and currently benefits from use for car parking in association with the existing Jewson's site. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has commented that the proposed location is suitable for residential housing and only standard conditions are required to safeguard any contaminations found on site at a later date. These will be attached.

10.55 The proposed development is located within an area of poor air quality which suffers from high concentrations of nitrogen dioxide. Therefore, it has been designated as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). To safeguard against additional unnecessary impacts to air quality, conditions are recommended to mitigate future 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. These will be secured.

10.56 A noise assessment has been submitted by the applicant. The report demonstrated that the likely noise from the surrounding neighbouring commercial and residential units was not audible or would be "low" to "moderate". Therefore, there would be relatively little noise experienced by future occupants of the block from these uses. The Environmental Health Officer has raised no objections to these findings. However, conditions governing final mitigation measures for internal and external noise controls will

be attached to ensure that final noise impacts from and to the development are minimised by any plant or other equipment.

10.57 The application site falls under Flood Zone 1. Flooding and drainage strategies have been submitted with the application and will be discussed in later sections. However, the proposed methods have been accepted by the LBH's Flood Officer.

### **Parking and Highways**

10.58 Policies CP9, CP10 and DC32 require that proposals for new development 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.

10.59 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 1b (Poor) where 6b (Excellent) is the highest. The site is 10 minutes' walk to Romford Station which provides train lines into Central London. There is also a bus stop directly in front of the site for buses 252, 248. Under the application, it is proposed to move this bus stop slightly north along South Street to allow clear visibility splays and access into the proposed rear parking area. As the proposed bus route falls under the control of Transport for London (TfL), officers together with the applicant have had extensive discussions to resolve any issues.

10.60 TfL initially raised concerns regarding the proposed bus stop movement. As such, there have been several discussions with TfL. TfL have stated that the proposed relocation of the bus stop is now acceptable subject to the applicant signing a S106 confirming that they would pay for the move. The applicant has confirmed that they are happy to accept this. As such the relevant Heads of Terms have been attached.

10.61 The application proposes off street car parking spaces and cycle parking as below:

#### **Parking**

<b>Type</b>	<b>Proposed No.</b>
Residential Car spaces	18
Residential Disabled Car spaces	5
Residence Cycle spaces	81
Visitor/Commercial Cars spaces	7

Large lorry spaces	2
Visitor Cycle spaces	4
Front Large Lorry Loading Bays	2

- 10.62 In addition, to the above, it is required that electrical car charging points are provided at 20% active and 20 passive for meet future demand. This is in keeping with the London Plan policy requirements. This has not been indicated on plan. As such, a condition requiring 20% passive and 20% active electrical charging points in line with the London Plan will be attached for details to be provided at a later date.
- 10.63 Neighbour comments have been received on the grounds that the proposed development would lead to increased parking pressures in the area with the development only proposing 18 residential parking spaces. Neighbours have also commented that the development would increase traffic along South Street. Given the proximity to Romford Station the London Plan would normal require the full development to be secured as car free without any additional off street parking provision. TfL have been consulted and expressed concerns regarding the proposed car parking provision given the locations PTAL of 6a. Therefore the provision of 18 spaces has come as a compromise to all sides. Subject to conditions and S106 TfL have raised no objections.
- 10.64 The applicant has provided a Travel Plan with the application. This has been assessed by the Council's Travel Plan Officer who has also raised no objections. A condition will be attached to require the appointment of 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 also be secured via S106 and be reviewed annually for a period of five years following occupancy.
- 10.65 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. Officers consider that given the likely number of new homes planned for the Romford area, it would be beneficial to review whether the nearby streets not currently restricted should be. In this case, it is recommended that a contribution be secured for CPZ implementation as well as parking permit restriction. If a CPZ is introduced, it would minimise conflict between existing and future residents over parking.
- 10.66 The applicant has agreed to the above contribution. The Local Highway Authority has raised no objection subject to the applicant entering into a Legal Agreement pursuant to Section 16 Greater London Council (General Powers)

Act 1974 to prevent future occupiers from applying for parking permits. Subject to the completion of this agreement, the planning obligations 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.

- 10.67 The application proposes refuse at ground floor. These provisions have been reviewed by the Designing Out Crime Officer as well as the Council's refuse and recycling department. No objections have been raised in regards to the location of the refuse or the proposed provision. However further details pertaining to refuse management and the exact proposed size of bins are required. Therefore, a condition securing the refuse management plan will be attached to any permission. Lastly, a Construction Management Plan condition is recommended to be attached to ensure neighbouring amenity is safeguarded and the highway network is not prejudiced.

### **Sustainability**

- 10.68 In recognising the importance of climate change and the need to meet energy and sustainability targets, as well as the Council's statutory duty to contribute towards the sustainability objectives set out within the Greater London Authority Act (2007), Policy 5.2 of the London Plan requires all major developments to meet targets for carbon dioxide emissions. This is targeted the eventual aim of zero carbon for all 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.
- 10.69 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 percent 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.
- 10.70 In terms of the Local Plan policy DC50 (Renewable Energy), there is a 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.

10.71 A Sustainability and Energy Report has been submitted and reviewed by officers. This 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.

10.72 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.

10.73 Policy 5.3 of the London Plan seeks that developers utilise the highest standards of sustainable design and construction to be achieved to improve the environmental performance of new developments. Guidance of how to meet the requirements as presented from the above policy is further discussed within SPD Sustainable Design Construction (2009). This encourages developers to consider measures beyond the policy minimum and centred around development ratings, material choice, energy and water consumption.

10.74 Policy 5.9 of the London Plan emphasises that major development proposals should reduce potential overheating and reliance on air conditioning systems

10.75 The applicant's sustainability report demonstrates that the proposal would be able to meet at least 44% carbon dioxide reduction or 37.27 tonnes of CO2 per annum. This is a higher than the benchmark minimum of 35% set by the GLA. This is to be achieved through a number of measures across the development such as the use of sustainable construction methods, energy efficient boilers choice of building materials, energy reduction, installation of Photovoltaic Panels at roof level and the introduction of brown roofs. The use of brown roofs would mitigate water runoff and sewer overflow by absorbing and filtering water that would normally be directed to gutters, increasing volume during wet weather. The proposed landscaping at podium level will also add to a greener air flow in the location by removing air particulates and producing oxygen.

- 10.76 However this is below the required 100% stated under the London Plan. In keeping with the GLA methods, the remaining regulated carbon dioxide emission reductions will be met through a Section 106 contribution to the Council's carbon offsetting fund in order to meet the zero carbon target. In light of this, officers accept the lower provision and will secure the remaining amount via a S106 off site contributions charged at £60 per tonne.
- 10.77 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 of the London Plan where it stresses 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 person 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.
- 10.78 Policy DC51 highlights the need for applicants, as a minimum, to incorporate a high standard of water efficiency which can include greywater and rainwater recycling to help reduce water consumption. Therefore a condition will be attached to ensure the 105 litre target is maintained.

### **Flooding and Drainage**

- 10.79 Guidance under the NPPF seeks to safely manage residual risk including by emergency planning and give priority to the use of sustainable drainage systems.
- 10.80 In order to address current and future flood issues and minimise risks in a sustainable and cost effective way Policy 5.12 of the London Plan emphasises that new developments must comply with the flood risk assessment and management requirements and will be required to pass the Exceptions Test addressing flood resilient design and emergency planning as set out within the NPPF and the associated technical Guidance on flood risk over the lifetime of the development. Furthermore, Policy 5.13 of the London Plan stresses that development should utilise sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) and should aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible.
- 10.81 In terms of local planning policies, policy DC48 emphasises that development must be located, designed and laid out to ensure that the risk of death or injury to the public and damage from flooding is minimised whilst not increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere and ensuring that residual risks are safely managed. The policy highlights that the use of SUDS must be considered. Further



guidance of how to meet the requirements as presented in the Core Strategy is supplemented under LBH's SPD on '*Sustainable Design Construction*' 2009 which encourages developers to consider measures beyond the policy minimum and centred on Flood risk.

- 10.82 Policy DC51 seeks to promote development which has no adverse impact on water quality, water courses, groundwater, surface water or drainage systems. Whilst policy CP15 (Environmental Management Quality) seeks to reduce environmental impact and to address causes of and to mitigate the effects of climate change, construction and new development to reduce and manage fluvial, tidal and surface water and all other forms of flood risk through spatial planning, implementation of emergency and other strategic plans and development control policies; whilst having a sustainable water supply and drainage infrastructure.
- 10.83 The application site falls within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of flooding area) of the Environment Agency Flood Map. The site is therefore not located close to any culverts, rivers, marshes, Site of Special Scientific Investigation and other such water bodies. Therefore, no specific mitigation measures are required for the proposal. The technical document submitted with the application demonstrates that there are no existing surface water manholes at the site. In addition, it is proposed that as the site is not close to any existing surface water drainage systems or foul water system a new system to feed into existing nearby residential sewers be created. Foul water will discharge into the Thames Water's sewer network. Thames Water have commented that these provisions are acceptable subject to further details supplied to them. Thames Water have confirmed that the existing infrastructure would be able to accommodate the proposed development.
- 10.84 Policy 5.13 of the London Plan states that developments should utilise sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) unless there are practical reasons for not doing so and applicants should aim for greenfield run-off rates. The applicant has confirmed that SUDs measures would be used at the site including the use of brown roofs with details to be secured via condition. However due to the layout of the site, the applicant has said that it is not possible to implement rainwater storage measures. However interception measures will be implemented on the podium roof. This would allow the runoff of rainwater to be controlled and reduced while also supporting biodiversity within the area. Infiltration has also been considered however there is insufficient space to provide this. Officers have reviewed these details and consider them to be acceptable.

### **Community Infrastructure Levy**

- 10.85 The development would be liable for the Mayoral CIL. The Mayor has established a CIL charging schedule with a charge of £25 per square metre. The final CIL charge will be calculated by the CIL officer when final figures are provided. However the officers calculate that the preliminary figure is £152,665 (total floor area 6106.6sqm).
- 10.86 The London Borough of Havering's CIL was adopted in September 2019. Therefore financial contributions for the education infrastructure will be secured via this mechanism. As the relevant floor area for the development is 5034.60 sqm (residential only) and the CIL charging schedule applies a charge of £125 per sqm to any development in Zone A (any development north of the A1306), the projected applicable levy is £630,450. However this would be subject to any relevant reliefs for social housing and/or existing floor space. A final figure would be calculated at a later date.

## **11 HOUSING DELIVERY TEST**

- 11.1 On 13 February 2020 the Government published the 2019 Housing Delivery Test (HDT) results. The results show that within Havering 33% of the number of homes required were delivered over the three year period of 2016-17 to 2018-19. The NPPF (paragraph 11d) states that where the delivery of housing was substantially below (less than 75%) the housing requirement over the previous three years, the policies which are most important for determining the application are considered out of date. This means that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole. This is commonly referred to as the "tilted balance" in favour of sustainable development and is a significant relevant material consideration in the determination of the planning application.
- 11.2 The proposed development would contribute to boosting housing supply and delivery and this weighs in favour of the development. The assessment of the planning application has not identified significant harm nor conflict with development plan policies and where there is some harm/conflict identified it is considered that these do not outweigh the benefits of the proposal. It is therefore considered that in this case, the proposal does benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 11 d) of the NPPF.

## **12 CONCLUSIONS**

- 12.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) requires the Council to determine any application in accordance with the statutory

development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. All relevant policies contained within the Mayor's London Plan and the Development Plan, as well as other relevant guidance and material considerations, have been carefully examined and taken into account by the Local Planning Authority in their assessment of this application.

- 12.2 The preliminary proposals for the site were subject to consideration by the Strategic Planning Committee and comments made in those forums have been input into the development. For example, the number of family units have significantly increased and there has also been an increase in the number of residential parking spaces. The proposal would not unduly harm the amenities of existing neighbouring residential properties through significant or unacceptable loss of light or outlook. It would provide for much needed quality family housing, including 14 affordable units of which 64% are family sized units, all with a good standard of accommodation including outlook, privacy and access to daylight.
- 12.3 As conditioned, the proposal would not compromise the character of the locality or any nearby historic environments or buildings. It accords with the relevant development plan policies and conforms to the design principles and parameters established by the Council's policies.
- 12.4 Although the development is of a denser and higher scale than those currently around it, the building has been designed such that it is stepped in height to reflect the sites context and as such is considered to be in keeping with the Council's aim to encourage denser developments close to the centre of Romford to help address the Boroughs growing demand for housing.
- 12.5 Furthermore, in accordance with the NPPF and the poor housing delivery within the Borough, the benefits of the proposal outweigh any policy conflict or harm identified and represents sustainable development which should be approved.
- 12.6 In light of the above, the application is **RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL** in accordance with the resolutions and subject to the attached conditions and completion of a legal agreement.

This page is intentionally left blank