



Havering

L O N D O N B O R O U G H

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA

7.00 pm	Thursday 7 October 2021	Hybrid Meeting Council Chamber, Town Hall
----------------	------------------------------------	--

Members 8: Quorum 4

COUNCILLORS:

Conservative Group (4)

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

Residents' Group (1)

Reg Whitney

Upminster & Cranham Residents' Group (1)

Linda Hawthorn

Independent Residents Group (1)

Graham Williamson

Labour Group (1)

Keith Darvill

For information about the meeting please contact:

Taiwo Adeoye - 01708 433079
taiwo.adeoye@onesource.co.uk

To register to speak at the meeting please call 01708 433100
before Tuesday 6 October 2021

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

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

Reporting means:-

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

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

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

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



AGENDA ITEMS

1 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman will 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 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.

4 MINUTES (Pages 1 - 4)

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 12 August 2021 and to authorise the Chairman to sign them.

5 DEVELOPMENT PRESENTATIONS (Pages 5 - 6)

Report attached.

6 PE/00661/21 - ABERCROMBIE HOUSE, HILLdene AVENUE, RM3 7UA (Pages 7 - 16)

Report attached

7 APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION (Pages 17 - 20)

8 P0284.21 - BEAM PARK PHASE 2A UPLIFT (Pages 21 - 62)

Report attached.

9 P0290.20 - DOVER'S CORNER NEW ROAD (Pages 63 - 76)

Report attached.

10 P0755.12 - NEW CITY COLLEGE, ARDLEIGH GREEN CAMPUS (Pages 77 - 106)

Report attached.

Andrew Beesley
Head of Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
Council Chamber, Town Hall, Main Road, Romford RM1 3BD
12 August 2021 (7.00pm - 9.30 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS 8

Conservative Group	Timothy Ryan (Vice-Chair), Ray Best, Maggie Themistocli and +Carol Smith
Residents' Group	Reg Whitney
Upminster & Cranham Residents' Group	Linda Hawthorn
Independent Residents Group	Graham Williamson
Labour Group	Keith Darvill

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Dilip Patel.

+Substitute members: Councillor Carol Smith (for Dilip Patel).

All decisions were taken with no votes against.

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

10 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest.

11 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 July 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

- 12 **P0851.20 - THE VERVE APARTMENTS, MERCURY GARDENS, ROMFORD - VARIATION OF CONDITION NO. 2 (PARKING) OF PLANNING PERMISSION J0026.15 DATED 28/10/15 TO ALLOW A REDUCTION IN PARKING SPACES TO 27 (CHANGE OF USE FROM (CLASS B1 (A)) TO RESIDENTIAL USE (CLASS C3) FOR 115 PROPOSED NEW FLATS (PRIOR APPROVAL)**

The report before the Committee detailed an application to vary condition 2 of the previous planning report J0026.15.

With its agreement Councillor Joshua Chapman addressed the Committee.

The Committee considered the report and it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

- Impact upon residential amenity through the reduction in on site car parking provision.

The further consideration of the application was suspended following the Assistant Director of Planning's decision as AD to exercise the powers available to them (under the Planning Committee Procedure Rules) to bring a further report to the Committee giving detailed planning and legal advice on the reason the Committee wished to refuse the planning application.

- 13 **P1591.20 - THE VERVE APARTMENTS, MERCURY GARDENS, ROMFORD - RETENTION OF 22 APARTMENTS**

The report before the Committee detailed an application to retain 22 apartments in the Verve Apartments.

With its agreement Councillor Joshua Chapman addressed the Committee.

The Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to:

- The completion of a Section 106 Agreement and conditions.
- In addition to the single condition published in the report, there may be a need to include a further condition which cross referenced to the need to provide 60 car parking spaces which were secured via an earlier grant of planning permission. The potential need for this condition was agreed by Members.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Development Presentations

Introduction

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

Advice to Members

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

Public speaking and running order

6. The Council's Constitution only provides for public speaking rights for those applications being reported to Committee in the "Applications for Decision" parts of the agenda. Therefore, reports on this part of the agenda do not attract public speaking rights, save for Ward Members.
7. The items on this part of the agenda will run as follows:
 - a. Officer introduction of the main issues
 - b. Developer presentation (20 minutes)
 - c. Ward Councillor speaking slot (5 minutes)
 - d. Committee questions
 - e. Officer roundup

Late information

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

Recommendation

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

 Havering LONDON BOROUGH	Strategic Planning Committee 7 October 2021
---	--

Pre-Application Reference:	PE/00661/21
Location:	Abercrombie House, Hilldene Avenue, RM3 7UA
Ward:	Gooshays
Description:	Demolition of all existing buildings and structures, site preparation works and the construction of a part 2/part3/part4-storey building comprising a hostel facility (approximately 74 residential units) and medical centre (approximately 1560 square metres), along with all associated infrastructure, plant, access arrangements, [car/cycle] parking, and hard and soft landscaping.
Case Officer:	John Kaimakamis

1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 This proposed development is being presented to enable Members of the Committee to view and comment upon it before a planning application is submitted. The development does not constitute an application for planning permission and any comments made upon it are provisional and subject to full consideration of any subsequent application, and the comments received as a result of consultation, publicity and notification.
- 1.2 Officers have been in pre-application discussions with regard to this site. The proposed scheme has been subject to review by the Havering Quality Review Panel (QRP), and it is now considered appropriate to seek Members' views before the proposal is developed any further.

2 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

2.1 Proposal

- The proposal relates to a council-led scheme for temporary/emergency sheltered housing for families, comprising around 74 units, alongside a separate medical centre. The applicant aims to replace the existing facility on site, to increase capacity and improve the existing accommodation. This scheme forms the first phase of a wider masterplan within the area, with the council exploring the potential to redevelop the Farnham Road shopping centre and Chippenham Road sites to the south in the longer term.
- Proposal includes the demolition of all existing buildings/structures (including Abercrombie House, former Library, and former Boxing Club).
- The approximately 74 dwelling family hostel would be provided in varying sizes of 1, 2 and 3-bed units including wheelchair accessible rooms, replacing the 40 rooms in the existing Abercrombie House hostel
- The medical centre would be approximately 1,560 sqm (GIA) in size.
- The building would consist of Part-2, Part-3 and Part-4 storey building elements, whilst the proposal also includes all associated infrastructure, plant, access arrangements, parking, central courtyard, public realm and hard/soft landscaping.

2.2 Site and Surroundings

- The site is located within a district centre in Harold Hill, in the northeast of the borough.
- To the south of the site, Farnham Road is a post-war development with retail at ground floor level and housing above. To the north and west of the site, recently developed housing is of slightly higher density than the surrounding suburban context, and includes three storey apartments; located to the east is two storey suburban housing that is more typical of the wider area.
- Local Green Belt areas are accessible on foot, due to the relatively peripheral location.

- The site falls within Public Transport Accessibility Level Zone 2. There is no rail / tube station in the centre, and the nearest station is around 30 minutes' walk to Harold Wood. A regular bus service to Romford Town Centre is located directly in front of the site.

2.3 Planning History

There is no recent relevant planning history that relates to the current proposals at this site.

3 CONSULTATION

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

- London Fire Brigade
- TfL

4 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 The main planning issues raised by the application which the committee should consider are:

- Principal of Development
- Form and Massing
- Quality of Accommodation
- Transport
- Landscape
- Energy and Sustainability
- QRP Feedback

4.2 Principal of Development

- The principle of development is supported as it addresses the existing problems with Abercrombie House and the emergency family accommodation in the form of a family hostel. Potential to provide higher quality accommodation for families in need of emergency housing and make more efficient use of the site.
- Further information is required for the Medical Centre to clarify that the scale and layout of the proposals are suitable.
- Although this site is a standalone application, issues that are likely to impact later phases of the masterplan in the wider area should be considered. For

example, how parking is likely to be distributed, provision of play/amenity space, potential to improve key pedestrian/cycle routes. Information on these and any other relevant issues should be provided.

- If provision of the homeless family accommodation is to be relevant to overall affordable housing provision in later phases, this needs to be set out at this stage.
- Justification for loss of boxing club and availability of alternate community uses in the vicinity will be required to be provided.

4.3 Form and Massing

- The proposed form and massing generally appear to create an appropriate relationship with the surroundings. The proposal has been reduced to part 2/part 3/part 4-storeys and the relationship with the existing housing opposite on Bridgewater Road and any mitigation from level changes within the site needs careful consideration.
- Given the low-rise suburban nature of the surroundings any increase in height/massing beyond the current proposal should be avoided. The transition from the two storey housing to the east on Bridgewater Road and Hildene Avenue to the site will be important. Currently, the three-storey element in the northeast corner of the site has the potential to impact negatively on neighbouring amenity.

4.4 Provision Quality of Accommodation

- The temporary nature of the housing and provision of communal facilities can help justify a reduction in the scale of units to below standard London Plan requirements for conventional housing. Concerns that the scale and layout of the smallest unit types offer limited quality/flexibility and recommend that these are replaced with the more larger unit types where possible.
- Need to demonstrate sufficient provision on on-site communal facilities within the building: lounge / washing facilities etc
- The mix of unit types, which would be 1, 2 & 3 bed units will be driven by the Housing Team and the identified need.

- Need to demonstrate that adequate light can be provided to all units and equally that the scale of the scheme does not adversely affect the light to any nearby residential properties.
- Need to demonstrate that there is satisfactory levels of communal amenity space/playspace for the future occupiers including details of quality of provision for all ages of children and parents, given level of occupation and likely stay length.

4.5 Parking and Servicing

- Consideration of parking, access and servicing issues required and any proposed loss of street parking is likely to be of particular relevance.
- The number car parking spaces for the emergency housing should be justified, we would support a reduction in this quantum if the brief allows.
- A Transport Assessment including parking surveys of the surrounding area will be required.
- A cycle strategy should be provided.

4.6 Landscape

- Landscape proposals should be developed from the outset to input at a strategic level and a landscape strategy for the perimeter parking/verge areas as well as the courtyard will be important.
- An Urban Green Factor calculation should be considered at outset.
- A SUDS strategy should be provided.
- Child yield/play requirements should be provided to demonstrate how London Plan standards can be adhered to.

4.7 Energy and Sustainability

- An overheating strategy should be provided particularly with regard to single aspect south facing units. The lack of balconies means that alternative methods of solar shading are likely to be necessary.
- Indicative wall thicknesses and corresponding U-Values should be provided for discussion at pre-application stage.

- Further information on the renewable energy strategy required as the scheme develops including demonstration of sufficient plant space.

4.6 **Quality Review Panel (QRP) Comments**

- The proposal was presented to the Havering Quality Review Panel on 15th June 2021. Members should note that the proposal being presented to them now may have changed to reflect the QRP's comments. The following comments were made by the QRP:
 - Panel feels that this is a promising scheme and the proposals represent a dramatic improvement on the existing hostel on the site. Massing and heights are appropriate, but panel feels that a more suburban form could be considered within this setting. Panel particularly supportive of the decision to arrange the building around a central communal courtyard, which it feels will be a significant asset, and urges the design team to consider carefully how it could be integrated more fully with how the rest of the building is used. Designing in movement through the space would help and panel suggest that a single storey building at the eastern end of the courtyard would help to achieve this and also provide much-needed additional space within what is a highly congested scheme: panel would like to be reassured that the site is capable of successfully accommodating so many families, albeit temporarily. More work therefore is needed on landscape and amenity space. The proposed approach to the environmental performance of the scheme, particularly with regard to energy, also requires further development.
 - Panel feels that the scheme's architecture and materiality are developing well. The massing and heights of the scheme work well, but the form could be broken up somewhat to give the scheme a more appropriate, suburban character.
 - Panel feels that the arrangement of the units is largely successful, and it welcomes the separation of the entrance from the bedrooms. They note that space within all of the units is necessarily tight, but that this is exacerbated within the larger, flexible units that can be adapted to increase the number of bed spaces without a corresponding increase in the amount of living space. The panel would like to see an assessment of the capacity of these units to accommodate activities, such as homework, and consideration given to increasing their size where possible.
 - Half of the units have no relationship with the courtyard, and there are a lot of single aspect units facing north, and some facing south. There is potential for providing dual aspect units and the panel would like to see this explored.

- The provision of glazing at the ends of corridors, to allow for natural lighting, is well-intentioned, but the panel feels that this limits the potential for larger, dual aspect units here. It suggests that on top floors, the corridor could instead be lit by sky lights, allowing for larger units on these floors.
- The panel feels that the internal corridors could feel institutional, and the panel would like to see the design team take every opportunity to introduce moments of delight, with inviting spaces for people to linger and seek respite. In particular, it feels that there is potential to reduce the number of cores, making them more generous and introducing courtyard views.
- While it recognises the constraints, the panel feels that there are potentially too many units on the site, without additional space being made available for retreat and respite, and for general amenity. Viewing the scheme within the context of the wider masterplan could offer potential solutions.
- Communal courtyard is a significant asset to the scheme, but panel feels that further thought should be given to ways in which this space could be better activated and integrated into the building, allowing for increased opportunities for residents to interact in informal settings. The landscape design should be developed to consider the differing needs of residents including spaces of calm as well as spaces for play and socialising -
- E.g., panel suggests opening up the gallery to the courtyard, and locating facilities and circulation routes that necessitate or encourage movement through the space, whilst a free standing, single storey building could be provided at the eastern end of the courtyard to house additional internal amenity, such as space where children could do their homework in relative peace, a communal kitchen and/or lounge.
- Panel notes that there will be a lot of children resident within the scheme, albeit on a temporary basis, with very limited play space available. Potential to create a degree of conflict over the use of the amenity space available, which will require careful design to accommodate the diverse demands placed up on it.
- Given pressures on amenity space, consideration be given to the potential for using some of the roof space for this purpose, where other uses (such as greening and energy generation) allow.
- Similarly, further consideration given to the potential for providing balconies to the units, in order to create additional amenity space for residents, where this is cost-effective.
- Pleased that early consideration has been given to the street landscape, which it feels will be critical to the success of the scheme and the wider masterplan.

- Proposed courtyard is a promising element of the scheme but, given the number of residents anticipated, it is likely to be heavily used. Would like to see the courtyard divided into different 'rooms' that can allow for quieter enjoyment as well as more active use.
- Proposed medical centre will have an awkward relationship with the courtyard and activating the ground floor elevation to Hildene Avenue will be challenging; integrating the proposed car parking will also require careful treatment.
- Landscape architect should be appointed early on to help ensure the full potential of both courtyard and wider public realm is realised, particularly around the residential entrance.
- Early thought to issues around sustainable energy, water and drainage, and to move quickly to establish their ambitions for the scheme's environmental performance.
- Pleased proposal is already considering the whole-life carbon of scheme, and welcome intention to use modern methods of construction (MMC) to mitigate this.
- Recognises that it may not be feasible to reuse the existing buildings, consideration should be given to reuse of existing substructures, as well as the reuse of waste materials.
- Panel notes the early analysis of daylight and overshadowing, and welcomes intention to set back windows to provide some integrated solar shading. However, the south-facing, single aspect units will need particular attention in this regard and would also benefit from some noise buffering to mitigate the impact of Hildene Avenue.
- Scheme should be considered in relation to the wider masterplan, both in terms of its character but also with regard to the capacity of the site. E.g., play and amenity space could be provided within Farnham Road, which could also be designed as a safe and attractive route to the park and wider area.
- Clarity needed on the connections beyond the site to public transport routes, cycle networks and existing green space, such as Harold Hill Central Park, which will provide important amenity and play space, particularly for older children.
- Operational and servicing requirements of building will likely result in extensive blank façades at ground floor, particularly along the northern elevation and around the health centre. Design needs to consider carefully how these are treated to activate the adjacent streets.

4.7 Other Planning Issues

The proposal would attract Section 106 contributions to mitigate the impact of the development, covering the following:

- Improvements to public realm (particularly pedestrian spaces/highway in the vicinity of the site – including Liveable Neighbourhoods)
- Transport improvements including: cycling, public transport, CPZ
- Carbon Offset Contribution

The proposal would be subject to the Mayoral and Havering Community Infrastructure Levy contributions to mitigate the impact of the development but subject to relief based on existing and proposed uses.

Other considerations include:

- Sustainable design and construction measures;
- Secured by Design
- Preventing Anti-Social Behaviour
- Mitigation of noise from plant and servicing

Summary of Issues

4.8 Officers have discussed the following matters with the applicant team and Members may wish to comment in relation to these points in addition to any other comments/questions that they may wish to raise:

- Principal of Development
- Form and Massing
- Quality of Accommodation
- Transport
- Landscape
- Energy and Sustainability

Conclusion

4.9 The proposals are still at pre-application stage and input from Members would help to influence the final details of any development. There are some aspects that require further work as identified in this report and Members' guidance will be most helpful to incorporate as the various elements are brought together.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 7

Applications for Decision

Introduction

1. In this part of the agenda are reports on 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 Adopted March 2021
 - 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 where there are registered public speakers:

- a. Officer introduction of the development
 - b. Registered Objector(s) speaking slot (3 minutes)
 - c. Responding Applicant speaking slot (3 minutes)
 - d. Ward Councillor(s) speaking slots (3 minutes)
 - e. Officer presentation of the material planning considerations
 - f. Committee questions and debate
 - g. Committee decision
16. The items on this part of the agenda will run as follows where there are no public speakers:
- a. Where requested by the Chairman, officer presentation of the main issues
 - b. Committee questions and debate
 - c. Committee decision


Late information

17. 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

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

This page is intentionally left blank

 Havering LONDON BOROUGH	Strategic Planning Committee 7 October 2021
---	--

Application Reference:	P0284.21
Location:	Beam Park (Phase 2A), Former Ford Assembly Plant Site, Dagenham and Rainham
Ward:	South Hornchurch
Description:	‘Drop in’ full planning application for the redevelopment of Block Y (formerly Plot 16) and Block I within Phase 2A of the wider Beam Park Masterplan Permission Ref: P1125.19 to provide for 190 residential units (minimum 59% affordable) within a residential block (Block Y) comprising of part 4, part 5, part 8 and part 10-storeys, and a residential block (Block I) comprising of part 4, part 5 and part 8-storeys, along with associated open space; landscaping; flood compensation area; car and cycle parking and highway works.
Case Officer:	John Kaimakamis
Reason for Report to Committee:	The application is of strategic importance and contained within a consented wider application site area within both the London Borough of Barking and Havering boundaries.

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 are able to secure a development that would make an important contribution to housing delivery within the

Borough by securing up to 190 units with 59% affordable housing units as an isolated site as part of the wider Beam Park Masterplan permission.

- 1.2 The approach to site layout, height and massing represents an acceptable approach given the location of the site. This initial scale and design was also reviewed by Members of the Strategic Planning Committee and the Council's Quality Review Panel.
- 1.3 The application seeks planning permission for the redevelopment to provide for 190 residential units (minimum 59% affordable) within a residential block (Block Y) comprising of part 4, part 5, part 8 and part 10-storeys, and a residential block (Block I) comprising of part 4, part 5 and part 8-storeys.
- 1.4 The proposals would have public benefits in making a contribution towards meeting the above targets for net additional housing provision, including various affordable housing tenures. As such, the principle of a residential-led scheme on the site is considered appropriate subject to compliance with all relevant policies of the development plan.
- 1.5 Other benefits include the provision of modern residential accommodation, improved design quality of the streets and public open spaces, and associated pedestrian and cycle improvements.
- 1.6 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 is recommended for approval.

2 RECOMMENDATION

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

Any direction by the London Mayor pursuant to the Mayor of London Order, and the prior completion of a Legal Agreement pursuant to s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), including any required deed of variation under s106A to the original legal agreement, and all other enabling and other enabling powers, with the following Heads of Terms:

- Early and late Stage Viability Review Mechanisms for affordable housing provision attached.
- Affordable housing (113 units), consisting of Affordable Rent (24 units), London Living Rent (29 units) and Shared Ownership (60 units).
- Affordable housing rent levels secured
- Shared ownership units maximum combined income £90,000

- Shared ownership annual housing cost no more than 40% of value
- Affordable housing breakdown and unit location
- Carbon offset fund contribution in respect of shortfall to achieve a 100% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions compared to Part L of the Building Regulations 2013, such sum calculated at ninety-five pounds (£95.00) per tonne that falls below the 100% threshold, for a period of 30 years, duly Indexed,
- Highways contribution for amendments to CPZ.
- Active transport contribution towards Beam Park Framework
- Subsequent uplifts in all transport contributions and necessary changes to triggers for payment
- Car free restriction on obtaining parking permits in existing and future Controlled Parking Zones/s to be secured by agreement pursuant to Section 16 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974
- Reasonable legal fees for the drafting and negotiation of the deed whether or not it goes to completion
- S106 monitoring fee towards the Council costs of monitoring compliance with the deed.
- All contribution sums to be indexed.

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 30th May 2022 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 of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

Conditions

1. Time Limit of Implementation
2. Approved Plans
3. Approval of Materials
4. Access Arrangements
5. Accessibility and Management Plan - Residential
6. Accessibility of Public Realm
7. Car and cycle park management plan
8. Occupier Cycle Parking
9. Visitor Cycle Parking
10. Travel Plan
11. Site Levels
12. Secure by Design
13. Accessibility and Adaptability
14. Provision of Amenity Space

15. Refuse Storage and Segregation for Recycling
16. Carbon Reduction- Residential
17. Energy compliance
18. Photovoltaic panels – Energy hierarchy
19. Energy Efficiency
20. Overheating
21. Ecology and Landscape Management Plan
22. Landscaping, public realm, play space and boundary treatments
23. Living Roofs
24. Nesting Birds and Bat Roosts
25. Protection of Trees
26. Vegetation Clearance
27. Examination of Trees for Bats
28. Air Quality Assessment
29. Boiler and Combined Heat Power
30. Noise Assessment
31. Lighting Strategy- Phase 2 River Beam Interface
32. Flood Risk
33. River Beam Buffer Zone
34. Sustainable Urban Drainage
35. Drainage Strategy
36. Drainage Maintenance
37. Piling Method Statement
38. Non-Road Mobile Plant and Machinery (“NRMM”)
39. Oil Interceptors
40. Contamination Remediation Scheme (enabling works)
41. Remediation Scheme (enabling)
42. Unexpected Contamination
43. Borehole Management
44. Construction Environmental Management Plan
45. Demolition and Construction Hours
46. Piling Vibration
47. Written Scheme of Investigation
48. Foundation Design
49. Permitted Development
50. Satellite Dishes
51. Fire Safety
52. Bird Hazard Management Plan
53. Outline Delivery and servicing plan for residential uses
54. Glare
55. Cranes
56. Family Housing
57. Parking
58. Urban Greening Factor

Informatives

1. Planning obligations
2. Phases planning permission
3. Street naming and numbering

4. Thames Water
5. Lighting
6. Environmental Health – Gas
7. Written scheme of investigation
8. London Fire Bridge
9. Network Rail
10. Contaminated land
11. Refuse
12. Deemed discharge
13. Pre-commencement conditions
14. Highway legislation
15. Temporary use of the public highway
16. Adoption of roads
17. Surface water management
18. Highway approval required
19. Secure by design
20. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
21. NPPF positive and proactive

3. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 3.1 The wider Beam Park site comprises 31.5 hectares (77.8 acres) of vacant, former industrial land to the north of the A13 and south of the A1306, which straddles the boundary between the London Boroughs of Barking & Dagenham and Havering, with the border of the boroughs broadly demarcated by the Beam River, which runs north to south. The majority of the site is covered in hardstanding and there is some gas infrastructure, including a pressure reduction station and underground gas mains, running across the site.
- 3.2 The original hybrid application under planning reference P12452.17 was subject to a resolution to refuse planning permission by the Regulatory Services Committee on March 15th 2018. However, the application was later called-in and formally determined by the Greater London Authority in February 2019. Planning permission was granted for 3,000 residential units (50% affordable); two 3 form entry primary schools and nursery; supporting uses; railway station; and other associated works.
- 3.3 The current application relates to a part of the wider site, specifically within Phase 2a, whereby it comprises changes to two of the four plots within this phase: Plot 16 (which was consented to comprise 16 three-storey dwellings) and renamed new Block Y, and Block I (which was consented to comprise an apartment block with 70 units).

- 3.4 The site is currently served only by buses on New Road and has a PTAL of 2. However, the wider Beam Park masterplan permission secured improvements to the bus services and the construction of a new station ('Beam Park station') on the London, Tilbury and Southend rail line between Fenchurch Street, via Barking, to South Essex, which are expected to improve PTAL to at least level 3. The original planning permission is subject to a condition that limits the proposal to 3 out of the indicated 8 phases until the station is operational.

4 PROPOSAL

- 4.1 Full planning permission is sought to amend Plot 16 and Block I of the masterplan approved under P1125.19 to introduce 99 additional units (for a total of 190 units, instead of 91), by:
- Replacing 16 three-storey dwellings on Plot 16 with a 4-10 storey apartment block (Block Y) containing 111 units; and
 - Increasing the height of Block I from 4-6 storeys to 4-8 storeys to provide 9 additional units (for a total of 79 units).

5 PLANNING HISTORY

- 5.1 The following planning applications are relevant to the site:
- **P0290.18:** Cross boundary planning application for enabling works of Phase 2 of the wider Beam Park site to prepare it for development, including clearing of on-site structures, addressing contamination, importation and positioning of crushed material on site for up to 24 months (preventing future settlement), localised piling and installation of band drainage.
Committee Approval with conditions, August 2018
 - **P1242.17:** Cross boundary hybrid planning application for the redevelopment of the site to include residential (50% affordable); two primary schools and nursery (Use Class D1); railway station; supporting uses including retail, healthcare, multi faith worship space, leisure, community uses and management space (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, D1 and D2); energy centres; open space with localised flood lighting; public realm with hard and soft landscaping; children's play space; flood compensation areas; car and cycle parking; highway works and site preparation/ enabling works (UPDATED AUGUST 2018) – ***Approved subject to S106 and conditions, February 2019 (GLA Ref: GLA/2933a/05)(LBBD ref: 17/01307/OUT).***

- **P0359.18:** A cross border application seeking temporary permission for a two storey building to accommodate a marketing suite and development management office with connected illuminated signage, with free standing show home (3 storey) and new pedestrian bridge along with associated access, car parking, landscaping, bridge improvement, boundary treatment and engineering works – **Approved, May 2018**
- **K0002.19:** Reserved matters application relative to phase 2A of the Beam Park development connected to hybrid planning permission GLA2933a/, LBBD 17/01307/OUT, LBH P1242.17, seeking agreement to details site access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale GLA ref: GLA/2933a/RMA2a – **Approved by Greater London Authority December 2019**
- **P1125.19:** Variation of conditions 5 (Approved Plans) 7 (Phasing Plan) and 33 (Landscaping) of planning permission P1242.17 (GLA Ref: GLA/2933a/05) to allow amendments to the site area located within the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham. No changes are proposed within London Borough of Havering's site area – **Approved subject to Deed of Variation to S106 and conditions January 2020**
- **P0498.19:** Temporary change of use permission for Beam Park marketing suite with associated parking and access arrangements as linked to Beam Park Masterplan – **Approved subject to conditions, June 2020**
- **P1896.20:** Application for reserved matters seeking approval of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of a 2 form entry Primary School together with a 30 place FTE nursery, 12 place Additional Resource Provision, a MUGA and informal play space – **Approved subject to conditions and legal agreement, July 2021.**
- **P0242.21:** Variation of Condition No. 4 (Approved Plans) of Planning Permission P1125.19 dated 15/01/2020 to amend parameters and associated drawings to enable insertion of an additional floor to Block T – **SPC resolution to grant consent subject to conditions and legal agreement, awaiting signing of legal agreement.**
- **P0278.21:** Reserved matters application, associated with Block T within Phase 2A of the Beam Park development as approved by amended hybrid planning permission seeking agreement to appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and access – **Under consideration.**

6 STATUTORY CONSULTATION RESPONSE

6.1 A summary of consultation responses are detailed below:

- **Historic England (GLASS):** Conditions are recommended in line with original masterplan consent.
- **Greater London Authority (Stage 1):** The proposals are broadly supported in principle but further information and clarifications are required to ensure compliance with the London Plan. These matters relate to the matters below:
 - The proposed 3% increase of residential units within the wider Beam Park site from the originally consented 3,000 units of the masterplan to 3,099 would further optimise housing delivery on this site and is supported, subject to confirmation that infrastructure provided by the masterplan scheme is sufficient, or will be suitably upgraded, to account for the increased housing.
 - The proposed amendments to two sites within Phase 2A would result in an uplift of 99 residential units, of which 43 would be affordable. The Council must confirm the unit numbers that have been approved through the submission of affordable housing schemes. The proposed revisions to the housing mix would be acceptable, as they would meet the wider masterplan S106 requirements.
 - Havering's Local Plan does not identify the application site as suitable for tall buildings and the application does not strictly comply with London Plan Policy D9(B3). GLA officers will consider the material considerations in favour of the proposed tall buildings at this site, along with the wider public benefits of the scheme and relevant development plan policies, in the balance against this issue on non-compliance at the Mayor's decision-making stage. In other respects, the design approach is generally supported. A revised fire statement must be submitted in accordance with Policy D12 and D5(B5) of the London Plan.
 - Car parking should be reduced and the proposed parking management plan should be revised. In addition, the quality of the proposed cycle parking should be improved. The monetary value of all contributions should be increased in proportion to the uplift in residential units, as well as the usual indexation.
 - The extant consent is subject to a Grampian condition that restricts occupation beyond Phase 3 before the station is constructed and operational, because it was considered that units beyond that cap would have unacceptable impacts on the transport network. The proposed increase on Phase 2A would not have an impact on that cap.

- Revisions to the proposals to reduce car parking and vehicle movements are necessary to improve the air quality impacts of the scheme. Additionally, revisions to the air quality assessment and mitigation measures are required in order to meet the requirements of London Plan Policy SI1(B). Other issues on energy, whole life-cycle carbon assessment, and circular economy also require resolution.
- **Environment Agency:** No objection.
- **London Underground:** No comments.
- **Network Rail:** No representation received.
- **Thames Water:** No objection subject to Ground Water Risk Permit informative.
- **Natural England:** No objections and considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites or landscapes.
- **London Fire Brigade:** No objection. No further fire hydrants required.
- **London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority:** No objection subject to compliance with following requirements:-
 - Firefighting lift installed in blocks;
 - Wet rising main to be provided in the firefighting shaft (within 18 metres of appliance parking position);
 - Sprinkler system to be installed in accordance with BS9251:2005; dry raising main in south east stairwell (inlet within 18 metre of appliance).
- **Metropolitan Police Secure by Design Officer:** No objection subject to the attachment of secured by design conditions and informative.
- **LBH Environmental Health (Land Contamination, noise, air quality):** No objection subject to conditions governing contaminated land, air quality neutral, residential boilers, non-road mobile machinery, noise and sound insulation.
- **LBH Highways:** No objection subject to conditions, legal obligations and informatives being applied: restricted CPZ to be introduced for application area, construction logistics plan, cycle storage, vehicle access, vehicle cleansing, restrictions on parking permits, controlled parking zone contribution.

- **LBH Refuse Officer:** No objection. URS guidance is currently being developed.
- **LBH Flood Officer:** No objection. The proposed Flood Risk Assessment and Strategy is acceptable.

7 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- 7.1 In accordance with planning legislation, the developer has consulted the local community on these proposals as part of the pre-application process and this has been detailed in the submitted Statement of Community Involvement.

8 PREAPPLICATION DISCUSSIONS

Quality Review Panel (QRP) Comments

- 8.1 The application was presented to the QRP for comments on the 18th March 2020. Final comments received from the panel were as follows:
- Panel unconvinced by rationale for increasing height and massing of Blocks Y and I, where the framing effect is far less effective and questions whether primary consideration here is one of viability rather than improving quality of the scheme.
 - The increased height and massing of Blocks Y and I will have a negative impact on housing immediately to their north and on the wider public realm.
 - Impact goes beyond daylight to the units themselves, which has been modelled, but also includes overshadowing of public spaces, wind effects and visual intrusion.
 - Officers should seek reassurance that these impacts have been fully considered as to whether heights are acceptable.
 - Level changes, road and gas pressure-reducing station significantly impact upon the quality of the central park and urge the design team to think further about mitigating these impacts and ensuring better connectivity.
 - Absence of clear and comfortable link between south garden and central park is missed opportunity, which undermines the connectivity of the scheme and risks creating an underused and fragmented public realm.
 - Concerned about the quality of connecting route along the southern edge of site, from the underpass beneath Thames Avenue towards the station. Could be mitigated by pulling back the wings of Block I in order to create a wider, more appealing green route.

- Recognises that Thames Avenue, the gas pressure-reducing station and the necessary change of levels create real constraints within the public realm. These constraints require a very high quality response in order to mitigate their impact. Panel feel strongly that the tightly-drawn red line needs to be relaxed to bring in those areas of public space adjacent to the proposed buildings, in order to achieve a higher quality environment in these areas, especially around the park and the gas facility.
- Ground floor uses of Block Y are critical to making an attractive, useable public realm at this junction, and the current proposals do not go far enough in activating the building frontage. This is particularly important where the buildings face onto the new south garden and the southern connecting route to the new station.
- Southern elevation should feel like the front of a building, rather than a back.
- Ground floor units look out onto car parking and the panel feels that these areas in particular need to be designed to the highest standard.
- Additional attention should be given to improving the space between the gas facility and Block Y, in order to make people feel safe.
- Questions the extent to which a neighbourhood of this density is truly family-friendly. Main movement axes have very narrow pavements and the route to the south of Block Y is particularly constrained.
- Opportunities to increase pedestrian priority and improve the quality of the public realm across the phase as a whole should be taken, including pavements widths and materials, traffic slowing/calming measures, crossings, and shared surfaces.
- If the scheme is to be family-friendly, the public realm provided needs to do more to compensate for the increased density and the composition of streets and spaces becomes ever more critical.
- Architectural detailing and the materiality need further exploration. Insufficient differentiation between the form and materials of the villa blocks and the warehouse blocks, as panel feels are closer in language to point blocks than warehouses. Further thought should be given to the architectural response of the taller warehouse point blocks to the housing at the centre of the scheme, giving as much attention to this transition as has been given to the east-west transition.
- Additional play space in the south garden, while welcome, risks being unsuccessful because the change in levels and the bund protecting the railway create something of a sunken hollow, which is already poorly overlooked and isolated. The play space is cut off from both the residential units and the central park by highways and car parking. Encourage further thought about the location and quality of play space.

- Concerns about the reduction in the proportion and quantum of family housing within this phase. Even if the absolute numbers of family units are not to be reduced, the change in proportion will impact on the character of the place. 3-bed units may be occupied by sharers rather than by families, changing the demographic mix of the new neighbourhood – and its ability to respond to Havering’s housing needs.
- Phasing of construction will be critically important to the success of the new neighbourhood. Rigorous strategy should be set out to avoid disruption to early residents, and exploring fully the potential for modern methods of construction, including off-site fabrication.

8.2 The proposals have evolved considerably since being presented to the QRP on the 18th March 2020. A number of positive changes have been incorporated into the final scheme prior to submission, as well as further amendments post SPC Developer Presentation with the council’s design officers. This included reducing proposals so that only part of one block had a maximum 10-storeys to the green space and the other maximums were at 8-storeys with retaining elements that step down to 4/5 storeys to form an acceptable relationship with neighbouring houses. Other changes saw improvements to the public realm from the consented Masterplan including the provision of some shared surfaces to increase priority for pedestrians and increased passive observation to the pedestrian route running along the railway line. The changes also help to make the central park area more accessible by interspacing some of the parking with tree planting and pedestrian routes. Further, family housing has been provided to meet the minimum amounts secured by condition under the original Masterplan. As such the scheme has evolved with positive changes following the Quality Review Panel in order to address comments that were made.

Strategic Planning Committee Developer Presentation Feedback (9th July 2020)

8.3 A summary of comments received by the Committee were as follows:

- The proposed heights for Block I and Y do not relate to the site. The justification that the increase is aimed at ‘equalising’ the blocks so they relate to the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham’s Area is not justification in itself. This did not form part of the design considerations under the original scheme.
- Members felt that the proposed increase to the Blocks have not been properly justified. However are further out of character to the community on the other side of New Road.
- Concern was raised in regards to the proposed drastic reduction in family housing as this does not comply with the emerging Local Plan which asks for increased family units, or the existing Beam Park Masterplan provision.

- The loss of houses to apartments does not contribute towards the promised vision of a 'garden suburb'
- The introduction of Blocks would result in an inner city urban landscape and further erodes the family friendly community.
- The proposed parking reduction together with the proposed increase in occupiers would result in further parking pressures.
- Further details are required on the wider implications of the proposed changes as they relate to overshadowing, walkways etc.
- Members suggested that a further developer's presentation was required following further design work to address the above

8.4 As highlighted in Paragraph 8.2, a number of positive changes have been incorporated into the final scheme prior to submission, as well as further amendments post SPC Developer Presentation with the council's design officers. These changes related to reductions in massing and height, public realm improvements, and meeting the original Masterplan objectives for family housing.

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 1019 neighbouring properties being notified of the application and invited to comment. Comments have been received from 10 neighbours.

9.3 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- None

9.4 The following Councillor(s) made representations:

- None.

9.5 The following neighbour representations were received:

- 10 objectors
- 0 comments.
- 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

- Concerns raised that this will only exacerbate the eyesore already being built.
- Overdevelopment with as many flats being provided as possible.
- Querying whether sprinkler systems provided to the new buildings.
- Lack of car parking being provided and development will lead to congestion on the local roads.
- The housing being provided is not affordable.
- Buildings already constructed in Beam Park resembling a ghetto and more akin to central London areas rather than the garden suburb promised.
- Light being blocked in lower sunlight months of the year.
- Development would lead to overcrowding with more people and cars and as a result more noise.
- Concerns buildings in Phase 2 will block light to future residents of Phase 1.
- More family housing should be provided in place of high rise buildings.
- Proposal leading the way for Beam Park to become a high rise estate.
- Increased population would have a negative bearing on infrastructure services.
- Proposal would lead to an invasion of privacy.

Support

- None.

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.

- Phase 1 property owner purchased on the understanding there would be no further towers and could impact on selling the property in the future.
- Cost of private flats on Phase 1 not affordable prices.

Procedural issues

- 9.8 No procedural issues were raised in representations.

10 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)

- 10.1 The current drop-in planning application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement. The environmental information for the purposes of the applicable Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations has been taken into account in the consideration of this application.

11 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 11.1 The main planning considerations are considered to be as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Design and Tall Buildings Considerations
- Quality of residential accommodation
- Inclusive Design
- Secured by Design
- Density
- Housing Mix
- Affordable Housing and Viability
- Open Space and Children's Play Space
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenity
- Environmental Issues
- Transport and Highways
- Energy and Sustainability
- Flooding, Drainage and Urban Greening Factor
- Community Infrastructure Levy

Principle of Development

- 11.2 Policy H1 of the London Plan seeks to optimise potential housing delivery across London, particularly through higher density residential development on brownfield sites with good existing or planned access to public transport and within walking distances of stations and town centres, including through the use of sensitive intensification of existing residential areas. The London Plan has set a 10-year housing target of 12,850 homes a year for the period between 2019/20 to 2028/29.
- 11.3 Policy CP1 of the Havering Core Strategy aims to meet a minimum housing supply of 535 within Havering by prioritising the development of brownfield land and ensuring these sites are used as efficiently as possible. The wider application site is allocated in both Havering Council's Site Allocation DPD, in the draft Havering Local Plan and in Barking & Dagenham Council's Site

Allocation DPD, to provide up to 3000 homes, two schools, a new railway station, retail, community and health uses.

- 11.4 The principle of a mixed-use redevelopment of this brownfield site has already been established under Planning Permission Reference P1242.17 and subsequently as amended by S73 Planning Permission Reference P1125.19.
- 11.5 The current proposal seeks to increase the number of residential units by 99 on two specific plots within Phase 2A of the Masterplan. Specifically, this includes an increase in massing to Block I and replacing the previously consented terraced housing on was previously called Plot 16 with a flatted apartment block and now labelled as Block Y. The proposals would therefore increase the total number of units that would be provided on the wider Beam Park site from 3,000 to 3,099.
- 11.6 The provision of additional housing is consistent with the NPPF and Policy CP1 and therefore the proposal is acceptable in principle in land use terms. Notwithstanding, the acceptability of the proposal is subject to consideration of the detailed impacts of the development and these are discussed in turn below. This also includes matters relating to the existing s106 of the wider Masterplan site, the relevant CIL contributions and the infrastructure throughout the site, as infrastructure contributions will be required to be proportionately uplifted, as appropriate given the increased in quantum to 3099 residential units.

Design and Tall Buildings Assessment

- 11.7 The site layout principles of the originally consented Masterplan were based on the Council's Rainham and Beam Park Planning Framework and the urban design strategy in the London Riverside OAPF. The scheme was based on a simple grid layout with a perpendicular street pattern with the building line setback from New Road to contribute towards the aspiration to turn this route into a linear park with improved cycle and pedestrian connections. The main east-west route through the site consisted of a landscape green route adjacent to the Beam River and connecting the two boroughs with a pedestrian friendly route.
- 11.8 The building heights strategy was based upon locating the taller elements and mixed use blocks towards the eastern and western ends of the wider site whereby the would be closest to Beam Park and Dagenham Dock stations. Within the new local centre, building heights were approved between 6 to 16-storesys in the area closest to the station. The apartment blocks along New Road and the southern boundary still relatively close to the stations were consented

between 5 and 8-storeys. The remainder of the site towards the centre and Beam Park open space consisted of 2 to 3-storey houses.

- 11.9 A variety of building typologies were secured all utilizing a material palette of predominantly brick. Courtyard podium blocks were proposed along the western and southern boundaries, which had a warehouse style to reference the industrial character to the south.
- 11.10 Development Plan policies seek to secure sustainable development that is of high quality and contributes towards local character, legibility, permeability and accessibility of the neighbourhood. Developments should contribute to people's sense of place, safety and security. Development should have regard to the pattern and grain of spaces and streets in orientation, scale, proportion and mass and be human in scale with street level activity.
- 11.11 The delivery of high quality design is a key objective of the planning system which is to contribute to achieving sustainable development as supported by the NPPF. Sustainable development is further described as including positive improvements in the quality of the built and historic environments including but not limited to replacing poor design with better design. A core planning principle of the NPPF is to always seek to secure high quality design.
- 11.12 NPPF Chapter 12 'Achieving well-designed places' reinforces that this is a key aspect of sustainable development and indivisible from good planning and should contribute positively to making places better for people. Chapter 7 also confirms that high quality design includes consideration of individual buildings, public and private spaces. Policies and decisions should ensure that development amongst other things, responds to local character and history and reflects the identity of local surroundings and materials, whilst not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation. Also, that they are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.
- 11.13 At a local level, Policy CP17 of the Havering Core Strategy requires new development maintain or improve the character and appearance of the local area in its scale and design, whilst CP18 states that all new development affecting sites, buildings, townscapes and landscapes of special architectural, historical or archaeological importance must preserve or enhance their character or appearance. These are reinforced by Policies DC61 (Urban Design), DC63 (Delivering Safer Places) and DC66 (Tall Buildings and Structures) of the Havering Development Control Policies.
- 11.14 The approved Beam Park Masterplan has many positive aspects and design and planning officers believe it has the potential to deliver relatively high quality places to live. Therefore, it is considered that justification is required to support any uplift in accommodation proposed for Phase 2A. During the course of the

pre-application process, officers and the QRP explored where height increases should be limited and opportunities to improve the quality of the public realm.

- 11.15 The initial proposals at pre-application stage for the uplift in accommodation, were not considered acceptable by officers as the proposed blocks of 10, 11 and 13-storeys along the railway edge could not be justified – given that the logic of stepping down massing away from the new Beam Park Station would have been lost. However, officers and QRP Members conceded that Plot Y, with relatively open aspects to the central park area and rail track had potential to accommodate some increase in density. The justification provided by the applicant regarding the advantages of some increased enclosure and passive observation to the green space help to support this argument. Previous concerns had been raised by officers on the masterplan about the area around the underpass and gas works next to Plot Y having the potential to attract antisocial behaviour. Therefore potential benefits of increased activity associated with higher density housing are recognised.
- 11.16 It is considered that the revised proposals and under consideration in this application for a maximum of 10-storeys to the green space and 8-storeys to the remaining blocks represent a reasonable compromise. Retaining elements that step down to 4/5-storeys helps to create an acceptable relationship with neighbouring houses. Improvements to the public realm on the approved Masterplan include the provision of some shared surfaces to increase priority for pedestrians and increased passive observation to the pedestrian route running along the railway line. These are recognised as significant advantages given that these routes are likely to be used regularly by children attending the new Primary School. The updated proposals also help to make the central park area more accessible by interspacing some of the parking with tree planting and pedestrian routes, in response to QRP comments.
- 11.17 Therefore the broad layout principles are consistent with the established masterplan parameters, as the proposed tall Blocks I and Y are located along the southern boundary of the site where other consented tall blocks are present and provide an acoustic buffer from the adjoining railway line and A13. In addition, the massing of Blocks I and Y steps down towards the centre of the Beam Park site, which is coherent with the low-rise nature of this section of the masterplan. As such, it is considered that the proposed layout, design and masterplan principles would accord with both the strategic and local urban design policies set out above.
- 11.18 Design Codes and parameter plans were secured as part of the Masterplan permission, in order to ensure a holistic, high-quality design. Phase 2a comprises typologies and materials that were set out within the approved Design Code. The massing of Blocks I and Y have been designed in composition as cubic and warehouse typologies responding to the site context

and establishing a family of buildings with a common architectural language. These would contribute to the hierarchy of streets and experience of the public realm and would also share the same palette of materials to reinforce the sense of place. The appearance of these two Blocks within Phase 2a aligns with the Design Code and is supported as the proposed revisions have sought to retain and replicate the principles of the character areas throughout.

- 11.19 Subject to conditions requiring details and samples of all of the proposed materials, they are considered to suitably reference and complement the palette of materials in the surrounding area and are acceptable. Additionally, these conditions should ensure that lower quality materials such as composite type cladding and brick slips are not used, as these type of materials would undermine any quality attributed to the design. Consequently, a full size sample panel will be conditioned.
- 11.20 Overall, in terms of detailed architectural design, the proposals have been carefully considered and subject to the conditions outlined above, the proposal will achieve a high quality and appropriate design response which would enhance the character of the building and the surrounding area.

Tall Buildings Assessment

- 11.21 As noted above, the consented buildings as part of the wider Masterplan permission were for three-storey dwellings on Plot 16 (now New Block Y) and Block I which was 4-6 storeys.
- 11.22 The proposed building as part of the drop-in application seeks to replace Plot 16 with part 4, part 5, part 10-storey building and revise Block I to a part 4, part5, part 8-storey building.
- 11.23 Policy D9 of the London Plan states that tall buildings should be part of a planned and design-led approach, incorporating the highest standard of architecture and materials and should contribute to improving the legibility and permeability of an area, with active ground floor uses provided to ensure such buildings form an appropriate relationship with the surrounding public realm. Tall buildings should not have an unacceptably harmful impact on their surroundings in terms of their visual, functional, environmental and cumulative impacts, including wind, overshadowing, glare, strategic and local views and heritage assets.
- 11.24 The policy is clear that “Tall buildings shall only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans”.
- 11.25 Policy DC66 of the Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD states that only in Romford Town Centre will tall buildings (defined as six storeys or more than 18 metres) be normally granted permission and Policy ROM19 of the Romford Area Action Plan further sets out specific areas where

tall buildings may be acceptable – the application site lays outside of Romford Town Centre and the Romford Area Action Plan area.

- 11.26 Local Policy DC66 states that outside of the town centre, tall buildings may be granted permission in exceptional circumstances. The Policy does not explain what may be considered exceptional circumstances but goes on to outline criteria against which tall buildings must achieve. The justification for Policy DC66 explains that the criteria are derived from the London Plan 2008 – the version of the London Plan in force at the point of adoption of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The current London Plan was adopted earlier this year and therefore it is considered that the criteria part of Policy DC66 is inconsistent with the more recent plan and carries limited weight.
- 11.27 The proposal is for a couple of buildings up to 8 and 10-storeys in height that fall within the definition of a tall building. This is not an area for tall buildings identified in any adopted development plan and therefore the proposal is contrary to Policy D9 of the London Plan.
- 11.28 Nevertheless, the proposal must be seen in the context of the consented scheme across the wider Masterplan area, which includes buildings up to 16-storeys. Given that proposed tall Blocks I and Y are located along the southern boundary of the site where other consented tall blocks are present further to the east and west along the southern boundary, they provide an acoustic buffer from the adjoining railway line. Although the 8-10 storey heights are considered as tall buildings in policy terms, they would not sit out of character with the immediate Beam Park site and still offer a transition to the low-rise nature of the central part of the masterplan. Further, the two blocks under this proposal also contain 4-5 storey parts to the buildings in order to integrate better with the housing to the north of this part of Phase 2a.
- 11.29 The proposals maintain improvements to pedestrian permeability through the site as highlighted above, whilst public realm improvements and active frontages are proposed at ground level. The proposed buildings would provide a positive impact on longer distance views. Whilst the proposals would not be in conformity with the tall buildings policy, this must also be considered in the context of the public benefits of the scheme, as the proposals form part of a wider Masterplan seeking to improve the quality of housing. The proposed new buildings would result in an addition to an already varied townscape and will deliver an improvement to the skyline through its aspirational high quality design and appearance.
- 11.30 The submission includes an Environmental Statement that outlines the development would not have an adverse impact on the micro-climate, aviation and telecommunications. As mentioned above, the proposed new buildings would result in an addition to an already varied townscape and will deliver an

improvement to the skyline, whilst the proposals improve pedestrian permeability through the site with public realm improvements and active frontages are proposed at ground level.

- 11.31 Finally, subject to the materials conditions outlined above the aspiration to provide a high quality development could be achieved and as such the height and massing of the scheme would be acceptable.

Quality of residential accommodation

- 11.32 Policy D4 of the London Plan provides the minimum quantitative standards for private internal space, private outdoor space and floor to ceiling heights for all tenures of residential housing. Single aspect units should normally be avoided and only provided where these units would constitute a more appropriate design solution in terms of optimising the capacity of a particular site whilst ensuring good design. Potential issues associated with single aspect units in terms of passive ventilation, privacy, daylight, overheating and noise should also be adequately addressed and single aspect units that are north facing contain three or more bedrooms, or are exposed to significant adverse impacts should normally be avoided.
- 11.33 These requirements are also further elaborated within the Mayor's London Housing SPG. These set out a benchmark unit per core per floor ratios. Together these form the pivotal backbone for the quality of any future residential accommodation. The SPD details specific space standards for communal areas, storage, bathroom spaces and corridor widths.
- 11.34 New Block Y (formerly Plot 16) and revised Block I comprise of approximately 82% dual aspect units with the remaining amount single aspect. However, none of the 35 units that would be single aspect are north facing. Balconies and private terraces serve all units, while the core per floor ratio ranges from 3 to 8, with only one instance of 9 units per core on the second and third floors of Block Y. All units comply with the London Plan and the National Technical Housing Standards in terms of overall size, storage, communal space and bathroom size and as such are of an adequate quality.
- 11.35 The Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines provide a test for measuring the average daylight factor (ADF) within habitable rooms to understand the amount of daylight afforded to these spaces. An ADF of 5% is recommended for a well day lit space, 2% for partly lit, below 2% the room will likely be dull and require electric lighting. As a minimum, 1.5% ADF for living rooms is recommended. The proposal for new Block Y (formerly Plot 16) for 111 residential units and revised Block I for 79 units would total 190 residential units and consist of an overall total of 527 habitable rooms. A total of 89.6% of

rooms would meet the minimum targets set by the BRE guidelines. Given the constraints and density of the proposal the 55 out of 527 rooms that fall short of the ADF calculation would not warrant refusal.

- 11.36 Overall, given the density, design and layout of the blocks proposed, it is considered that the number of dual aspect units has been maximised with no north facing single aspects units. The layout consist relatively shallow floorplans and staggered/projecting elevations, and as such on balance the quality of the residential units would be satisfactory.

Inclusive Design and Fire Safety

- 11.37 Policy D5 of the London Plan requires that all new development achieves the highest standards of accessibility and inclusive design, ensuring they can be entered and used safely, easily and with dignity by all; are convenient and welcoming (with no disabling barriers); and, provide independent access without additional undue effort, separation or special treatment, whilst Policy DC7 of the Havering Development Control Policies seeks 10% of all new homes to be wheelchair accessible.
- 11.38 Further, Policy D6 of the London Plan seeks all new homes to meet the Building Regulations M4(2) standard for 'Accessible and adaptable dwellings' and 10% of the dwellings shall be designed to meet the M4(3) standard for 'Wheelchair user dwellings'.
- 11.39 Details submitted with the application demonstrate that the development could meet the above requirements. These details are to be secured by 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.
- 11.40 Further, details submitted with the application also demonstrate that the development would provide 10% wheelchair user units. Therefore the development would also comply with the provision of M4(3) and these details are also to be secured via the imposition of a condition.
- 11.41 In accordance with the London Plan Policy D12 on fire safety, the applicant submitted a fire statement, produced by a third party suitable qualified assessor. The strategy was amended during the course of the application to address the requirements of Policy D12 (B,1-6) and it is noted that information about the building's construction methods, products and materials used should be as specific as possible.
- 11.42 Further, Policy D5(B5) of the London Plan seeks to ensure that developments

incorporate safe and dignified emergency evacuation for all building users. In developments with lifts, as a minimum, at least one lift per core (or more subject to capacity assessments) should be suitably sized fire evacuation lifts capable of evacuating people who require level access from the buildings. It is noted that evacuation lifts should be provided in addition to Building Regulations requirements for firefighting shafts/lifts to ensure they can be used for evacuation purposes when the firefighting lift is in use by the fire and rescue service.

- 11.43 The applicant has provided a statement containing a declaration of compliance that the fire safety of the proposed development and the fire safety information satisfy the requirements of Policies D12(A) and D5(B5). Compliance with the revised fire statement submitted shall be secured through the imposition of a planning condition.

Secured by Design

- 11.44 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.
- 11.45 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.
- 11.46 In keeping with these policies officers have consulted the Metropolitan Police's Designing Out Crime team 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

- 11.47 The development seeks to provide 190 residential units on a site area of 1.2 hectares which equates to a density of 158 units per hectare. The site is currently served only by buses on New Road and has a PTAL of 2 (on a scale of 0 to 6b where 6b represents the highest level of public transport access). However, the wider Beam Park Masterplan secured improvements to the bus services and the construction of a new station ('Beam Park station'), which are expected to improve PTAL to at least level 3.
- 11.48 Policy DC2 of Havering's Development Control Policies specifies a density range of 165-275 units per hectare. Policies D1-D4 of the London Plan place greater emphasis on a design-led approach to ensure that development makes the best use of land with consideration given to site context, public transport, walking and cycling accessibility and the capacity of surrounding infrastructure.
- 11.49 In addition, policy CP1 states that the Council will prioritise the efficient development of brownfield land to help meet the Boroughs housing targets. While policy CP2 states that sustainable communities should be encouraged by "ensuring that the required sizes and types of new housing are of a density and design that is related to a site's access to current and future public transport and are compatible".
- 11.50 In this instance, the density varies across the different character areas across the wider Masterplan area. The plots along the southern boundary have densities varying between 92 – 188 units per hectare and the proposed uplift under this proposal for two blocks within Phase 2a would still come within that threshold. When considering the consented context and location along the southern boundary blocks, the public transport accessibility and uplift in housing numbers including affordable housing on the site, the site would be suitable for a higher density residential-led scheme. Overall, the proposals would optimise the development capacity of the site and as such the proposed density is considered acceptable.

Housing Mix

- 11.51 Policy DC2 of Havering's Development Control Policies sets out an indicative mix for market housing of 24% 1 bedroom units, 41% 2 bedroom units, and 34% 3 bedroom units. Policy 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) was informed by an extensive Housing Needs and Demands Assessment (2012), which suggested that 75% of the rented provision should be one or two bedroom accommodation and 25% three

or four bedrooms and for intermediate options, a recommended split of 40:40:20 for one, two and three bedroom accommodation.

- 11.52 The borough's housing needs have since been updated and there is a greater emphasis on family sized accommodation. Draft Policy 5 of the Havering Local Plan seeks a mix of 5% 1 bedroom units, 15% 2 bedroom units, 64% 3 bedroom units and 16% 4+ bedroom units for market housing. With regard to affordable housing, a mix of 10% 1 bedroom units, 40% 2 bedroom units, 40% 3 bedroom units and 10% 4+ bedroom units is sought. The draft policy does state that it would have regards individual site circumstances including location, site constraints, viability and the achievement of mixed and balanced communities.
- 11.53 Policy H10 of the London Plan states that new development should generally consist of a range of unit sizes and sets out a number of factors that should be considered when determining the appropriate housing mix on a particular scheme. This includes housing need, the requirement to deliver mixed and inclusive neighbourhoods, the nature and location of a site in relation to town centres and public transport access, the requirement to optimise housing potential, and the relationship between new build housing supply and demand within the existing stock.
- 11.54 Of the 190 total residential units proposed, 77 units would be private housing with a mix of 50% 1-bedroom units, 43% 2-bedroom units and 7% 3-bedroom units. The 24 affordable rent units would have a mix of 29% 1-bedroom units, 38% 2-bedroom units and 33% 3-bedroom units. The 89 shared ownership/London Living Rent units would have a mix of 36% 1-bedrooms, 39% 2-bedrooms and 25% 3-bedrooms. Overall, the housing mix would consist of 41% 1-bedrooms, 41% 2-bedrooms and 18% 3-bedrooms.
- 11.55 The proposed mix of tenures would have a shortfall of the suggested percentage of different sized units when compared against the indicative mix of Policy DC2 and Draft Policy 5 of the Local Havering Plan. However, it should be noted that previously the two blocks in question (Block I and former Plot 16) under the reserved matters consent for 91 residential units consisted only of shared ownership and Living London rent units. The current application to increase the amount of units from 91 to 190 residential units has seen introduction of further affordable rent and private market units to these blocks. The proposed housing mix must also be considered in the context of the mix across the entire 4 blocks of Phase 2a of the Masterplan. When taking into account the uplift in 99 units across the whole of Phase 2a, the housing mix would consist of 39% 1-bedrooms, 36% 2-bedrooms, 20% 3-bedrooms and 5% 4-bedrooms. The resultant housing mix would provide for a minimum of 25% family housing in all phases (except Phase 1) of the wider Beam Park site, as required by condition 77 in the original masterplan permission.

- 11.56 Furthermore, in this instance it is considered that the overall housing mix would provide a good mix of unit sizes and a range of housing typologies when taking into account the site's location within a wider Masterplan regeneration scheme, the public transport improvements that will arise from the infrastructure contributions as a result of the application and the fact that the proposal meets the 25% threshold of family accommodation achieved by the original permission. It should also be noted that the provision of further 3-bedroom units within the housing mix would potentially make the scheme even less viable than it currently stands as the 113 affordable units out of 190 may be further reduced.
- 11.57 As such, it is considered that the overall proposed mix of housing would be appropriate in this instance.

Affordable Housing and Viability

- 11.58 London Plan Policy H4 and the Mayor's Affordable Housing and Viability SPG set a strategic target of 50% affordable housing in all new developments. Policy CP2 of the Havering Core Strategy seeks to ensure that in total, borough-wide 50% of all homes from new residential planning permissions are affordable; of which 70% of affordable housing to be delivered as social/affordable rent and 30% as intermediate, to include London Living Rent and Shared Ownership. This is also sought as an aspiration to be achieved in Policy DC6 of Havering's Development Control Policies.
- 11.59 The current proposal for new Block Y (formerly Plot 16) and revised Block I when considered in isolation would provide for 113 out of 190 units as affordable units (59%). This would comprise of 24 units as Affordable Rent (21%), 29 units as London Living Rent (26%) and 60 units as Shared Ownership (53%). The provision of in excess of 50% negates the need for a Viability Assessment in accordance with the policy, whilst tenure mix would be a variation from the policy aspirations of both the Havering and London Plans, However it is considered that the current proposal must also be considered in light of the wider Masterplan permission.
- 11.60 In term of affordable housing, the Masterplan provided for 50% affordable housing across the eight phases, with additional clauses secured to ensure this is appropriately distributed across the Masterplan to require a minimum of 39% affordable housing in each phase and an average of 42.5% to affordable housing be maintained after every stage. The approved Masterplan tenure mix is 80% intermediate (consisting of Shared Ownership and London Living Rent) and 20% London Affordable Rent, which differs from the development plan policies.

- 11.61 The consented reserved matters for Phase 2a consisted of 70 affordable units (out of a total of 184 units) with a tenure mix of Affordable Rent (17%), units as London Living Rent (33%) and Shared Ownership (50%). This tenure mix for Phase 2a was considered appropriate at the time as it met the minimum threshold of 39% affordable housing in each phase, whilst Phase 1 which preceded Phase 2a had secured the provision of 54% affordable housing, and as such the average threshold of 42.5% to affordable housing be maintained after each phase was met.
- 11.62 When considering the uplift in 99 units as a result of this application across the whole of Phase 2a whereby 113 units out of a total 283 are affordable (39.9%), the proposed affordable housing mix would consist of Affordable Rent (21%), units as London Living Rent (26%) and Shared Ownership (53%). As such, this approved Masterplan tenure mix, maintains the minimum threshold of 39% affordable housing in each phase, and the overall average threshold of 42.5% to affordable housing be maintained after each phase is also met (46.8%).
- 11.63 The submission seeks to both to vary the original S106 legal agreement for the wider Beam Park masterplan to “grey out” the drop-in application site and to remove any obligations which specifically bind the site, whilst simultaneously creating a new S106 legal agreement to specifically bind this current drop-in application site and reflect the additional 99 units. As such, an early and late stage review mechanism will be required to be secured via the legal agreement in line with the London Mayor’s Affordable Housing and Viability SPG.
- 11.64 Policy H6 of the London Plan sets out the Mayor’s preferred affordable housing tenures, which includes social rent, London affordable rent: London living rent and London shared ownership. The provision of 24 affordable rented units are also to be secured via the legal agreement with reference to the Mayor’s London Affordable Rent (LAR) benchmarks, which are updated annually, and to provide clarity on the affordability levels. For the avoidance of doubt, affordable rent at 80% of market rent is not acceptable.
- 11.65 The application also includes 60 shared ownership units and in order to comply with the definitions of intermediate housing set out in the development plan, shared ownership units should be available to households on a range of incomes below the maximum £90,000 net household income cap set in the London Plan, and London Living Rent units (of which 29 units are proposed) should be subject to a maximum income cap of £60,000. Finally, annual housing costs (including service charges, rent and any interest payment) for both the shared ownership and London Living Rent units should be no greater than 40% of net household income. These requirements are to be secured via the s106 legal agreement.

- 11.66 For the reasons outlined above and subject to the relevant legal obligation set out, it is considered that the development accords with key policy objectives in relation to affordable housing provision.

Open Space and Children's Play Space

- 11.67 Policy D21 of the Havering Development Control Policies states that it will require major new residential developments to include provision for adequate open space, recreation and leisure facilities. Where it is not possible to include such facilities within the development site, the Council will require the facilities to be provided nearby. In some cases improving the quality of existing facilities may be appropriate. Financial contributions to enable the provision of new facilities or improvement to the quality of existing facilities may also be sought.
- 11.68 The approved Masterplan secured a central park would sit within Phase 2, as well as planting on the southern edge surrounding Plots 16 (New Block Y) and Block I, and planting round Block T. The Design Codes also split the wider site into various landscape character areas with Phase 2A falling across a number of these: Beam Park, which lies at the centre of the site and forms the central area of open space within the Masterplan; Park Lane, which runs laterally through the site, connecting the station square with the rest of the development and comprising of swales; and Beam Terrace, which is a terraced boundary to the central park.
- 11.69 The design and landscaping of the central park, Beam Park, is of crucial importance to the success of the Masterplan, as it is both the primary area of open space and is also located at the heart of the development, stitching it together. The proposed development under the current submission would not jeopardise the delivery of these important open spaces.
- 11.70 Policy DC20 of the Havering Development Control Policies seeks to achieve the provision of adequate children's play space within 400 metres of home. Policy S4 of the London Plan states that residential developments should incorporate high quality, accessible play provision for all ages, at least 10 square metres per child. Play space provision should normally be provided on-site, however off-site provision may be acceptable where it can be demonstrated that this addresses the needs of the development and can be provided nearby within an accessible and safe walking distance, and in these circumstances contributions to off-site provision should be secured via legal agreement. Play space should be available to all housing tenures within immediately adjacent blocks and courtyards to promote social inclusion.

- 11.71 The GLA's play space calculator (2019) would generate a requirement of 983 square metres of play space for New Block Y and revised Block I. The applicant has stated that the southern section of open space to Block Y would be provided for playspace and this amounts to 994 square metres. The 994 square metre figure of provision by the applicant in essence includes all of the communal open space to the south of Block Y, and quite clearly not all of this space is designated play space. Some of these areas are defensible spaces, other includes pathways and also general communal areas. Whilst some of these areas would form a dual purpose and allow for child's play, it is not appropriate to include all of the communal open space provision in this calculation.
- 11.72 Nevertheless, the proposal must also be seen in the context of the play space secured under the wider Masterplan permission. More than 7,000 square metres of play space was secured and approximately half of this was secured to be delivered under Phase 1 of the development. The overall amount was in excess of the required amount by a couple of thousand square metres, therefore the additional space of 994 square metres (albeit shared with communal spaces) is a further addition to that already secured under the wider Masterplan permission.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

- 11.73 The proposal site of new Block Y and revised Block I is not in close proximity to any neighbouring residential properties outside the wider Masterplan site area. However, it is in close proximity to other plots and blocks that have been delivered under Phase 1 or are to be delivered under Phase 2a. Residential amenity comprises a range of issues which include daylight, sunlight, overlooking, overshadowing impacts, as well as sense of enclosure and a loss of outlook. These issues are addressed in detail below.
- 11.74 The Development Plan contains policies which seek to appropriately safeguard the amenities of residential occupiers when considering new development. Policy DC61 of Havering Development Control Policies 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. The Residential Design SPD states that new development should be sited designed such that there is no detriment to existing residential amenity through overlooking and/or privacy loss, dominance or overshadowing, and a reduction of daylight and sunlight levels.
- 11.75 Policy D3 of the London Plan (Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach) states that development proposals should deliver appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity. Further, Policy D9 (Tall Buildings) states that the

wind, daylight, sunlight penetration and temperature conditions around the building(s) and neighbourhood must be carefully considered and not compromise comfort and the enjoyment of open spaces, including water spaces, around the building.

- 11.76 It is widely acknowledged that daylight and sunlight are fundamental to the provision of a good quality living environment and for this reason people expect good natural lighting in their homes. Daylight makes an interior look more attractive and interesting as well as to provide light to work or read by. Sunlight provides light and warmth, makes rooms look bright and cheerful and has a therapeutic, health-giving effect. In addition, daylight can reduce the need for electric lighting and sunlight can contribute towards meeting some of the heating requirements of homes through passive solar heating. Inappropriate or insensitive development can reduce a neighbour's daylight and sunlight and thereby adversely affect their amenity to an unacceptable level.

- 11.77 Paragraph 1.3.45-46 of the Mayor of London's Housing SPD states that:

'Policy 7.6Bd requires new development to avoid causing 'unacceptable harm' to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly in relation to privacy and overshadowing and where tall buildings are proposed. An appropriate degree of flexibility needs to be applied when using BRE guidelines to assess the daylight and sunlight impacts of new development on surrounding properties, as well as within new developments themselves. Guidelines should be applied sensitively to higher density development, especially in opportunity areas, town centres, large sites and accessible locations, where BRE advice suggests considering the use of alternative targets. This should take into account local circumstances; the need to optimise housing capacity; and scope for the character and form of an area to change over time.'

The degree of harm on adjacent properties and the daylight targets within a proposed scheme should be assessed drawing on broadly comparable residential typologies within the area and of a similar nature across London. Decision makers should recognise that fully optimising housing potential on large sites may necessitate standards which depart from those presently experienced but which still achieve satisfactory levels of residential amenity and avoid unacceptable harm.'

- 11.78 As referenced above, The Building Research Establishment (BRE) provide guidance on site layout planning to achieve good sunlighting and daylighting ('Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice 2011, 2nd edition' (released October 2011)). It is intended for building designers, developers, consultants and Local Planning Authorities (LPAs).

- 11.79 The application was accompanied by a sunlight and daylight report which provided an assessment of the new and revised Block in terms of its relationship with existing neighbouring buildings. The submitted report assessed the development against the BRE methodologies relating to daylight [Vertical Sky Component (VSC) and No Sky Line (NSL)], sunlight [Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) and Winter Probable Sunlight Hours (WPSH)], and overshadowing [sun on ground assessment].
- 11.80 The above report highlights how 81% of the windows assessed at Blocks Y and I would meet the Vertical Sky Component recommended levels and 97% of rooms would meet the Annual and Winter Probable Sunlight Hours. Additionally, the open areas surrounding the blocks would meet the minimum levels of sun on ground as recommended by the BRE guidelines.
- 11.81 In terms of neighbouring Blocks, revised Block I to the east adjoins Block J1 from Phase 1. This relationship between the two blocks is not altered under this application as the eastern part of Block I remains at 8 storey level and as such the impact between two blocks as consented under the Masterplan remains unchanged.
- 11.82 The central plot of housing delivered under Phase 1 (Plot 14) which lies to the north of Block I would be minimally affected by the increase in height of the western part of Block I from 6 to 8-storeys. The housing blocks to the north would still receive adequate sun on the ground and not be overshadowed unduly. New Block Y would be opposite the housing within Plot 13 of Phase 2a and not altered by the permission. Given the layout and design of Plot 13 there would be 4 homes directly opposite the new Block Y however these would be opposite the 4/5-storey elements. Similarly with Block I, the housing blocks to the north would still receive adequate sun on the ground and not be overshadowed unduly. It should be noted that a suggestion has been put forward through consultation to increase the distance of Blocks Y and I from the southern boundary (railway) to improve those areas to the south. It is considered that this would result in moving Blocks Y and I further north from where they are currently sited and this could have the potential of having a negative impact on the amenity of the housing properties to the north in Plots 13 and 14. Therefore, it is considered that the siting of Blocks Y and I provides for a balanced considerations of relevant matters.
- 11.83 Officers have assessed all of the daylight/sunlight information as well as the distance/height ratio regarding outlook, and consider that the overall impact of the proposals in terms of the above tests would be at levels that are considered acceptable for a scheme of this nature that seeks to bring forward the delivery of a substantial amount of homes.

Environmental Issues

- 11.84 The Council's Environmental Health Officer has raised no objections in relation to any historical contaminated land issues, air pollution or noise. The Environment Agency has also been consulted and has confirmed that there are no objections to the proposals by way of environmental matters.
- 11.85 A Contaminated Land study was undertaken during the outline application stage. Council's Public Protection officer has recommended conditions seeking an updated Desktop Study and Site Investigation, as well as Remediation Strategy and Verification Report. It should also be noted that the site is brownfield land and currently benefits from residential use as approved under the Masterplan. Therefore some remediation and contamination works would be required to secure the site for future use. These will be secured via conditions.
- 11.86 The proposed development is located within an area of poor air quality which suffers from high concentrations of nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter. 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.
- 11.87 London Plan Policy SI1 requires development proposals to meet a number of requirements to tackle poor air quality, protect health and meet legal obligations. The transport chapter of the 2021 ES states that the increase in housing numbers has resulted in an increase in car or van drivers by 9.2% compared to the consented trip generation, with additional car parking proposed. The current application therefore increases the impact of the proposed development on air quality as a result of increased road traffic. The submitted air quality assessment covers the impact of road traffic from the entire development and it concludes that the proposed development will lead to adverse impacts on local air quality, including *moderate* and *substantial* adverse impacts at existing human health receptors, and an increase in the area of the designated ecological sites where nitrogen deposition exceeds critical loads. The development would fail to meet the air quality neutral benchmarks for transport emissions unless specific mitigation measures are proposed to address this.
- 11.88 Further information has been submitted outlining mitigation measures and both Council's Environmental officer and the GLA have requested that a condition is

imposed to ensure that the mitigation measures off-set the excess in transport emissions.

- 11.89 Furthermore, conditions are recommended to safeguard a Dust Management Plan (and including a Dust Monitoring Scheme) so that dust and emissions controls measures are employed on the site during construction.

Transport and Highways

- 11.90 Policies CP9 and CP10 of the Havering Core Strategy and Policy DC32 of Havering's Development Control Policies 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.
- 11.91 Policy DC33 seeks to ensure all new developments make adequate provision for car parking. In this instance, the proposals would comprise of 71 car parking spaces for Blocks Y and I (0.40). This consists of 34 car spaces for the affordable units, 24 spaces for the private units and 13 visitor parking spaces. Whilst the overall number of car spaces has been increased from that approved under the reserved matters for Phase 2A, the ratio of parking has dropped given the uplift in residential units. Nevertheless, the overall amount of car parking for Phase 2A as a whole would remain at 0.52. TfL have expressed reservation from a strategic view that the additional spaces across Blocks Y and I have not been fully justified to demonstrate why they are the 'minimum necessary' and seek a reduction in the car parking proposed for the application.
- 11.92 The site is currently served only by buses on New Road and has a PTAL of 2. However, the wider Beam Park masterplan permission secured improvements to the bus services and the construction of a new station, which will improve the PTAL of the site. It should be noted that the original Masterplan permission contained a Grampian condition that restricts occupation of any unit after Phase 3 before the station is constructed and operational, as it was considered that units beyond that cap would have unacceptable impacts on the transport network. The GLA have stated that the proposed uplift of 99 units within Phase 2A would not have an impact on that cap and as such have advised that the transport impacts are not so significant. In the circumstances a refusal on these grounds is unlikely to be successful.
- 11.93 The proposed car parking numbers represent a reduction in the overall ratio given the replacement of houses in former Plot 16 with flats in new Block Y.

London Plan policy would seek car free developments for sites within PTAL 5-6, however sites with a PTAL of 2-3 in Outer London would trigger a maximum car parking standard of 0.75 car spaces and the proposal would be within these London Plan standards. As such, it is considered that the proposed number of spaces are appropriate.

- 11.94 Other matters to be secured by condition are (20% active and all remaining spaces passive) electrical vehicle charging points in line with the London Plan, as well as a Car Parking Design and Management Plan to ensure that the disabled car parking is used only by Blue Badge holders and arrangements for meeting any future demand for such provision.
- 11.95 Cycle parking is proposed for 344 long stay cycle spaces and 17 short stay spaces. This general provision would be in line with Policy T5 of the London Plan. However, the areas allocated within the ground floor will need to be revisited to ensure that the specific details of the various types of cycle spaces that need to be provided. TfL have commented that at least 20% cycle spaces be Sheffield stands at normal spacing (no less than 1.0 metre spacing) and a further 5% should be provided as Sheffield stands at wider spacing. Additionally, access to all areas of cycle storage should be through the corresponding residential lobby of each building. It is considered that there is sufficient space within the buildings and around the site to accommodate suitable cycle, therefore a condition will be attached to agree the cycle provision and to ensure it complies with the London Cycle Design Standards (LCDS).
- 11.96 The uplift in additional units will require amendment to the CPZ and as such a contribution to its amendment shall be sought under the legal agreement. The wider Masterplan permission also secured contributions towards improvements to bus services and for walking, cycling and public realm improvements on surrounding roads. In order to reflect the increased population of the site resulting from the proposed uplift in residential units, the monetary value of all contributions should be increased in proportion to that uplift as well as the usual indexation.
- 11.97 This will allow for incrementally greater increases in bus services to accommodate the additional demand as required by London Plan Policies T3 and T4, and allow for improvements to the pedestrian and cyclist network over a wider area in line with London Plan Policies T2 and T5, which should be directed towards locations identified within the Active Travel Zone assessment.
- 11.98 Subject to the completion of this agreement and the attached planning conditions, the proposal would be acceptable in highway terms and it is not considered that the proposed development would result in parking or highway

safety issues. The legal agreement would also be consistent with the other residential developments within this area.

- 11.99 Finally, a Travel Plan is to be secured via the s106 legal agreement, and a Construction Logistics Plan and a Delivery and Servicing Management Plan are to be secured via condition.

Energy and Sustainability

- 11.100 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), the London Plan requires all major developments to meet targets for carbon dioxide emissions. This is targeted with 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.
- 11.101 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.
- 11.102 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.
- 11.103 The submission has been accompanied by an energy strategy which proposes a 43.4% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions on the residential element of the scheme through energy efficient measures, such as 100% low energy lighting and mechanical ventilation with heat recovery. This exceeds the minimum on-site carbon reduction targets set out in the London Plan. Any remaining shortfall in CO₂ emissions in meeting the zero carbon policy would be met through a carbon off-set payment secured via the legal agreement.

- 11.104 Two energy centres have been secured under the site wide Masterplan permission which consist of CHP units in combination with gas boilers providing heating and hot water to the residential blocks. The two blocks under this application within Phase 2a are covered by the east side energy centre. The additional units would fit within the capacity that is available from the energy centre and further efficiency has been achieved as a result of the gas fire boilers associated with the houses of former Plot 16 being replaced with flats with HIU and DH connections being added. Roof mounted solar panels are proposed across the two blocks which would be incorporated with green/brown roofs. These are to be secured via condition.
- 11.105 The energy strategy is generally compliant with the London Plan energy policies however, additional technical information has been requested by the GLA in relation to further Be Lean measures being required, as well as further information on energy costs, overheating, district heating connection (including the decarbonisation plans for the network) and PV potential. The applicant has been liaising with the GLA regarding these matters and any outstanding matters required can be secured via the imposition of a condition.
- 11.106 In accordance with London Plan Policy SI2, a Whole life-cycle carbon assessment (WLCCA) is required for submission. A draft assessment has been reviewed by the GLA and considered appropriate however further details are required to be secured by condition. A condition is also required for the submission of a post-construction assessment to report on the development's actual WLC emissions.
- 11.107 Finally, London Plan Policy SI7 requires development applications that are referable to the Mayor of London to submit a Circular Economy Statement, whilst London Plan Policy D3 requires development proposals to integrate circular economy principles as part of the design process. A draft Circular Economy Statement has been submitted to the GLA who have stated this can be resolved prior to a Stage 2 referral. As such, this requirement shall also be conditioned should permission be granted.

Flooding, Drainage and Urban Greening Factor

- 11.108 Guidance under the NPPF seeks to safely manage residual risk including by emergency planning and give priority to the use of sustainable drainage systems.
- 11.109 In order to address current and future flood issues and minimise risks in a sustainable and cost effective way, 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, it 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.

- 11.110 In terms of local planning policies, Policy DC48 of the Havering Development Control Policies 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.
- 11.111 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) of the Core Strategy 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.
- 11.112 The application site is located within Flood Zone 3 and as a result proposed levels were set to raise the site out of the predicted flood level of a 1 in a 100 year event. The Council's drainage and flood officer has been consulted as well as the Environment Agency. The drainage officer has confirmed that the submitted details are acceptable subject to conditions. Therefore subject to conditions the proposal is acceptable.
- 11.113 Sustainable urban drainage systems have been incorporated into the proposal including a network of swales and basins to route any water back to the river, whilst green/brown roofs at rooftop and permeable public and communal green spaces would have soft landscaping and planting. The above ground SUDS measures would provide biodiversity benefits and help to provide a reduction on the surface run-off for the existing site. Overall, it is considered that the proposed SUDS measures are satisfactory and these are to be secured via condition.

- 11.114 Policy G5 of the London Plan sets an Urban Greening Factor (UGF) target score of 0.4. The proposal provides a UGF assessment of the wider Masterplan site, which achieves a score of 0.40. This would be achieved through a range of urban greening measures, including public realm landscaping, trees, natural vegetation and tree planting along the southern boundary with the railway. The greening measures contained within the current drop-in application that contribute to the wider UGF target score shall be secured via condition.

Community Infrastructure Levy

- 11.115 The Mayor has established a CIL charging schedule with a recent amendment that came into force from 1st April 2019. The amendment increases the CIL contribution by £5 per square metre to £25. The proposed development would be liable for this charge. Therefore a mayoral levy would be applicable, subject to any relief for social housing.
- 11.116 The London Borough of Havering's CIL was adopted in September 2019. The proposed floor area of the development would be subject to the CIL charging schedule at a charge of £55 per sqm to any development in Zone B (any development south of the A1306). Therefore the levy would be applicable subject to relief for social housing.

12 HOUSING DELIVERY TEST

- 12.1 On 19 January 2021 the Government published the 2020 Housing Delivery Test (HDT) results. The results show that within Havering 36% of the number of homes required were delivered over the three year period of 2017-18 to 2019-20. 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.
- 12.2 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. Therefore, it is 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.

13 FINANCIAL AND OTHER MITIGATION

- 13.1 Policy DC72 of Havering's Development Control Policies emphasises that in order to comply with the principles as set out in several of the Policies in the Plan, contributions may be sought and secured through a Planning Obligation. The London Plan also states that development proposals should address strategic as well as local priorities in planning obligations.
- 13.2 From a sustainability perspective, the proposal is accompanied by a Sustainability Statement and Energy Statement. Any remaining shortfall in CO2 emissions would be met through a carbon off-set payment secured via the legal agreement. The recommendation includes for a contribution to the CPZ as a result of the changes brought about by the proposal. Additionally, a contribution towards improvements of Beam Parkway which is just north of the site is also recommended in order to assist with the development of the Beam Parkway Framework.
- 13.3 In light of the above and discussions in other parts of this report the proposal would attract some necessary section 106 provisions to mitigate the impact of the development on the wider infrastructure within the Borough.

14 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY

- 14.1 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.
- 14.2 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.
- 14.3 Policy CG1 of the London Plan also seeks to support and promote the creation of an inclusive city to address inequality. In view of the stakeholders affected by the development proposals, the most significant impacts in this case relate to the protected characteristics of age, disability and gender. It is considered

that there would be no communities falling under the list of “protected characteristics” that would be significantly or unduly harmed by the proposals.

- 14.4 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 would comply with the Council’s statutory duty under this important legislation.
- 14.5 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.

15 CONCLUSIONS

- 15.1 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.
- 15.2 The preliminary proposals for the site were subject to consideration by the Quality Review Panel and Strategic Planning Committee and comments made in these forums have had some input into the development.
- 15.3 The application seeks planning permission for the redevelopment of Block Y (formerly Plot 16) and Block I within Phase 2A of the wider Beam Park Masterplan Permission Ref: P1125.19 to provide for 190 residential units (minimum 59% affordable) within a residential block (Block Y) comprising of part 4, part 5, part 8 and part 10-storeys, and a residential block (Block I) comprising of part 4, part 5 and part 8-storeys.
- 15.4 In land use terms, the proposal would result in a net increase of 99 residential units (91 to 190) to that previously consented within these 2 blocks in Phase 2A of the consented Masterplan, and would make a significant contribution towards meeting the above targets for net additional housing provision, whilst a total of 113 out of 190 units would be brought forward as various affordable housing tenures. As such, the principle of a residential-led scheme on the site is considered appropriate subject to compliance with all relevant policies of the development plan.

- 15.5 In addition to the Mayoral and Havering Community Infrastructure Levy, the application is supported by a comprehensive s106 planning agreement and contributions related to and mitigating impacts of the scheme. For these reasons and all the detailed matters considered in this report, the scheme is acceptable subject to conditions, informatives and the s106 legal agreement.
- 15.6 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.

 Havering LONDON BOROUGH	Strategic Planning Committee 7 October 2021
---	--

Application Reference:	P0290.20
Location:	Dovers Corner industrial Estate, including the Rainham Trading Estate, New Road, Rainham
Ward:	South Hornchurch
Description:	Section 73 Application (Minor Material Amendment) to vary Condition 44 (Traffic Light Management System) of Planning Permission P0922.15 dated 16 October 2017 for the demolition of existing structures and the phased redevelopment to provide 394 residential dwellings, car parking, bicycle parking, substation, public open space and pedestrian/cycle infrastructure, works and improvements (including de-culverting of Pooles Sewer, relocation of gas main, minor alterations to access from New Road and closure of existing secondary accesses, formation of emergency access onto Lamson Road and other associated works).
Case Officer:	John Kaimakamis
Reason for Report to Committee:	Call-in application by ward councillor. The application is of strategic importance and therefore must be reported to the Committee

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The application relates to the development site to the south west of the Dovers Corner roundabout on the A1306 (New Road). The Section 73 application seeks to vary the wording of Condition 44 of Planning Permission Reference P0922.15 that was granted consent on 16 October 2017 for the demolition of existing structures and the phased redevelopment to provide 394 residential dwellings,
- 1.2 The original application was presented to Havering's Regulatory Committee in November 2016 and it was resolved to grant planning permission subject to conditions and a section 106 legal agreement.
- 1.3 Condition 44 was requested by Members of the Committee and sought details of a Traffic Light Management System to the approved priority junction that provided access to and from the site.
- 1.4 This application seeks to remove the requirement of providing a signalised junction but maintain a non-signalised priority junction for access to the application site.

2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 The proposed amendment to the consented scheme would be acceptable in highway terms and it is not considered that the proposed development would result in highway safety issues.
- 2.2 It is considered that installation of traffic signals at the application site junction would be located close to the existing pedestrian crossing and will have the tendency to create a stop and go mechanism in traffic flow. Further, it is considered that amending the signalised junction to a priority junction is justified as the Beam Parkway development has progressed extensively and any further inclusions into this project is likely to have knock on effect on the current measures that are in progress.
- 2.3 The technical details of the access priority junction have been agreed with the Council's Highways Team in the form of a section 278 legal agreement having regard to the integration of the junction within the wider New Road improvement measures to create Beam Parkway.
- 2.4 Finally, the application is supported by a revised capacity analysis to compare a priority junction with a signalised junction. The modelling work takes on board the improvement works that have been undertaken along New Road and concludes that a non-signalised priority junction arrangement would operate within capacity and more efficiently, and therefore remove the risk of queuing traffic affecting the operation of the Dovers Corner roundabout.

- 2.5 The proposed development is subject to appropriate conditions that were previously imposed which seek to facilitate the development and mitigate its potential impacts. Obligations and financial contributions that were secured towards environmental, infrastructure and services required to facilitate and also mitigate potential impacts of the proposed development have been retained.

3 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:
- Any direction by the London Mayor pursuant to the Mayor of London Order
 - Conditional upon the prior completion of a Deed of Variation pursuant to Sections 106A and 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to the existing legal agreement of Deed of Planning Obligation made under section 106 and of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 dated 12 October 2017 to secure the planning obligations in that agreement to a planning permission issued pursuant to this planning application.
- 3.2 That the Assistant Director Planning is delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above and that if not completed by the 30 April 2022 the Assistant Director of Planning is delegated authority to refuse planning permission or extend the timeframe to grant approval.
- 3.3 That the Assistant Director Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

Conditions

1. In Accordance With Amended Drawings
2. Accordance with Environmental Statement and Mitigation Measures
3. Phasing
4. Condition Discharge Plan
5. Materials
6. Hard and Soft Landscaping
7. Gas Pipeline Relocation
8. Gas Pipeline
9. De-Culverting Works
10. Car Parking
11. Electric Vehicle Charging Points
12. Energy Efficiency

13. Air Quality
14. Land Contamination
15. Land Contamination (2)
16. Land Contamination (3)
17. Refuse and Recycling
18. Cycle Storage
19. External Lighting
20. No Additional Flank Windows
21. Removal of Permitted Development Rights
22. Boundary Treatment
23. Landscape Management Plan
24. Non-Road Mobile Plant and Machinery
25. Secured by Design
26. Hours of Construction
27. Vehicle Cleansing
28. Construction and Demolition Management Plan
29. Noise Insulation
30. Wheelchair Accessibility
31. Details of Emergency Access
32. Details of Cycleways and Footpaths
33. Visibility Splays
34. Highway Agreements
35. Fire Hydrants
36. Archaeology
37. Foundation Design and Method Statement
38. Water Efficiency
39. Ecological Survey Prior to De-Culverting Works
40. Habitat Creation Works
41. Car Parking Management Strategy
42. Access Details
43. Stage 3 Road Safety Audit
44. Priority Junction Details

Informatives

1. NPPF Positive and Proactive
2. Mayoral CIL
3. Planning Obligations
4. Temporary Use of Highway
5. Changes to the Public Highway
6. Highway Approval Required
7. Secured by Design
8. Working in the Vicinity of Gas Pipelines
9. Working in Proximity to Railway
10. Essex and Suffolk Water
11. Considerate Constructors Scheme

- 12. Sustainable Construction Strategy
- 13. Protection of Species
- 14. Control of Dust and Emissions
- 15. Archaeology

4. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 4.1 The application site lies to the south west of the Dovers Corner roundabout on the A1306 (New Road), approximately 250 metres from Rainham village centre. The site, which amounts to 5.85 hectares, lies to the north of the C2C and High Speed 1 railway lines, with Rainham Creek to the east and a drainage ditch, known as Pooles Sewer to the west. The main access is on to New Road, with a secondary access onto Bridge Road. The site is lower than New Road, but generally level with a fall southwards towards the railway lines.
- 4.2 The site was previously occupied by a number of industrial estates which included a range of light industrial and commercial uses comprising B1, B2, B8 and sui generis use classes. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and has a PTAL of 3.
- 4.3 To the south of the railway lines is the Rainham sewage works beyond which is the A13 and further industrial areas. To the west of the site is the new Passive Close development and Havering College, where new development is proposed.

5 PROPOSAL

- 5.1 The proposal seeks the variation of Condition 44 (Traffic Light Management System) of Planning Permission P0922.15 dated 16 October 2017 for the demolition of existing structures and the phased redevelopment to provide 394 residential dwellings, car parking, bicycle parking, substation, public open space and pedestrian/cycle infrastructure, works and improvements (including de-culverting of Pooles Sewer, relocation of gas main, minor alterations to access from New Road and closure of existing secondary accesses, formation of emergency access onto Lamson Road and other associated works).
- 5.2 Condition 44 of the original planning permission was as follows:

*“Unless alternative implementation programme is agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, no part of any phase of the development hereby permitted as specified in condition 4 above shall be occupied until a **traffic light management system** has been installed at the junction of the new access road with the A1306 in accordance with details that shall have been submitted to and*

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The traffic light system shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Traffic light controls are considered necessary at the entrance and exit from the development prior to first occupation to ensure highway safety and that the development accords with the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC32.”

5.3 The application seeks to vary Conditions 44 as follows:

*“Unless alternative implementation programme is agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, no part of any phase of the development hereby permitted as specified in condition 4 above shall be occupied until a **priority junction** has been installed at the junction of the new access road with the A1306 in accordance with details that shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The priority junction shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.*

Reason: The priority junction is considered necessary at the entrance and exit from the development prior to first occupation to ensure highway safety and that the development accords with the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC32.”

6 PLANNING HISTORY

6.1 The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:

- **U0002.08** - Demolition and mixed use redevelopment of 735 dwellings comprising 95 houses and 640 apartments, retail (A1-A4) and commercial floorspace (B1 & D1), car parking, public open space, de-culverting of Pooles Sewer, alterations to access to New Road, closure of accesses to New Road and Bridge Road, formation of emergency-only access to Lamson Road - **Approved on Appeal.**
- **P0922.15:** Demolition of existing structures and the phased redevelopment to provide 394 residential dwellings, car parking, bicycle parking, substation, public open space and pedestrian/cycle infrastructure, and other works and improvements (including de- culverting of Pooles Sewer, relocation of gas main, minor alterations to access from New Road and closure of existing secondary accesses, formation of emergency access onto Lamson Road and other associated works) at Dovers Corner Industrial Park, Rainham Trading Estate and Boomes Industrial Estate, New Road, Rainham. – **Approved with Legal Agreement, 16/10/2017**

7 STATUTORY CONSULTATION RESPONSE

7.1 A summary of consultation response are detailed below:

- ***Transport for London:*** No comment and is happy for LBH to determine it as it sees fit.
- ***Greater London Authority:*** The GLA have assessed the details of the application and concluded that given the scale and nature of the proposals the amendments do not give rise to any new strategic planning issues. Therefore, under article 5(2) of the above Order the Mayor of London, the application does not require any further consultation with the GLA and the Council may proceed to determine the application without further reference to the GLA.
- ***Historic England (GLAAS):*** No comments are raised as the proposals do not affect the archaeological condition relating to the permission.
- ***Natural England:*** No comments.
- ***London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority:*** LFEPA have conformed that no additional hydrants are required and content for works at the site to go ahead as planned.
- ***LBH Highways:*** No objections on the layout and operation of the priority junction, and consider that amending the signalised junction to a priority junction is justified as the Beam Parkway development has progressed extensively and any further inclusions into this project is likely to have knock on effect on the current measures that are in progress; installation of traffic signals at the above junction would be located close to the existing pedestrian crossing (i.e. located immediately to west side of the Dover's Corner roundabout) and will have the tendency to create a stop and go mechanism in traffic flow. Have also recommended inclusion of a condition that a Road Safety Audit, Stage3 must be carried out independently by Road Safety Auditors as soon as the highways works are carried out.

8 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

- 8.1 The application was advertised via a Press Notice and Site Notice displayed at the site for 21 days between 28 February and 20 March 2020.
- 8.2 A formal neighbour consultation was also undertaken with 364 neighbouring properties being notified of the application and invited to comment. Comments have been received from 1 neighbour.

8.3 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- None.

8.4 The following Councillor(s) made representations:

- The application has been called in by a Ward Councillor as Condition 44 was originally imposed by Members when a resolution was made to grant consent at Havering's Regulatory Committee in November 2016.

8.5 The following neighbour representations were received:

- 1 objector
- 0 comments.
- No petitions have been received.

8.6 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

- Shouldn't be providing more new homes without a primary and secondary school.
- Local hospital has long waiting list.
- Current infrastructure cannot cope with development
- Traffic can be quite bad around Dovers Corner and further homes will add to this.

Support

- None.

Officer Response: The above objections relate to considerations that were assessed during the original planning application. None of the proposed amendments under this submission would alter the delivery of the consented homes.

Non-material representations

8.7 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

8.8 No procedural issues were raised in representations.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

9.1 The main issues arising from this proposal relate to:

- Acknowledgement of the scope of what may and may not be considered under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990
- Nature of the variation and whether the change(s) materially/adversely alter the nature of the scheme
- Any significant material alterations since the original grant of planning permission.

Scope of the Consideration of the Case under Section 73 of the T&CPA

- 9.2 Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 concerns 'Determination of application to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached'. It is colloquially known as 'varying' or 'amending' conditions. Section 73 applications also involve consideration of the conditions subject to which planning permission should be granted. Where an application under s73 is granted, the effect is the issue of a fresh grant of permission and the notice should list all conditions pertaining to it. The application cannot be used to vary the time limit for implementation.
- 9.3 It is important to note that when assessing s73 applications the previously granted planning permission is a significant material consideration, which impacts heavily on the assessment of the proposal. If the original application has been implemented, or if the permission has not yet expired, the applicant may go ahead and complete the original approved scheme if they wish.
- 9.4 Alterations to planning policy and other material considerations since the original grant of planning permission are relevant and need to be considered. However, these must be considered in light of the matters discussed in the previous paragraphs and the applicant's ability to complete the originally approved development.

The Variation

- 9.5 Planning Permission Reference No: P0922.15 granted consent for the demolition of existing structures and the phased redevelopment to provide 394 residential dwellings, car parking, bicycle parking, substation, public open space and pedestrian/cycle infrastructure, and other works and improvements (including de-culverting of Pooles Sewer, relocation of gas main, minor alterations to access from New Road and closure of existing secondary accesses, formation of emergency access onto Lamson Road and other associated works) at Dovers Corner Industrial Park, Rainham Trading Estate and Boomes Industrial Estate, New Road, Rainham.
- 9.6 The application seeks to vary the wording of Condition 44 of the planning permission to delete the reference to the traffic light management system and revert to the original priority junction (non-signalised) form of site access.

Principle of Development

- 9.7 The principle of development has already been established under Planning Permission Ref: P0922.15. The amendment sought above would not impact on the delivery of the above housing numbers secured by the consent.

Design

- 9.8 The proposed amendment does not change the built form and as such there are no design considerations that arise from the proposal.

Parking and Highways Issues

- 9.9 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.
- 9.10 The proposed development includes a single point of access from New Road and the existing primary site access junction on New Road would be modified to serve the new development and the existing ghost right turn into the site would be retained. Since the proposal was presented to Havering's Regulatory Committee in November 2016 there have been improvements to New Road as part of its transformation into Beam Parkway. The Beam Park Masterplan and Planning Framework of 2016 sought to transform New Road from a traffic dominated road into an attractive green corridor, the Beam Parkway, to provide quality walking and cycling route and a series of pocket parks which will transform the image of the area.
- 9.11 Measures were included to reduce through traffic on New Road, reduce carriageway space and transforming it into an attractive street that is easier to cross. As a result of funding secured by the Council from the Mayor of London and TfL, a consultation was undertaken in July 2018 on a proposed scheme for Beam Parkway. With regard to the section of New Road in proximity to Dovers

Corner, the proposed scheme sought to retain the existing signalised pedestrian/cycle crossing on New Road located to the east of the access to Dovers Corner and before the roundabout, narrow the carriageway and also to form an uncontrolled crossing point in New Road located to the west of the site access/egress to Dovers Corner.

- 9.12 The proposed Beam Parkway Framework scheme detailed a priority junction for site access to and from the Dovers Corners site and did not envisage a signalised junction. This design since the consultation has now been finalised with works anticipated in 2021. It should also be noted that the legal agreement signed with the original planning permission secures a £500,000 s106 obligation towards New Road improvements (A1306 Pedestrian/Cycle Works Contribution) which will assist in funding the proposed Beam Parkway Framework scheme.
- 9.13 Council's Highway officers have confirmed that amending the signalised junction to a priority junction is justified as the Beam Parkway development has progressed extensively and any further inclusions into this project is likely to have knock on effect on the current measures that are in progress. Further, they consider that the installation of traffic signals at the application site junction would be located close to the existing pedestrian crossing (i.e. located immediately to west side of the Dover's Corner roundabout and earmarked as retained within the Beam Parkway Framework scheme) and will have the tendency to create a stop and go mechanism in traffic flow.
- 9.14 Furthermore, since the proposal was presented to Havering's Regulatory Committee in November 2016, technical details of the access priority junction have been agreed with the Council's Highways Team in the form of a section 278 legal agreement. These technical details were agreed in consultation with the Highways Team having regard to the integration of the junction within the wider New Road improvement measures to create Beam Parkway.
- 9.15 The s278 legal agreement details a non-signalised priority junction for access to and from the Dovers Corner application site. The signalised crossing point to the east of the junction (and west of the roundabout) is to remain, which complies with the Beam Parkway Framework scheme. In coming to the above s278 arrangement with Highways it was considered that the existing toucan crossing west of the roundabout facilitated safe pedestrian and cycling movement between Rainham Rd and Bridge Rd. The potential removal and replacement of this crossing further west and closer to the application site's junction would deflect from the existing north-south crossing and potential lead to unsafe crossing movements. Therefore, it was considered to retain the existing toucan crossing in its current form and supplement this with an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing with refuge as per the Beam Parkway Framework scheme.
- 9.16 In addition to the above, the applicants have also conducted a revised capacity analysis to compare a priority junction (as approved in accordance with the details secured in the s278 highways agreement) with a signalised junction that is sought under the approved wording of Condition 44. The modelling work takes on board the improvement works that have been undertaken along New

Road and concludes that a non-signalised priority junction arrangement would operate within capacity and more efficiently, and therefore remove the risk of queuing traffic affecting the operation of the Dovers Corner roundabout. Council's Highway Team have reviewed the modelling and raised no objections to its conclusions.

- 9.17 Council's Highway Officer has also recommended a condition for a Stage 3 road safety audit to be carried out independently by Road Safety Auditors as soon as the highways works are completed, should permission be granted. Subject to the above, the proposal would be acceptable in highway terms and it is not considered that the proposed development would result in highway safety issues.

Planning Obligations, Conditions, Community Infrastructure Levy and local finance considerations

- 9.18 The conditions of the previous decision notice shall be re-imposed to the decision notice.
- 9.19 Condition number 1 of the original permission relates to the timeframe for implementation. Usually this is a 3-year time frame from the date of issue in accordance with Section 91(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). In this instance the development has already commenced on the 18 June 2018 and therefore the condition is no longer required.
- 9.20 Since the approval of the original application scheme some of the detail required by condition have been approved. In the interest of completeness the condition list would be updated to make reference to those approvals.
- 9.21 The original application was subject to a legal agreement to mitigate against the impacts of the development. As this application requires the issue of a new/fresh planning permission the applicant has agreed to re-apply the agreed Heads of Terms of the original legal agreement to the new planning permission. This is important as it ensures those obligations originally agreed are met in the case of the implementation of the current application.
- 9.22 The application would be subject to a Deed of Variation to the original section 106 legal agreement.

Other Matters

- 9.23 This application does not represent an opportunity to revise or reconsider the original grant of planning permission under P0922.15. This application only relates to the consideration of the variation of condition 44 as set out above.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION


Summary

- 9.24 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 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.
- 9.25 The changes sought through this S73 application are considered to be relatively minor and do not raise any significant issues already considered.
- 9.26 The proposed development is subject to appropriate conditions that were previously imposed which seek to facilitate the development and mitigate its potential impacts. Obligations and financial contributions that were secured towards environmental, infrastructure and services required to facilitate and also mitigate potential impacts of the proposed development have been retained.

Conclusion

- 9.27 It is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and deed of variation to link the application to the s106 legal agreement heads of terms for the reasons and details as set out in the resolutions of Section 3 of this Report.

This page is intentionally left blank

 Havering LONDON BOROUGH	Strategic Planning Committee 7 October 2021
---	--

Application Reference:	P0755.21
Location:	NEW CITY COLLEGE, ARDLEIGH GREEN CAMPUS, LAND OFF NELMES WAY
Ward	GOOSHAYS
Description:	ERECTION OF 2/3 STOREY 87 BEDROOM AND SUITES CARE HOME FOR THE FRAIL ELDERLY (CLASS C2 USE) WITH ANCILLARY AND COMMUNAL ACCOMMODATION, TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING, ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS, CAR AND CYCLE PARKING, SERVICING, REFUSE AND RECYCLING.
Case Officer:	RAPHAEL ADENEGAN
Reason for Report to Committee:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call-in application by ward councillor. • The application is of strategic importance and therefore must be reported to the Committee.

1 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 The application which seeks the construction of an 87 bed care home is being brought forward in order to facilitate the New City College's future Masterplan proposals. The application would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street-scene.
- 1.2 The site is not within the Metropolitan Green Belt and as matter of judgement there is no in principle objection to the land being brought forward for redevelopment to provide this type of residential home in lieu of the loss of parking spaces, which is to be provided on another part of the college site, and to which planning permission has been granted. A further part of the car park will be released for residential

development which will provide three self-build plots. This is the subject of a separate planning application submitted by New City College.

- 1.3 The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), the policies of The London Plan (2021), Havering's Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008) the emerging Local Plan, as well as to all relevant material considerations including the responses to consultation.

2 RECOMMENDATION

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

1. agree the reasons for approval as set out in this report, and
2. delegate authority to the Assistant Director Planning in consultation with the Director of Legal Services for the issue of the planning permission subject to minor amendments to the conditions or the legal agreement and the prior completion of the Section 106 Agreement pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and all other enabling powers on Heads of Terms covering the following matters:

i. **Carbon Offset**

Provision of actual carbon emissions and payment of any additional contribution if the on-site carbon reductions stated in the strategy are not achieved - carbon offsetting payment in accordance with Policy SI 2 of the London Plan: Contribution of £217,432 towards carbon reduction programmes within the Borough, duly Indexed.

ii. **Highways Works**

Contribution towards s278 Highway works.

iii. **Legal Costs, Administration and Monitoring**

A financial contribution (to be agreed) to be paid by the developer to the Council to reimburse the Council's legal costs associated with the preparation of the planning obligation (irrespective of whether the planning agreement is completed) and a further financial obligation (to be agreed) to be paid to reimburse the Council's administrative costs associated with monitoring compliance with the obligation terms.

- 2.2 That the Assistant Director Planning is delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above and that if not completed by the 31st December 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. Landscaping
5. Landscape Management Plan (Including biodiversity benefits of the scheme)
6. Secured by Design
7. Wheelchair Adaptable Dwellings
8. Window and Balcony Details
9. Photovoltaic Panels
10. Boundary Treatments
11. Water Efficiency
12. Energy Statement Compliance
13. External Lighting Scheme
14. Noise Protection
15. Air Quality
16. Contaminated Land
17. Surface Water Drainage
18. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs)
19. Maximum 105 litres of water per person per day
20. Car Parking Plan
21. Disabled Parking Plan
22. Electrical Charging Points
23. Vehicle Access Prior to Occupation
24. Cycle Storage
25. Travel Plan
26. Demolition, Construction Management and Logistics Plan
27. Construction Hours (8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Friday, and between 8.00am and 1.00pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays/Public Holidays.)
28. Highway Works
29. Wheel Washing
30. Visibility Splays
31. Fire Brigade Access
32. Detail of Fire Hydrants
33. Refuse and Recycling
34. Site Levels
35. Construction Ecological Management Plan (Updated)

Informatives

1. Highway approval required
2. Secure by design
3. Street naming and numbering
4. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
5. NPPF positive and proactive

3 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 3.1 The application site is located within the Squirrels Health Ward. The overall site, including the college, is bounded by Nelmes Way and Ardleigh Green Road. Entrance into the site is primarily via Ardleigh Green Road. The application site comprises approximately 0.8 hectares.

- 3.2 The Site has historically been used as a car park (206 spaces) associated with the New City College, Havering Campus. The car park is due to be re-provided on an alternative part of the college campus. A separate planning permission (P0285.21) has been granted for this.
- 3.3 There is a large landscaped green space in front of the College on Ardleigh Green Road and a second large green open space between the parking and eastern boundary with a large bank of earth running its length. Ardleigh House Community Association and green open space sits adjacent to the application site. There is a Tree Protection Order covering the open space.
- 3.4 There is an existing unused site access off Nelmes Way, which will be opened up and utilised to serve the new Care Home. The existing access consists of a 6.2m wide dropped kerb crossover arrangement, located 90m west of the Garland Way junction at the south west corner of the development site.
- 3.5 The area around the site is predominantly residential in character with a predominance of detached and semi-detached houses and a small number of commercial units towards the station.
- 3.6 The site does not fall within a conservation area and there are no listed buildings on site. The site is also identified as falling within a possible contaminated land and landfill. The site falls within Flood Zone 1. The properties on the south side of Nelmes Way opposite the site fall within the Emerson Park Policy Area.
- 3.7 The application site also has a PTAL rating of between 1(Worst) and 2(Poor).

4 PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for the construction of a new 3-storey care home (C2 use class) which will provide circa. 87 care suites, including 24 dementia suites with associated parking, refuse area, electricity substation and landscaping.
- 4.2 The new care home will have communal facilities including: a village hall, garden room, café, restaurant, bistro; family room, lounge/activity/hobby rooms, cinema room and salon/therapy rooms.
- 4.3 The proposed building would be set centrally within the site and would have an H-shaped footprint (approximately 2,274sq.m) of mainly three-storeys in height; creating a landscape entrance forecourt and parking area to the south facing Nelmes Way and courtyards to the east and west. The proposed access to the development will be from the existing access off Nelmes Way. Communal garden areas surround much of the building's footprint with reinforced boundary planting proposed. The building will have a pitched roof which varies in height from approximately 10.3m to 13.7m. A total of 46 car parking spaces are proposed for employees and visitors.
- 4.4 A 16.5sq.m electricity substation is proposed to the southwest end of site close to the access. A refuse storage building is proposed close to the southern boundary in the front courtyard in the parking area. Cycle storage are located to the side and front area of the site.

5 PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:

P0285.21 – Revised access arrangements, relocated car parking, new cycle parking involving demolition of P Block and associated landscaping.
Approved. Decision notice to be issued

P0762.21 - Outline application for the erection of 3 detached houses with garages and access.
Awaiting Decision

P0196.15 – Erection of a part two, part three storey 'Construction and Infrastructure Skills and Innovation Centre' with covered pedestrian link, external alterations to the existing building and alterations to the existing servicing arrangements and car parking provision along with associated landscaping and a cycle/pedestrian path.
Refused 27/07/17

P0642.13 – Single storey temporary building for education (class D1) use.
Approved 23/07/13

P0913.12 Extension of Time Limit on application P0683.09-Demolition of up to 6,550sqm of existing floorspace and the re-development of 9,450sqm new educational floor space (Class D1) together with associated landscaping and access – Outline
Approved 05-10-2012

P0752.11 - Extension of time to P1047.08 - for the provision of a basketball court, artificial 5- a-side football pitch with perimeter fencing and erection of acoustic boundary fence.
Approved 14-07-2011

P0683.09 - Demolition of up to 6,550sqm of existing floorspace and the re-development of 9,450sqm new educational floor space (Class D1) together with associated landscaping and access – Outline.
Approved 14-08-2009

Pre-Application Discussion

Prior to the submission of this planning application, the applicant has engaged with LBH planning and design officers over the last 24 months. Officers agree that the site comprises previously developed land and the principle of a residential care home development is acceptable subject to the application submission demonstrating that massing, height layout, access and landscaping are acceptable. In respect of the design of the proposals, the scheme has also been subject to post submission discussions with Officers as well as a QRP Chair Review. Officers expressed throughout the pre-application process that the quantum of development, layout arrangement will carry significant weight in the determination of an acceptable proposal.

The design has evolved in order to maintain the level of greenery at the front of the site and create a more suburban form of development to reflect the surrounding

character of Emerson Park. This matter is discussed in the Principle section of the report.

Summary of QRP Comments and Response from Applicant

QRP Comment	Officer Remark
<p>Response to Context: The panel feels that further thought needs to be given to how the scheme relates to the streetscape of Nelmes Way. The character of this relationship, in terms of openness, the tree line and the quality of the forecourt, is not yet clear.</p>	<p>The predominantly tree-lined and vegetative boundary along Nelmes Way are to be retained. Semi-mature new trees are to be planted in place of the trees to be removed. The overall tree-lined character will be preserved. The nature of the arrival court and the architectural treatment of the street façade has been improved, and now helps create a more clearly defined link with the streetscene.</p>
<p>Drawing on the suburban character of Nelmes Way, and in particular the green verge along the street, would help to create a successful relationship here.</p>	
<p>Architectural approach: The panel feels that referencing the Arts and Crafts language of Ardleigh House is a good starting point in developing the scheme's architectural approach, but it encourages the design team to also draw on the local suburban character.</p>	<p>The revised design creates a good blend of local suburban character influenced by the precedent of Ardleigh House.</p>
<p>The initial thoughts on the three blocks, each with a distinct identity, are interesting, but the panel would like to see the design team develop the building as a single composition, using bay windows and projecting elements drawn from Arts and Crafts precedents, to manage the articulation of the building's façade.</p>	<p>The Nelmes Way elevation has been revised to give the appearance of a single, well-articulated building rather than 3 linked buildings. There is now a consistency of materials but with variety in terms of articulation, eaves and ridge levels. Landscaping has been enhanced across the scheme and now reads as part of the building character.</p>
<p>Attention should be focused on the primary entrance – the secondary, service entrance could be masked from the street by trees – signalling arrival within the building's communal spaces.</p>	<p>The delivery entrance and turning head have been pulled further back from Nelmes Way and more space has been created for planting along the boundary to screen views of this end of the building.</p>
<p>Internal arrangement and quality of accommodation: The internal layout creates long corridors which can create difficulties with wayfinding and recognition, and the panel encourages the design team to develop more generous, differentiated spaces, and to ensure that entrances are distinct.</p>	<p>The care suites are generously sized compared to most UK care homes, with Studios of 25sqm and 1-Bed Suites of 40sqm. These enjoy high levels of natural daylight and natural ventilation. Communal areas are also spacious and well-lit. Throughout the home residents enjoy a high quality environment with lots of natural daylight throughout the day.</p>
<p>The panel notes that initial thought has been given to providing facilities for entertaining the children of visiting friends and relatives,</p>	

and it would like to see thinking on this developed.	Landscape proposals have been rationalised to accommodate this. It has been designed with activity areas, a sensory garden and familiar garden ornaments and features. A generous balcony terrace is provided at first floor level directly accessed from the first floor communal space.
Layout, landscape and public realm: The panel feels that the two orientations of amenity space, each with different identities, is a strength of the scheme. Microclimate analyses of the amenity spaces should guide the refinement of their design.	
In particular, this arrangement is likely to be beneficial to residents with dementia and the panel would welcome further differentiation of the spaces and greater attention to dementia-friendly layout and design. For example, circular routes around the spaces, and between them, would be helpful here.	
The panel questions the quality of the forecourt and feels that the pedestrian experience of arrival, which is routed around and through a car park and cycle racks, is likely to be unsatisfactory. The forecourt should be reconsidered to address this.	A new pedestrian access from Nelmes Way, leading directly to the main entrance, with a gateway in the boundary wall is now incorporated in the scheme. This will provide a better arrival experience through a small garden area and reduce the potential for conflict created by a single access point into the site and sets up a framed view of the entrance from the street.
The panel notes that the scheme has a high number of car parking spaces. If these are genuinely necessary then the area could be broken up, with different surfaces and planting, to integrate it into the landscape.	A case for the level of parking provision has been made and officers are satisfied with the location of the parking areas and proposed landscaping to mitigate any potential visual impact in the streetscene.

Following previous Pre-App and QRP comments, the design team attended a post submission meeting with Council urban design officers to address previous concerns raised. Through this process the design team made updates to improve the quality of the scheme. Urban design officers are satisfied that these updates have created a scheme of acceptable quality that integrates appropriately within the surrounding context

Summary of SPC Comments and Response from Applicant

SPC Comment	Officer Remark
Parking: The need to have a full justification for the parking levels proposed.	A detailed Transport Statement has been submitted as part of planning application which justifies the level of parking being proposed
Landscape: The need to have full details about the level of landscaping to be provided including species and size and details of root protection for existing trees that are going to be retained.	A detailed Landscape Masterplan has been submitted as part of the planning application. This includes specification of tree and hedge species and sizes for the public-facing areas, other areas being dealt with by condition. A detailed Tree Report has been submitted as part of the planning

	application which includes details of root protection for existing trees being retained.
Sustainability: A wish to see a building with strong green/carbon credential	An Energy Statement has been submitted with the application and found to be compliant with relevant policies. Compliance is to be secured through s106 and condition which is recommended. .

Community and Stakeholder Engagement

A Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) accompanies the application and this document explains the programme of public consultation and community engagement carried out prior to the submission of the application. As part of its programme of community engagement, the applicant has initiated a number of public consultation exercises including leaflets distribution, video and phone calls, public consultation (exhibition) event during the day and evening, engaging with Local Councillors to invite to a preview of the public consultation, writing to local groups, consultation website where all of the exhibition materials could be viewed, questions asked and comments submitted, as well as undertaking one Strategic Planning Committee Developer Presentation.

The applicant's response to the issues raised in the course of the public engagement contained in the SCI is as follows:

Environment:

- The applicant takes great care of the long-term management of their facilities so there will be no littering or other anti-social behaviour issues from a new care home here. The site is staffed 24/7 and a General Manager is appointed well in advance of any of the applicant's sites opening to ensure they are and continue to be well managed.
- In terms of the wider environment, as many existing trees on the site that can be retained will be, and more trees will be planted to replace any that are lost. Furthermore, new trees will be semi-mature so that new residents can enjoy them from the first day the care home opens.

Traffic:

- Compared to alternative uses for this site, such as C3 residential, care homes are low generator of traffic movements. As such, there will only a limited uptick in traffic using Nelves Way to access this care home. Importantly, shift patterns will be staggered to avoid the morning and evening 'rush hour', and many staff members will access the site by public transport, walking or cycling.

Parking:

- Our proposals match the parking standards the Council has set down for a care home. We therefore believe that all staff and visitor car parking can be accommodated in the car parking spaces we are proposing.

GP Practice:

- Many people who move into Signature Senior Lifestyle care homes do so from locations within the immediate local area and are already on local GP Practice lists. Furthermore, Signature ensure that GPs visit the care home frequently to address the medical needs of a range of residents at one time, meaning GPs time is used as efficiently as possible. Also, with a range of other medical staff employed at the care home itself, the need for GP time is often reduced when compared to if the resident remained in their existing home.

Staff and Jobs:

- The proposed care home will create between 100 and 120 full and part time posts, and Signature Senior Lifestyle's aim with all new care homes is to employ people who already live locally. Indeed, they are also looking to link with New City College's social care students and create clear pathway for those who are interested from their studies into this care home.

6 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

6.1 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultation

6.2 A summary of the consultation responses received along with the Officer comments

LBH Highways – The developer must enter into S278 agreement with the local council due to proposed new entrance, egress. The property must not be occupied until S278 has been agreed with London Borough of Havering (LBH) design standard.

Overall, no objections relating to the development.

Officer comment: Noted and appropriate condition and informatives suggested.

LBH Environment Health – (Noise) No objection on noise grounds subject to further noise conditions including a pre-commencement condition.

LBH Environment Health – (Contamination) The submitted Geoenvironmental Ground Investigation identified some localised elevated contaminant levels. No fundamental objection is raised subject to pre-commencement conditions.

LBH Environment Health – (Air Quality) The development is located within a designated Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) due to high concentration of nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter. Based on the submitted Air Quality Assessment, no objection to the proposal subject to pre-commencement condition.

Officer comment: Noted and appropriate condition and informatives suggested.

LBH Ecology Consultant – We have reviewed the Preliminary Ground Level Bat Roost Assessment of Trees (Middlemarch Environmental, August 2021) relating to the likely impacts of development on designated sites, protected species and Priority species / habitats.

We are satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination. No objection subject to securing biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures through imposition of applicable condition(S)

LBH Landscaping Consultant –The Urban Green Factor should be revised to achieve the 0.4 score from its current 0.38 in line with any design progression and is included with any further landscape related submissions . A prior to commencement of development: Landscape Scheme condition is recommended

Officer comment: Noted and appropriate condition and informatives suggested

London Fire Brigade – Following the submission of additional information, we no longer have any fundamental objection to the scheme.

Officer comment: Noted and appropriate condition and informative suggested.

Thames Water – (Foul Water and Surface Water) no objection to the application based on the information provided. However, approval should be sought from the Lead Local Flood Authority.

Anglian Water – It falls outside of our statutory sewage boundary – we have no comment.

Essex & Suffolk Water – No objection to this development subject to compliance with our requirements, consent is given to the development on the condition that a water connection for the new dwellings is made onto our Company network for the revenue purpose.

Designing Out Crime Officer – No fundamental objection subject to conditions.

Officer comment: Noted and appropriate condition and informatives suggested.

8 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

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

8.2 A total of 47 consultation letters were sent to neighbouring properties regarding this application.

8.3 10 representations (9 objection, 1 comment with condition) have been received.

Representations

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

Objections

- i. The size of the proposed development will dominate the street view and impact negatively on the character of Nelves Way;

- ii. The proposal is out of character
- iii. This is a residential area and cannot cope with a large care home facility
- iv. Concerned about the level traffic to be generated as a result;
- v. Not enough parking facility;
- vi. A 3 storey building that can accommodate 87 bedrooms will be impossible to screen sufficiently and will cause issues with privacy in overlooked rooms at the front of our property;
- vii. We believe that the original traffic monitoring survey at the site was carried out during the Corona virus lockdown when no one was out and the college was closed. This does not reflect the true daily situation. Parking and traffic in this section of Nelmes Way is already very busy when the college is open and we think that this will be made worse by the number of employees and visitors generated by such a large facility;
- viii. Both Nelmes Way and Platford Green would adversely affected by this development with increased traffic from relatives and staff visiting residents;
- ix. We are in a residential area and we have terrible traffic already with all the visitors and parents picking up children from Nelmes School and Champion School as they park along Tyle Green to pick them up. A care home will only mean more traffic, more people and we do not want to live in such a busy area;
- x. Its excessive depth and height, result in an unsatisfactory relationship between building blocks leading to loss of outlook;
- xi. This is an overdevelopment of the site;
- xii. More trees should be planted instead.

Comment with condition

- xiii. Overall plans look ok but we have a major concern regarding being over looked as we are one of the houses backing onto the land

Emerson Park & Ardleigh Green Residents' Association (EPAGRA):

- xiv. While the site is outside the Emerson Park, its relationship with it requires the proposal be assessed against similar policies governing Emerson Park. Since it would represent an institutional residential development, we do not believe that this proposal would comply with current relevant planning policies. Should an exception be made, the development should seek to ensure that it would maintain and enhance the character of the area;
- xv. A 3-storey scale building would be unique in the area, and as such out of character;
- xvi. We support the proposed elevation which divides the frontage into 3 elements, thereby creating a scale more sympathetic to that of large detached houses;
- xvii. A substantial and attractive boundary treatment is essential and should include an appropriate, attractive boundary enclosure, of sufficient height to screen the site;
- xviii. Lighting should be well designed;
- xix. The open vista to be created from Nelmes Way across the car park and building should be reduced to allow for more planting within the car park;

Officer comment: The issues raised are addressed in the context of the report.

Cllr Roger Ramsey:

Having been contacted by EPAGRA on behalf of residents I would wish the following matters in particular to be considered by officers and by the committee:

1. The impact on surrounding dwellings because of its scale and nature.
2. The impact on existing mature trees, and if the development is allowed the need for landscaping and suitable screening to mitigate the visual impact.
3. The need for restrictions on signage and lighting to mitigate the impact on the surrounding housing.
4. Such a development should not be commenced until sufficient alternative car parking is available for college use.
5. Provision should be made on site or elsewhere for vehicles associated with the construction works or construction workers in order to safeguard the local road network.

Officer comment: The issues raised are noted and are considered in the context of the report.

9 Relevant Policies

9.1 The following planning policies are material considerations for the assessment of the application:

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out Government planning policies for England and how these should be applied. It provides a framework within which locally-prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced. Themes relevant to this proposal are:

- 2 - Achieving sustainable development
- 5 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- 8 - Promoting healthy and safe communities
- 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
- 11 - Making effective use of land
- 12 - Achieving well-designed places
- 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

London Plan 2021

- GG1 Building strong and inclusive communities
- GG2 Making the best use of land
- GG3 Creating a healthy city
- GG4 Delivering the homes Londoners need
- GG5 Growing a good economy
- GG6 Increasing efficiency and resilience
- D2 Infrastructure requirements for sustainable densities
- D4 Delivering good design
- D5 Inclusive design
- D6 Housing quality and standards
- D7 Accessible housing
- D11 Safety, security and resilience to emergency
- D12 Fire safety

- D14 Noise
- G5 Urban greening
- H13 Specialist older persons housing
- G1 Green infrastructure
- G9 Geodiversity
- SI1 Improving air quality
- SI2 Minimising greenhouse gas emissions
- SI3 Energy infrastructure
- SI4 Managing heat risk
- SI5 Water infrastructure
- SI6 Digital connectivity infrastructure
- SI7 Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy
- SI12 Flood risk management
- SI13 Sustainable drainage
- T1 Strategic approach to transport
- T2 Healthy Streets
- T3 Transport capacity, connectivity and safeguarding
- T4 Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
- T5 Cycling
- T6 Car parking
- T9 Funding transport infrastructure through planning

Sustainable Design and Construction (2014)

This SPG contains advice on natural resource management, climate change adaptation and pollution management. It reinforces similar policies contained within national and local planning policy.

Character and Context SPG (2014)

This document sets out the principles of site responsive design that should inform the Design and Access Statement to be submitted with the application, helping to promote the right development in the right place.

Accessible London SPG

This and the document Design and Access Statements: How to write, read and use them (Design Council, 2006) guidance from Design Council CABE will also help to inform preparation of the Design and Access Statement needed to accompany the application.

Havering Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008)

The following policies are considered relevant to the proposed development:

- CP1 - Housing Supply
- CP2 - Sustainable Communities
- CP5 - Culture
- CP8 - Community facilities
- CP9 - Reducing the need to travel
- CP10 - Sustainable transport
- CP15 - Environmental Management
- CP17 - Design

- DC3 - Housing Design and Layout
- DC5 – Specialist Accommodation
- DC27 – Provision of Community Facilities
- DC32 - The Road Network
- DC33 - Car Parking
- DC34 - Walking
- DC35 - Cycling
- DC36 – Servicing
- DC49 - Sustainable Design and Construction
- DC50 - Renewable energy
- DC51 - Water supply, drainage and quality
- DC52 - Air Quality
- DC53 - Contaminated Land
- DC55 – Noise
- DC60 - Trees and Woodland
- DC61 - Urban Design
- DC63 - Delivering Safer Places
- DC62 - Access
- DC66 - Public Realm

Havering Emerging Local Plan (2018)

The following policies should inform design of the proposed development:

- 3 - Housing supply
-
- 6 – Specialist accommodation
- 7 - Residential design and amenity
- 12 - Healthy communities
- 16 - Social Infrastructure
- 23 - Transport connections
- 24 - Parking provision and design
- 26 - Urban design
- 27 - Landscaping
- 29 - Green infrastructure
- 30 - Nature conservation
- 33 - Air quality
- 34 - Managing pollution
- 35 - On-site waste management
- 36 - Low carbon design, decentralised energy and renewable energy

Havering Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)

Aspects of the following documents apply to the proposed development though need to be read in combination with newer mayoral guidance:

- Residential Design (2010)
- Sustainable Design and Construction (2009)

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

- Principle of Development
- Design, character and setting of the building
- Impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers
- Access, the impact on the highway network and parking provision
- Flood Risk and Development
- Sustainability
- Noise and Air Quality
- Statement of Community Involvement
- Archaeology and Contamination
- Ecology and Biodiversity

10.2 **Principle of Development**

10.2.1 The application site forms part of the New City College. The College, as part of its Masterplan for the campus delivering an innovative education facility, have identified underutilised parts of the campus which could be sold in order to secure a capital receipt for reinvestment in the campus. This includes modern fit for purpose buildings.

10.2.3 As part of the Masterplan process, 476 car parking spaces currently provided has been assessed to be surplus to the requirement to meet the needs of its students, staff and visitors. The southern part of the car park, along Nemes Way, has been identified as an area which could be released for alternative development and this plot is the subject of this application and a separate outline application for three new self-build detached dwellings. Planning application (P0285.21) for relocating the car park area to another part of the college campus was approved at the 1st July 2021 Planning Committee. As such, the principal of redeveloping the application site for non-educational uses has been established.

10.2.4 The proposal is sited on a brownfield site. Local Plan policies CP2, CP8 and DC5 state among other things that development proposals for community facilities and specialist accommodation will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the principles of sustainable development are satisfied and that they will accord with the objectives and policies of the Local Plan. Policies CP1 and DC2 requires development to take place on previously developed land. These objectives are consistent with the London Plan and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which encourage the provision of more housing and the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed provided that it is not of high environmental value. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through decision-taking. Paragraph 11 (a) of the NFF states that:

“All plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to: meet the development needs of their area; align growth and infrastructure; improve the environment; mitigate climate change (including by making effective use of land in urban areas) and adapt to its effects.”

- 10.2.5 The proposed development represents an important employment investment in the area creating up to 100 jobs (70 full time and 30 part time). The jobs created would comprise a variety of positions and skill sets including carers, catering, housekeeping, administration and management roles. A number of construction jobs would also be created during the construction phase of the project. A number of supplier related jobs associated with both the construction and operational phases of the development will also be created to the benefit of the Hornchurch area and the wider area.
- 10.2.6 The provision of specialist housing accommodation is welcomed and is consistent with the aims of the emerging Local Plan Policy 6 and London Plan Policy H13 and the NPPF to deliver housing for older people. The site has not been allocated for additional housing supply and as such comes forward as a windfall residential site. The Council expects a significant amount of new housing to be from 'windfall' supply which is consistent with the London Plan which expects borough's to maximise housing supply.
- 10.2.7 The application site is located within an existing residential area where the infrastructure has capacity to absorb further development. The application site is also located within an area which is accessible by non-car modes of transport and where there are services and facilities available within walking distance of the site. Furthermore, there are no known physical or environmental constraints at this site.
- 10.2.8 In conclusion, the principle of housing for older people on a previously developed site in Hornchurch is supported subject to other relevant policy considerations including the wider impacts of this proposal on the highway network, parking provision, building layout & design, environment and residential amenity. These are now discussed in turn below.
- 10.3 **Design, scale and setting of the building**
- 10.3.1 The NPPF 2021 attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Paragraph 126 states *'The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable 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.'*
- 10.3.2 The NPPF states (paragraph 134) that "development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents". Paragraph 133 states that 'applicants will be expected to work closely with those directly affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community' and this is reinforced in London Plan Policy D2, which seeks the involvement of local communities and stakeholders in the planning of large developments.
- 10.3.3 Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan require that buildings, streets and open spaces should provide a high quality design response that has regard to the pattern and grain of the existing spaces and streets in orientation, scale, proportion, appearance, shape and form.

- 10.3.4 Core Strategy policy CP17 states that new development to ‘maintain or improve the character and appearance of the local area in its scale and design’. Core Strategy policy DC61 states that ‘Planning permission will only be granted for development which maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area. Development must therefore: respond to distinctive local building forms and patterns of development and respect the scale, massing and height of the surrounding physical context.’ These policies are expanded upon in the Council’s Supplementary Design Document (SDD) which requires the impact of a development to be assessed giving regard to the bulk, scale and design of the proposal and how it harmonises with the existing building and area.
- 10.3.5 The scheme before the Council has been developed through detailed pre-application discussions held with Officers and Chair’s Review - Quality Review Panel, as well as members of the Strategic Planning Committee.
- 10.3.6 It is evident that the design of the building has been influenced by the immediate context of the site in terms of its situation within the Emerson Park, Hornchurch whilst the layout of the site has regard to the residential area to the south (Nelmes Way) as well as the historic charm of Ardleigh House to the west and the northeast of the site as discussed in detail earlier in this report.
- 10.3.7 The accompanying Design and Access Statement provides a detailed description of the proposals and demonstrates that the proposed development can be satisfactorily accommodated across the site given the surrounding context.
- 10.3.8 The scheme proposes a varied palette of high quality traditional materials combined with a contemporary form of detailing, which would create a well-articulated and visually interesting building of an appropriately high standard for this location. The external wall treatment comprises a range of brick finishes, including textured detailing, deep set reveals and a celebratory expression of chimneys referencing the materials and handsome detailing seen on Ardleigh House. Notwithstanding the information submitted with this application, a planning condition requiring the approval of materials would be appropriate to ensure that the detailed design of the proposed building can be properly assessed and agreed.
- 10.3.9 The building features a strong and clear public entrance which will ensure that the building delivers a legible form. In terms of its scale and massing the proposed development represents an efficient use of the land whilst still sitting comfortably within the site. It is considered that the building’s design, scale and massing and site layout would result in a scheme which reflects the locality and the function of the building without resulting in an overly dominant form of development when viewed from surrounding public vantage points.
- 10.3.10 The proposal has also been considered against Local Plan Policy DC61 and Policy 27 of the emerging Local Plan require landscaping to form an integral part of the overall design. Landscaping can protect and enhance the existing visual character of the area and reduce the visual and environmental impacts of a development. In this case, a landscaping scheme is proposed for the site, which should assist in setting the development within the context of its wider surroundings and further act to soften the scale and visual impact of the building.

- 10.3.11 The Council's Landscape advisor has confirmed that the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) clearly identifies the existing vegetation to be retained and protected and justifies proposed removals. The proposed scheme has sought to reinstate and enhance the remaining trees with the addition of new tree planting to screen along boundaries and provide amenity and ecological enhancement throughout the site. The proposed level of tree planting is welcomed and, subject to further details coming forward regarding species and installation size, the provision is considered to be sufficient.
- 10.3.12 The general arrangement of the site is acceptable, however, the schedule of species needs minor amendments. Some identified species are inappropriate for their allotted locations due to their natural growth form and some trees specified on the schedule are not obtainable in the sizes specified. These are minor amendments which can be resolved through a condition requiring a detailed landscaping scheme to be approved.
- 10.3.13 The landscaping scheme pays particular attention to the treatment of the southern and south-eastern site boundary with Nemes Way and property on Garland Way. Here, a linear planting scheme will reduce the impact of the development on residential amenity and will comprise a mixture of dense tree planting, hedging and shrubbery.
- 10.3.14 The proposals also recognise that accessible and functional outside amenity areas will be very important to the health and wellbeing of the future occupants of the care home. To this end, the garden has been designed to include several distinctly separate areas, which have various functions, situated along a footpath which wraps around the building. This layout is designed to encourage users to walk alongside and touch, see and smell the plants, with raised planters, which are to be designed and specified in such a way as to be wheelchair accessible; accessing straight, without twisting. The largest garden area includes a pergola with climbing shrub to act as the focal point and destination with seating areas. Planting either side will provide some privacy. Lawns are to be planted with a variety of tree species to act as a mini parkland. Benches would be provided at various locations to enjoy different aspects of the garden in sunshine and shade.
- 10.3.15 The external areas at the front of the proposed building would have planting beds and shrubs designed to provide an attractive entrance and to soften the visual impact of the car park.
- 10.3.16 On balance, and although outside the Emerson Park boundary, it is considered that the proposals accord with the Urban Design Principles outlined in the adopted Emerson Park Policy Area Supplementary Planning Document and will assist in the overall aim of creating a high quality environment, establishment of a much needed private residential care home and the creation of employment opportunities in the area. The proposal also accords with the stated national, London and local plan policies.

10.4 **Impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers**

- 10.4.1 London Plan Policy D6 *Housing quality and standards* states that buildings and structures should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings in relation to privacy, overshadowing, wind and microclimate.
- 10.4.2 Core Strategy Policy CP17 requires development to respond positively to the local context in terms of design, siting, density and spacing. Policy DC61 requires all development to achieve a high standard of privacy and amenity, and sets out a number of criteria for the consideration of the same. In addition, development should be designed, orientated and positioned in such a way to minimise overlooking between dwellings. The Council's Residential Design Guide supplementary planning document is also relevant.
- 10.4.3 Policy DC55 deals specifically with noise and vibration pollution and states that proposals will be refused if the development is likely to generate unacceptable noise or vibration for other land users.
- 10.4.4 In assessing the environmental impacts of the proposal it is clear that a balance has to be made between ensuring that residents are adequately protected from noise, whilst at the same time not placing unreasonable restrictions on the nearby college.
- 10.4.5 There is a college next door with at least 400 parking spaces. The impact from the use of the college car park, the closest residential façade to the site and the assessment of the impact of the site operation on nearby residential properties can be seen from the noise readings taken for the noise impact assessment which accompanied the application. The noise assessment demonstrates the site is located within Noise Risk Category 1 which suggests a low level of risk for daytime and night time levels but further mitigation level will be required at Stage 2. It suggests that the development should be designed with a 4mm glass / 6 - 16mm air gap / 4mm glass double glazed windows and a Titon V50 Window Vent or similarly approved to all to ensure that the internal noise levels stipulated within BS8233:2014 are not exceeded. The measured noise levels will also need to be taken into account when choosing the glazing specification to ensure that sleep disturbance is minimised. Outside amenity areas must comply with the 55dB WHO Community Noise Guideline level.
- 10.4.6 Given the site's proximity to the sensitive boundary of Nelmes Way the site layout has been designed to minimise any environmental impact on the surrounding properties. In particular, the car parking areas and building service areas are sited away from the residences to the north of Garland Way and Russetts. The building's orientation is such that it would provide a visual and acoustic barrier to the servicing activities. Notwithstanding this, noise from deliveries at unsociable times would have the potential to cause a loss of amenity at the closest residential properties to the site. As such, a condition restricting delivery times is recommended.
- 10.4.8 .No details of actual plant or equipment to be installed has been provided, it is therefore recommended that a condition be placed on the application requiring any plant to be 10dB below the background noise level at the nearest sensitive receptors.
- 10.4.9 Environmental Health were consulted on the proposal and did not object subject to conditions to ensure that the development is carried out and completed in accordance

with details to be approved by the Local Planning Authority relating to noise attenuation/mitigation measures and the proposed mechanical ventilation systems.

- 10.4.10 With regards to odour from the kitchen extract system, although sufficient odour dissipation is likely due to the distance to the nearest residential properties, Environmental Health have suggested a planning condition requiring details of odour abatement measures for the kitchen extract system to be approved by the Local Planning Authority.
- 10.4.11 In terms of external lighting, a condition is recommended to protect neighbouring residents from the potential impact of the proposal.
- 10.4.12 The distance between the adjacent housing on Russetts and the proposed new housing on Garland Way and the proposed care home is approximately 23 metres. The height of the care home, although partly 2-storey, is predominantly 3 storeys, which is higher than the residential properties opposite but the overall height of the building is similar to the adjacent college buildings. The maximum height of the nearby residential property on Russetts is 8.1m whereas the 3 storey elements of the care home would range between 12.4m and 13.8m in height. However, the element closest to the properties on Russetts is mainly two storeys and approximately 10.3 in height set some 23m away and 5m from their rear boundary fence. The elevations and roof are staggered in order to break the building's elevation and soften the visual connection with Nelmes Way. The variety and subdivision of the building into a series of stepped blocks with a change of heights avoids the creation of a large continuous built form. For the reasons above, the proposal would have no significant impact on neighbour amenity in terms of access to day/sun/sky light, privacy or overbearing impact.
- 10.4.13 In terms of screening, the site boundary with Nelmes Way is buffered by structured landscaping which is comprised of a footpath, grass verge and some bordering trees and shrubs. The proposal includes a comprehensive landscaping scheme which would soften the visual impact of the development when viewed from Nelmes Way.
- 10.4.14 The northern site boundary with the college would also be screened by a mixed species hedge and the canopies from a mix of trees. In terms of privacy and the inter-visibility between the care home and the adjacent college, the nearest windows are approximately 10 metres apart, whilst others are up to 28 metres apart. This is due to the staggered footprint of proposed building. However, it is noted that there are no windows in the flank wall of the college building closest to the proposed care home. The nearest windows facing adjoining residential properties would be set approximately 50 metres apart. This separation distance and orientation, together with the proposed landscaping, is sufficient to ensure that there will be an acceptable degree of privacy for the future occupants of the care home and the occupants at adjacent properties.
- 10.4.15 Giving consideration to the scale of the proposal, it's siting and the separation distance from neighbouring properties, it is considered that the development would not have an unreasonable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties or the future occupiers of the care home subject to appropriate conditions.

In this respect, no objections are raised with regard to London Plan Policy D6, Local Plan policies DC55 and DC61 the SPD or the NPPF.

10.5 Access, the impact on the highway network and parking provision.

- 10.5.1 London Plan policy T4 states that 'when required in accordance with national or local guidance, transport assessments/statements should be submitted with development proposals to ensure that impacts on the capacity of the transport network (including impacts on pedestrians and the cycle network), at the local, network-wide and strategic level, are fully assessed. Transport assessments should focus on embedding the Healthy Streets Approach within, and in the vicinity of, new development. Travel Plans, Parking Design and Management Plans, Construction Logistics Plans and Delivery and Servicing Plans will be required having regard to Transport for London guidance'. Policies T2 and T5 relate to healthy streets, the provision of cycle and pedestrian friendly environments, whilst policy T6 relates to parking standards. Core Strategy policy CP9 seeks to 'secure enhancements to the capacity, accessibility and environmental quality of the transport network', whilst policy CP10 reinforces the aims of London Plan Policy T4, which aims to contribute to modal shift through the application of parking standards and implementation of a Travel Plan. These aims are also reflected in Policies 23 and 24 of the emerging Local Plan. These objectives are broadly consistent with a core principle of the NPPF that planning should seek to secure high quality design.
- 10.5.2 Vehicular access into the site is provided from Nelmes Way, where there is an access established by the existing College on site. This leads to a parking court towards the north and western corner of the site. A 2m wide footway would be provided along the south western side of the access and road from the existing footway on Nelmes Way. This would continue via an internal crossing to the main building entrance. A second pedestrian access is proposed some 15m east of the vehicular access with a 2m wide footpath providing an internal route from the footway on Nelmes Way directly to the building entrance.
- 10.5.3 The proposals seek to widen the access to 7.2m from 6.5m and provide a footway to the southern side. The width of the new access route is suitable to enable two way vehicle flow and visibility along Nelmes Way. The access shall be of the form of a vehicle crossing, thereby retaining pedestrian priority across the frontage of the site and ensuring that a new minor access is not created which would introduce difficulties in terms of junction spacing.
- 10.5.4 It is not intended that the access be gated. The setback of the buildings is sufficient that any ingress and egress of vehicles shall not interfere with the highway, nor shall vehicles waiting for delivery/service and emergency vehicles to manoeuvre within the site obstruct the carriageway whilst undertaking this activity.
- 10.5.5 The development proposals are considered by the Highway Authority to have a net impact of additional vehicle movements in the weekday AM peak and in the weekday PM peak over and above the existing situation. The level of additional vehicle movements would not result in a severe impact on the operation of the local highway Network taking into account the current use of the site as a higher college of education and the resultant level of parking from the proposed Master Plan which will be less than the existing. From the existing 476 parking spaces to 452

- 10.5.6 In terms of sustainable transport, the site is well located within walking distance of a range of shops and services and benefits from immediate access to footways, cycleway and public transport. It is observed that bus stops on Ardleigh Green Road exist adjacent to New City College site and these serve the number 256 bus service which operates between Noak Hill and St George's Hospital in Hornchurch typically every 8-13 minutes during the day. The southbound stop is a 250m walk from the site and has a shelter, seat and timetable and the northbound stop is a further 120m to the north and has a flag and timetable information. Gidea Park railway station is some 1.4km (0.870miles) west of the site on Station Road and serves the line between Liverpool Street and Shenfield with trains typically every 8- 10 minutes. Emerson Park railway station is some 1.3km south of the site on Butts Green Road and serves the TfL Overground line between Romford and Upminster with trains typically every 30 minutes. Bus services 256, 165 and 370 stop adjacent to Emerson Park railway station. The site is therefore considered to be one of sustainable locations in the Borough given that it is highly accessible for local amenities and accessible to a number of modes of transport other than by use of a private car.
- 10.5.7 Notwithstanding the above, given that the average age of residents of Signature care homes (85 years old), amenities and services have been provided on-site where possible to provide easy access for those with mobility issues. Residents are not provided with their own kitchen for meal preparation, with all meals taken in the on-site restaurant. Personal care is also taken in house. This means that there is little need for residents to do their own regular food shopping or access local services. In addition, a range of local shops and services is provided on Ardleigh Green Road some 430m north of the site. These include a Tesco Express food store, pharmacy, newsagent, homeware shop, takeaways, hairdressers and a restaurant.
- 10.5.8 In terms of parking, Policy T6 of the London Plan relates to parking standards while Policy 24 of the emerging Local Plan requires all developments to provide sufficient parking provision in accordance with the maximum parking standards in the London Plan. Paragraph 107 of the NPPF states that if setting local parking standards authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development, availability of public transport; local car ownership levels and the overall need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.
- 10.5.9 There are no specific car parking standards for care home developments provided in the London Plan 2021. Local Plan Policy DC33 sets out maximum parking standards in Annex 5 and for nursing homes/C2 uses indicates a provision of 1 car space per 4 resident bedspaces. On this basis, 22 on-site parking spaces would typically be required for a residential development of this scale. In this case it is proposed to provide 46 parking spaces for residents, visitors and staff in two car parking areas including three disabled bays. In addition, the applicant has advised that a minibus would be based at the care home for transporting residents to and from offsite activities, local facilities and medical centres as required. Trips out would be organised as part of the residents' daily activity programme.
- 10.5.10 In this regard the application is supported by a detailed Transport Statement which sets out the applicant's case that the level of parking space to serve the development

is appropriate given the lower demand generated specifically by care home accommodation of this kind. This evidence draws on the company's experience in constructing other care home housing schemes across the country and profiling the typical resident of an apartment Signature UK. The provision of 46 parking spaces on the site should therefore be adequate to accommodate parking demand within the site given the sustainable location of the site.

- 10.5.11 Notwithstanding the above, on-street parking is permitted within this stretch of Nelmes Way, albeit limited. The Highway Authority have advised that any potential for overspill on-street parking is not considered to have a prejudicial impact on the operation of the highway network.
- 10.5.12 On balance, given that accessibility by non-car modes of transport is relatively good and a wide range of regularly required services and facilities are within a short walking distance and the intended residents are frail and elderly, it is considered that the future residents of the development would not be dependent upon car ownership to meet most of their daily required needs. Whilst some staff and visitors are likely to be car owners, the consequence of this would not result in a significant adverse impact on either the highway network or the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
- 10.5.13 Subject to the mitigation measures to be secured through conditions, as referred to above, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and no objections are raised with regard to relevant national, London and local policies.

10.6. **Flood Risk and Development**

- 10.6.1 Local Plan Policy DC48 states 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.
- 10.6.2 The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment maps show that the site is not located in a higher risk flood zone London Plan policies SI12 and SI13 state that development should utilise sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) and should aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and this objective is reiterated in Policy DC48.
- 10.6.3 A Flood Risk Assessment and surface Water Drainage Assessment (carried out by Clark Smith Partnership, April 2021) was submitted with this application. Having consulted the Lead Local Flood Authority – the Council flood risk and drainage management team, no objections have been raised with regard to the impact on surface water flooding either on site or further afield and the proposed development has been found to be acceptable in principle, subject to suggested planning conditions including appropriate mitigation (including adequate warning procedures) can be maintained for the lifetime of the development, in accordance with Local Plan Policy DC48, policies SI12 and SI13 of the London Plan and the NPPF.

10.7. **Sustainability**

- 10.7.1 Paragraphs 155 - 158 of the NPPF relate to decentralised energy, renewable and low carbon energy. Chapter 9 of the London Plan contains a set of policies that require developments to make the fullest contribution to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change, and to minimise carbon dioxide emissions ,where the residential

element of the application achieves at least a 35 per cent reduction in regulated carbon dioxide emissions beyond Part L Building Residential development should achieve 10 per cent, and non-residential development should achieve 15 per cent through energy efficiency measures. . Specifically, Policy SI2 sets out an energy hierarchy for assessing applications, as set out below:

- 1) *Be lean: use less energy*
- 2) *Be clean: supply energy efficiently*
- 3) *Be green: use renewable energy*

10.7.2 Core Policy DC48 requires development proposals to incorporate sustainable building design and layout.

10.7.3 The applicant has submitted a Sustainability and Energy Report. The energy report sets out that a 51% reductions in regulated CO2 emission is predicted to be achieved onsite.

10.7.4 The Energy Strategy sets out the following approaches to be taken to achieve the London Plan CO2 target reduction:

“Be Lean” – sustainable design and construction measures will be used to improve air tightness, high performance glazing and efficient lighting;

“Be Clean” – highly efficient, individual low NOx boilers (The site is not situated near to an existing or planned district heat network, and on-site CHP and community heating is inappropriate for a development of this nature); and

Be Green” – the installation photovoltaic panels (PV) at roof level and the use of air source heat pumps.

10.7.5 Whilst a detailed design will be necessary to demonstrate that the proposed development will achieve the overall CO2 reduction, it is anticipated that through the above measures the proposal will achieve an overall CO2 reduction of 51%. In terms of carbon offset, it is estimate that 120.8 tonnes of domestic CO2 emissions would need to be offset through of site contributions. This is estimated at £217,432. The final offset contribution would be determined after a completed SAP certificate has been provided. The mechanism to secure this would be through the section 106 agreement.

10.7.6 In conclusion, the development would accord with development plan policies. To ensure compliance with these standards, a condition is attached requiring a post occupation assessment of energy ratings, demonstrating compliance with the

10.8 **Noise and Air Quality**

10.8.1 The proposed development is located within a designated Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) due to high concentrations of nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter. Paragraphs 112 & 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework and The London Plan policies SI1, SI3, T61 seeks to ensure that development proposals minimise increased exposure to existing poor air quality and make provision to address local problems of air quality, particularly within air quality management areas (which the

site is) and where the development is likely to be used by large numbers of people vulnerable to poor air quality (such as children or older people). Development proposals should be at least air quality neutral and should not lead to further deterioration of existing poor air quality.

- 10.8.2 An Air Quality Assessment has been submitted in support of this planning application to assess the air quality impacts of the proposals. The assessment concluded that following the successful implementation of the suggested mitigation measures during the construction phase, the residual effects of construction dust and emissions from construction activities upon the local area and sensitive receptors although adverse, will be temporary and not significant. And that during the operational phase, the operational assessment has demonstrated that the proposals will have a net positive impact upon existing air quality concentrations compared to the current use. Air quality for future residents is predicted to be good.
- 10.8.3 The Environmental Health Officers has advised that the Air Quality Assessment for the construction phase has shown that the site is Medium to High risk, in relation to dust soiling and Low risk in relation to human health effects. Based on this risk assessment, appropriate mitigation measures need to be set out in a Dust Management Plan, to ensure the air quality impacts of construction and demolition are minimised. This is to be secured by conditions.

Noise

- 10.8.4 Local Plan Policy DC55 states that planning permission will not be granted if it will result in exposure to noise or vibrations above acceptable levels affecting a noise sensitive development such as all forms of residential accommodation, schools and hospitals.
- 10.8.5 A Noise Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application. The acoustic report demonstrates the site is located within Noise Risk Category 2 which suggests a medium level of risk for daytime levels and Noise Risk Category 1 which suggests a low level of risk for night time levels. As a result, the report suggests a series of mitigation measures, all of which are to be incorporated into the scheme to meet the aims of Policy DC55. Again, the Environmental Health officer has not raised any objection to the proposal on noise grounds subject to conditions.
- 10.8.6 Based on the above and with the suggested mitigation measures in place, it is considered that the proposed development would accord with national, regional and local planning policies in relation to noise and air quality

10.9 **Archaeology and Contamination**

- 10.9.1 An Archaeological Desk Based Assessment has been submitted with the application in accordance with current and emerging planning policy, which concludes that in terms of relevant designated heritage assets, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck sites have been identified within the vicinity of the site. And in terms of relevant local designations, the study site does not lie within an Archaeological Priority Area or an Archaeological Priority Zone as defined by the London Borough of Havering and GLAAS. The study site can be considered likely to have a generally low archaeological potential for all past periods

of human activity and on the basis of the available information, no further archaeological mitigation measures are recommended for this site

- 10.9.2 Based on the above, it is considered that the proposal accords with the guiding principles of the NPPF, Policies HC1 of the London Plan, DC70 of the LDF, 28 of the emerging Local Plan and the Heritage SPD with regards to archaeology and cultural heritage matters.

Contaminated Land

- 10.9.3 The proposed care home use is more domestic in nature to that of the adjacent College site and the outside area may receive more use as a consequence, including gardening activities. On this basis, the Council's Environmental Health officer has recommended a Phase III Remediation Strategy report to be prepared subject to the approval of the Local Planning Authority to ensure that there is no risk of contamination in accordance with Local Plan policies CP15 and DC53 the NPPF

10.10 Ecology and Biodiversity

- 10.10.1 Policies CP16, DC58 and DC60 of the Havering Core Strategy seek to safeguard ecological interests and wherever possible, provide for their enhancement. The emerging Local Plan, Policy 30 states that the Council will protect and enhance the Borough's natural environment and seek to increase the quantity and quality of biodiversity by ensuring developers demonstrate that the impact of proposals on protected sites and species have been fully assessed when development has the potential to impact on such sites or species. The policy goes on to state that it will not permit development which would adversely affect the integrity of Specific Scientific Interest, Local Natural Reserves and Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, except for reason of overriding public interest, or where adequate compensatory measures are provided. The Council has also adopted the 'Protecting and Enhancing the Borough's Biodiversity' SPD (2009). This requires ecological surveys of sites to be carried out prior to development.

- 10.10.2 The presence of protected species is a material consideration, in accordance with the Framework (paragraphs 179-182), Natural Environment & Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 (section 40), Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (and amended 2012) as well as Circular 06/05.

- 10.10.3 Ecological Walkover Survey Report RT-MME-154285-01 dated April 2021 and Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy Report RT-MME-154285-02 dated April 2021 (by Middlemarch Environmental) was submitted in support of this application. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal found no evidence of roosting bats; however a low number of potential suitable roosting features were identified and, following Bat Conservation Trust best practice guidelines, further surveys were recommended to inform the need for mitigation measures in relation to bats.

- 10.10.4 The follow-up bat surveys (Preliminary Ground Level Bat Roost Assessment of Trees Report dated August 2021) were carried out on 16th August 2021 and low numbers of Common Pipistrelle bats were recorded foraging and commuting within 1km of the site. The Assessment shows that numerous trees were present throughout the site, predominantly associated with the site boundary features and car park. The majority of these trees on site were young or semi-mature, with several mature and early mature

trees present along the northern and eastern site boundaries. Two trees, T30 (early mature ash) and T70 (mature horse chestnut), were classed as having high potential to support roosting bats, due to the presence of a range of potential roosting features such as rot holes, knot holes and branch socket cavities extending into the principal leader. The remaining trees were generally in good condition, with some possessing dense ivy cover in places, but no obvious potential roost features when observed from ground level. These trees were classed as having low or negligible potential to support roosting bats.

- 10.10.5 The survey area is considered to be of moderate suitability for roosting, foraging and commuting bats, supporting numerous trees and hedgerows associated with the boundary features on site, which provide connectivity to the wider landscape and further suitable roosting, foraging and commuting habitats.
- 10.10.6 The development proposals, which include removal of some existing tree, will result in the loss of potential known bat roosts. However, suitable mitigation has been provided to safeguard bats and ensure their conservation status is maintained. With these mitigation measures in place, the Local Planning Authority has sufficient information to deal adequately with bats from a planning perspective, and can apply and satisfy the third test of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) prior to determination.
- 10.10.7 It is acknowledged that a European Protected Species (EPS) licence will be required to proceed lawfully. Natural England may require a number of up-to-date activity surveys for a licence to be issued, consequently these need to be factored in to any development timescale.
- 10.10.8 Havering Council Ecology Advisors were consulted and have advised that on the basis of the above, bats should not be regarded as a constraint to these development proposals and the application can be determined accordingly. Subject to suggested conditions and informatives in accordance with Local Plan policies CP16, DC58 and DC60, Policy 30 of the emerging Local Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

11 Financial and Other Mitigation

- 11.1 The heads of terms of the section 106 agreement have been set out above. These are considered necessary to make the application acceptable, in accordance with Policy DC72 of the Havering Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008) nor meet the objectives of policies SI2 and DF1 the of London Plan.
- 11.2 The proposal would attract the following Community Infrastructure Levy contributions to mitigate the impact of the development:
- The London Borough of Havering's CIL was adopted in September 2019. Therefore financial contributions for infrastructure will be secured via this mechanism. Based on the figures provided by the developer in the submitted CIL form in good faith, and assuming the application is approved this year, the CIL would be:
 - Havering CIL: @£125/m² (5,621.7m² net)= £ 702,712.50*

- Mayoral CIL: @£25/m2 (5,621.7m2 net)= £140,542.5*
*subject to indexation.

12 **Other Planning Issues**

Designing Out Crime

- 12.1 Policy CP17 on 'Design' and Policy DC63 on 'Delivering Safer Places' from LBH's '*Development Plan Document*' 2008 falls in line with national and regional planning guidance which places design at the centre of the planning process. The above mentioned policy piece together reasoned criteria's for applicants to adopt the principles and practices of Secure By Design (SBD). More detail on the implementation of the above policy is provided from LBH's SPD on '*Designing Safer Places*' 2010, this document which forms part of Havering's Local Development Framework was produced to ensure the adequate safety of users and occupiers by setting out clear advice and guidance on how these objectives may be achieved and is therefore material to decisions on planning applications.

- 12.2 The submitted Design and Access Statement has referenced a management and security strategy, benefits of this approach provide a sense of security to its residents and the local community and discourage antisocial behaviour. The statement outlines that the design has been developed with SBD principles in mind following subsequent consultation response by the Designing out Crime Officer. Points raised include improved residential areas (secure access and access control), residential amenity spaces, refuse collection and bicycle storage areas. The Designing Out Crime Officer has raised no fundamental objection to the proposal subject to conditions.

13 **Conclusions**

- 13.1 At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The NPPF outlines, in its introduction, three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles. Of particular relevance to this application is an economic role, among others, to ensure land is available in the right places to support growth; a social role to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; as well as a an environmental role which includes protecting and enhancing the built environment.

- 13.2 The NPPF does not require development to jointly and simultaneously achieve planning gain in each of the three considerations. It is sufficient for all three to be considered and for a balance between benefit and adverse effects to be achieved across those three areas. In this instance, the proposal makes effective and efficient use of a car park site considered to be surplus to requirement and part of the master plan to self-finance future development and improvement to the college, the location of the development would be highly accessible for local amenities and public transport, and would provide additional accommodation in the area to support local shops and services, all in line with the NPPF. In addition, the development would have the potential to offer a special range of accommodation which would have some social benefit and encourage diversification of community, as required by Paragraph 130 of the NPPF. At the same time it will deliver inward investment to the Borough providing economic development and employment opportunities.

- 13.3 The impacts of the proposal have been considered in terms of access, highway capacity, parking provision, neighbour amenity and design. Other material considerations have also been considered.
- 13.4 Subject to the imposition of relevant conditions and the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement, to secure the listed obligations, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of the above and is not contrary to the aims and objectives of National Planning Policy Framework 2021, the policies and proposals in the London Plan (2021), the Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2008, the emerging Local Plan, having regards to all relevant material considerations, and any comments received in response to publicity and consultation. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted.

This page is intentionally left blank