

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
Council Chamber - Town Hall
25 January 2024 (7.01 - 9.06 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS 8

Conservative Group	Ray Best, John Crowder and Philippa Crowder (substituting for Dilip Patel)
Havering Residents' Group	Laurance Garrard (Chairman), Bryan Vincent and Paul Middleton (substituting for Reg Whitney)
Labour Group	Jane Keane

All decisions were taken with no votes against.

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

36 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillors Dilip Patel (Philippa Crowder substituting) and Reg Whitney (Paul Middleton substituting).

37 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest.

38 MINUTES

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2023 and it was noted that minute 35 concerning P2071.22 – The Seedbed Centre, Unit E5, Davidson Way, Romford was not accurate and did not make reference to the two form Primary School. It was agreed that an amended minute on this matter would be presented at the next meeting of the Committee.

The minutes were otherwise agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

39 **W0152.23 - CHIPPENHAM ROAD**

The Committee was advised that 138 flats were proposed in a Council-led development. There would be 117 affordable flats as well as 21 units for care leavers. The church at the location would be remaining on the site.

The scheme had been progressed with officers and a quality review panel was now in place. The development would have 100% affordable housing with 10% wheelchair provision. Accessible units in the buildings would be accessed from Chippenham Road and parking would be available around the perimeter of the site. Storage for mobility vehicles and wheelchairs would be built into the development. There was potential for a community garden and there would also be a high number of dual aspect units in the development. Landscaping would include integrated play spaces.

Whilst accepting that part of Chippenham Road was in a Controlled Parking Zone, the site was surrounded by unrestricted parking zones and representatives of the developer advised that spare parking capacity had been surveyed in nearby roads such as Dartfields and had been found to be at around 50%. The development would have a parking ration of 0.4 spaces per unit of housing. This was the maximum allowed under the London plan and the developer did not wish to overprovide parking if there were sufficient on street parking spaces available. Accessible parking and electric vehicle charging points would be available on site.

The planning consultant for the applicant explained that he worked in close consultation with the Council's housing team. The homes for young people would be provided for clients who had recently left Havering Care Services. There would be an on-site support officer available but it was accepted that this would only be during the day, not on a 24-hour basis. The supported units would be in a specific part of the site with a separate entrance. Occupants would be at least 18 years of age and more detail could be given of the design of the units. Members remained concerned at the prospect of housing young people together in this way.

The development was supported by local ward Councillors who were pleased with the increased provision of 3-bedroom homes but felt this should be raised further if possible. Ward Councillors also supported the provision for care leavers, provided that the correct support was given to the young people and felt that the proposed landscaping was important for the area. They felt that there were enough parking spaces in the area and that the development should link in with the proposed redevelopment of the shopping centre in Harold Hill.

The Committee noted the report and the presentation by the developer and raised the following matters for consideration as the proposal moved forward:

- The lack of architectural merit in the proposals although it was noted that the designs were still at an early stage.

- Concern from some Members that there were not enough parking spaces in the development. It was noted that a car club would be provided and that Harold Wood station could be reached by bus in 10 minutes. The developer therefore felt that there would be adequate parking provision. A transport assessment would be undertaken as part of the planning application. A parking management plan would also be included. Cycle parking would also be provided in line with the London Policy.
- Concern that delivery vehicles would have to park in the street rather than on site as would refuse collection vehicles.
- The provision of electric vehicle charging points should be at least in accordance with the London Plan. Officers also advised that there would be dedicated parking spaces for electric vehicles. Members also felt that consideration should be given to parking facilities for vehicles from utility companies etc.
- That more large, family homes should be provided. The developer responded that more 3-bedroom homes as well as two 4-bedroom homes had now been added and that adding further larger homes would reduce the overall number of units available. Members continued to feel however that the pressure in the local area for larger homes should be addressed by the development.
- That effective on-site supervision of occupants of the units for young people should be available. More detail should be provided of the design of the supported units.
- Reassurance was needed that the district heating scheme would not be cost prohibitive although the planning consultant confirmed that the scheme was in line with national policy.

Any further comments were requested to be sent to planning officers within the next week.

40 **P0070.23 - VEOLIA LTD - COLDHARBOUR LANE**

A report before the Committee summarised an application relating to a site of 2.4 hectares with access from Coldharbour Lane. The site currently comprised two recycling facilities and an uplift to the buildings of approximately 3,500 m² was proposed. The number of parking spaces proposed had now been reduced so there would be a low physical impact of the development.

Officers confirmed that there were no concerns over noise or air quality and that the proposal was considered acceptable for environmental issues. An ecology consultant had recommended some conditions that would increase biodiversity at the site. Parking management and travel plans would be drawn up for the site.

The site was in a zone 3 risk area for flooding but officers did not feel there were any major concerns re this. No additional flood measures were

planned but the Environment Agency had recommended some appropriate conditions.

The site would operate 24 hours per day and there would be 20 extra HGV movements per day plus an extra 40 on site. The vehicles would not however be going past residential areas.

The Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to the conditions as set out in the report as well as an extra condition that the agreement of an additional Head of Terms re cycle access improvements be delegated to officers.

The vote in favour of granting planning permission was carried unanimously, 7 votes to 0.

41 **P1358.22 - RAINHAM MARSHES, SILT LAGOONS, COLDHARBOUR LANE**

The report before the Committee sought permission to redevelop 8.5 ha of an area of partially filled salt lagoons to the south of the A13. The area was currently used for the storage of materials and plant, with access from Coldharbour Lane.

The application was for the extraction of waste and proposed a washing and screening plant by the lagoons, a crushing plant and materials storage. An ecological survey of the site had been completed by the applicant.

106 neighbours and businesses had been consulted but no representations had been received. The development site had already been approved for waste processing and materials would be delivered by either road or river. Some 750k tonnes of waste would be delivered to the site per year.

Visual impact had been assessed for a planned future recreation site in the area but it was felt there would be little visual impact from the development. The nearest residential properties were more than 1 km away. The application had been reviewed by the Environment Agency, RSPB and the Council's ecological consultant and it was felt that this would lead to a better habitat in the area in the long run.

A transport assessment had been completed in support of the application. Transport for London (TfL) had raised concerns over the local transport network and had recommended restricting the number of HGV movements at the site. Staff parking of six spaces was considered adequate but, given TfL's recommendation to improve the local cycle network, around £45k would be sought to improve local cycle connections.

Strategic Planning Committee, 25 January
2024

The Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to the conditions and s. 106 amendment set out in the report.

The vote in favour of granting planning permission was carried unanimously, 7 votes to 0.

Chairman