

Application Reference: P0094.20

Location: Neopost House, South Street, Romford

Ward: Hylands

Description: Full planning application for Erection of four blocks ranging from five (5) to nine (9) storeys to provide 82 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with car parking, associated cycle parking, Refuse Storage Facilities and Landscaping.

Case Officer: Habib Neshat

Reason for Report to Committee:

The application is of strategic importance and has been subject to pre-application presentation to members of the.

1 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 The proposed development would provide reasonable residential accommodation in a scheme which responds well to the specific site and location constraints by creating a contemporary design of buildings of balanced proportion using high quality materials.
- 1.2 Through careful design, siting and orientation, the scheme has sought to ensure its impact in terms of loss of light and privacy of the existing and the future occupiers would be acceptable.
- 1.3 The impact of the proposed development upon highways condition is acceptable.

- 1.4 The proposal would comply with key objective of the planning policies by providing considerable number of residential dwellings of appropriate size, dwelling mix and tenure.
- 1.4 The proposal includes 50% provision of affordable
- 1.5 Subject to conditions, adequate provision for drainage and flood prevention, ecology and other sustainable measures.
- 1.6 Considering all the pertinent factors and in particular with reference to the Council's housing delivery record it is considered that any harm identified with the proposal is outweighed by the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

2 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That the Committee resolve to grant planning permission subject to:

- i) No significant issues being raised in regard to the review of the submitted financial viability assessment. Should a greater proportion of rented tenure affordable be considered viable, then the application should be refused or reported back to this committee;
- ii) the following Heads of Terms to be included in the legal agreement;

Head of Terms;

- 1. On site provision of affordable housing provision, including 14 affordable housing units for rent and 27 units for shared ownership
- 2. Agree a review of the viability of the development be undertaken towards the end of the project when actual build costs and sales values of the flats are known. This would allow financial payment to be made towards affordable housing provision where the viability of the development can be shown to have improved to provide a financial surplus.
- 3. To provide training and recruitment scheme for the local workforce during construction period, in accordance with the provisions of Policy 22 of the Submission Havering Local Plan 2016 – 2031
- 4. Financial payment to the sum of £94,823.00 towards the Council's carbon offset fund.
- 5. Financial payment to the sum of £30,000 with respect to Public Realm Improvements to Havering Well Garden
- 6. Financial payment to the sum of £40,000 with respect to improvements to Grenfell Park including the provision of outdoor gym and trail landscaping and new paths,

7. The provision of car club on-site and covering free member ship for a year and for each full driving licenced driver resident with £50 driver credit.
 8. A restriction on ability of future occupiers to obtain parking permits pursuant to Section 16 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974. Controlled Parking Zone contribution sum of £8,304.00 or such other figure as is approved by the Council: Indexed
 9. The developer / applicant to pay the Council's reasonable legal costs associated with the draft of the Legal Agreement prior to the competition of the agreement irrespective of whether the agreement is completed.
 10. All contribution sums shall include interest to the due date of expenditure and all contribution sums to be subject to indexation from the date of completion of the Section 106 agreement to the date of receipt by the Council.
- (ii) 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 plans
3. Materials samples
4. Contaminated land investigation
5. Landscaping to be provided (as per details submitted)
6. Boundary Treatment details
7. External Lighting details
8. Refuse & Recycling details
9. Cycle Storage to be provided and retained
10. Hours of construction, 8am to 6pm Mon-Fri; 8am to 1pm Sat
11. Construction Management plan
12. Wheel Wash Facilities (Pre-commencement)
13. The provision of NOx Boilers
14. Delivery and Servicing Plan
15. Measures to be implemented in accordance to energy statement
16. Measures to be implemented in accordance to ecology report.
17. Materials for hardsurfacing –

18. Car parking to be made available and retained
19. Wheelchair Adaptable Dwellings.
20. Mitigate impact of noise from Roads
21. Mitigate impact of noise from plants
22. Surface water drainage strategy.
23. Parking and cycle management plan
24. Passive and active provision of electric vehicle charging points,
25. Secure by design certificate
26. Tree planting and tree protection
27. Boundary conditions details –
28. Levels, gradients across all access routes,
29. Details of Play equipment –
30. Surfacing and safety requirements,
31. Edge protection surrounding accessible rooftop spaces
32. Photovoltaic Panel Details
33. Water efficiency

Informatives

1. NPPF positive and proactive
 2. Secure by design
 3. Planning obligations
 4. Changes to the public highway
 5. Highway approval required
 6. Temporary use of the public highway
 7. Street naming and numbering
 8. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
- 2.4 That, if by 1st October 2020 the legal agreement has not been completed, the Assistant Director Planning is delegated authority to refuse planning permission or agree an extension to the decision date.
- 2.5 That the Committee confirms that adequate provision has been made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees as required by Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

- 3.1 Full planning application has been submitted for the erection of four blocks ranging from five (5) to nine (9) storeys to provide 82 residential dwellings (Use

Class C3) with car parking , associated cycle parking, Refuse Storage Facilities and Landscaping'.

- 3.2 The blocks would be formed on the eastern and southern part of the site, largely occupying the existing car parks around the existing Neopost House.
- 3.3 Block A fronting the Roneo corner (southern side) would be 9 storeys high with the other buildings fronting the access to B&Q building range from 5, 6 and 7 – storeys to the eastern part of the site.
- 3.4 The proposal would provide 69 No, dedicated car parking spaces for residents at a ratio of 0.84 per unit for the proposed scheme and 0.35 for the entire site (including the conversion of the existing building into residential unit and the addition accommodation at its roof.
- 3.5 152 cycle storage space would be provided for the proposal scheme. However, a total of 322 cycle spaces would be provided for all emerging dwellings on site. The cycle spaces are separated into several cycle stores which will serve each of the various blocks. There would also be provision for the waste and recycle storage area.
- 3.6 The existing vehicular entrance from South Street would be retained for vehicular access. There will be 4 pedestrian access to the site; one adjacent to the existing vehicular access, two from the pedestrian and cycleway between South Street and Roneo Corner and one from Roneo Corner adjacent to Havering Well Garden.
- 3.7 The dwelling mix would comprise 24 unit one bed, 34 units 2 bed and 24 units 3 bed, totalling 246 habitable rooms.
- 3.8 A total of 41 units, 50% of the dwelling would be affordable. 66% in shared ownership and 34% affordable rent.
- 3.9 Three would be provision for communal amenity space, play space as well as private balconies and terraces.

4. **Site and Surroundings**

- 4.1 The site measures 0.6846ha and is located on the north eastern corner of the intersection between South Street and Roneo Corner (where the A124, A125, Rush Green Road and Upper Rainham Road converge). Access is provided in the north western corner of the site, near the point at which South Street becomes pedestrianised. Neopost House is a 6 storey office building located in

the centre of the site, running on a north - south access and constructed in brown brick. The building is currently being converted to residential use through permitted development. Surface level car parking is provided around the remainder of the site, including in an undercroft space along the eastern property boundary, where there is a level difference with the adjacent site (B & Q car park). Grass and several mature trees are located along the perimeter of the southern and western boundaries.

- 4.2 TfL advises that the site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 4 on the western part of the site and 2 on the eastern part of the site - a median level of PTAL 3 is therefore considered reasonable. The site is not designated within the Local Development Framework Proposals Map (LB Havering, 2008). Though the site is relatively close to the centre of Romford, it is not included within the limits of the Romford Development Framework (2015) or the Romford Area Action Plan Development Plan Document (2008).
- 4.3 The northern boundary of the site meets the rear gardens of residential developments along Clydesdale Road including a care home. To the south is Roneo Corner. The eastern boundary interfaces with a B&Q superstore and a small landscaped open space (separated from the south eastern corner of the site by a brick wall). To the west on the opposite side of the pedestrianised section of South Street is Vickers House, a recently constructed 9 storey apartment block (an additional block adjacent has planning permission but is yet to commence). The surrounding area is varied, with pockets of semi-detached double storey dwellings intersected by main roads that are fronted by large scale commercial use including a self-storage facility on the opposite side of the A125 and a Tesco supermarket on the same estate as the B&Q. The River Rom is located to the west of the site, running parallel to the Rom Valley Way, beyond which is Queen's hospital. Locally there are several recreational spaces including Grenfell Park to the south west, Park Lane and Hylands Park to the north east.
- 4.4 The site is located 1km south east of Romford Station. Bus routes 248 (Romford to Upminster), 252 (Collier Row to Hornchurch via Romford Station), 365 (havering Park via Romford Station and Elm Park Station) and 648 (Romford to Rectory Gardens via Upminster Station) are available from bus stop RA on Roneo Corner.
- 4.5 The application site is not within a conservation area, and there is not listed structure within the site.

Relevant planning History;

- 4.6 The Applicant (Galliard Homes) acquired Neopost House in 2016 and assumed vacant possession in January 2019. There have been a series of schemes under prior approval for conversion of the main office building into studio type accommodations and subsequent associated applications for the alterations to the fenestration.
- 4.7 Planning permission (Ref; P0883.19) has also been granted for the provision of 6 additional flats over the flat roof of the main building (not yet implemented). Also there is a separate approval for P0085.19 for a new substation enclosure, and provision of waste, recycle and cycle storage for the main Roneo House.
- 4.8 The Applicant is currently in the process of refurbishing Neopost House to implement Prior Approval scheme for 115 residential units,
- 4.9 The most other significant planning application relates to a recent refusal (Ref P0030.19) in respect of the same site which Officers resolving to refuse planning permission by way of delegated decision. 'The refused scheme sought the erection of three blocks ranging from 5 to 8 storeys above deck level, providing 104 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) and the erection of 6 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) to form an additional floor on Neopost House with private communal amenity areas at deck level and roof level of Neopost House, flexible D1 use (Use Class D1), associated car parking spaces, cycle storage, refuse provision and landscaping'. The refusal notice was dated 14th June 2019. The scheme was refused on 15 grounds; but the main objections in summary were as follows;
- Unacceptable visual impact with reference to site layout, incoherent arrangements of the blocks consideration of physical context);
 - Poor quality of dwellings, (daylight, sunlight, amenity space, single aspect dwellings, noise and air pollution and privacy distance
 - Poor housing mix (only one and two bed dwellings).
 - Absence of a legal Agreement with respect to affordable housing, exemption from control parking zone.
- 4.10 This decision has been subject to an appeal before the inspectorate which has just been dismissed, with the inspector raising similar concerns identified in the reason for refusal.

5 Consultation

- 5.1 In accordance with planning performance agreement, the developer has consulted the local community on these proposals as part of the pre-application process. Galliard Homes had appointed public consultee to carry out the public consultation.
- 5.2 The programme of public engagement has been multi-faceted and consisted of engagement with residents face-to-face through door knocking, through the online portal, through the distribution of printed materials, and through the public exhibition with residents and stakeholders.
- 5.3 Banners, site information, photographs and CGIs were produced for the public consultation, setting out the history of the site, the detailed proposals for the landscaping and development, and images of the proposed architecture.
- 5.4 The public consultation has also included significant engagement with the elected ward members as well as other elected local representatives.
- 5.5 As a result of the engagement members of the public have raised their concern with respect to overlooking/privacy, overdevelopment and highway safety issues as well as poor level of amenity space provision.
- 5.6 As part of the pre-application consultation undertaken by the applicant, they have also met with the Romford Civic Society.

Design Review panel;

- 5.7 The application scheme, during its emerging phase, has also been subject to examination by a the LB Havering Quality Review Panel (QRP) on 5th September 2019. The QRP provided detailed comments on 16th September 2019 relating to matters such as the design, building heights and massing as follows;
- The scheme has improved from those presented at the previous review (as part of the previous application) and in particular welcomed the decision to step back the proposed development from the eastern boundary of the site;
 - Concern with public space in particular, the quality and maintenance of the green space along the pedestrianised section of South Street;
 - 11 storey too high fronting onto Roneo Corner.
 - Improvement required for pedestrian access. ;
 - The Panel urged the design team to investigate the opportunities for providing a physical connection to Havering Well Garden;
 - Concern with the provision of single aspect dwellings (south and north) with respect to block A. Also concern with noise to balconies of Block A.

- Concern with the provision of communal gardens, amenity space and reconfiguration or reallocation public amenity space to car parking.

Strategic Planning Committee

5.8 The early proposals (at that time 11 storey proposal for Block A), were presented to the Strategic Planning Committee on 10 October 2019. The committee's response to the scheme was as follows;

- Concern with the proposed height of block A.
- Sought increase in the number of family units.
- Concern with the proposed single aspect units – in particular to those facing north on block A.
- Committee Members queried whether there was an opportunity to enhance the River Rom;
- Committee Members expressed a keenness to understand the sustainability credentials of the scheme

Local representation;

5.9 The application was advertised by letter and email to 241 individuals and organisations. A notice was displayed on the site advertising the application and giving 21 days to provide comments.

5.10 Six objections were received from two neighbouring properties. 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:

- Insufficient parking for the proposed number of units
- Increased parking stress within surrounding roads
- Significant hard surface with little greenery,
- Poor amenity space for the proposed development.
- Noise and disturbance
- Loss of privacy/overlooking
- Loss of light/overshadowing
- Impact upon ecology
- Overdevelopment of the site
- The design, bulk and scale would not be in keeping with the character of the area.

5.11 An objection has been received from the Romford Civic Society of the following grounds; it seems not to be carbon neutral and it does not demonstrate how it will contribute to a bigger plan for strengthening and improving biodiversity in

the town, including taking account of measures to support ecosystems and biodiversity improvement arising from the re-naturalisation of the River Rom as part of other schemes nearby.

Officer Note: The development site does not include or directly adjoin the River Rom.

Internal and External Consultation:

5.12 The following responses were received from statutory and London Borough of Havering consultees:

- Highway Authority: No Objection
- Public Protection (noise) – concern with excessive noise on the proposed balconies, and recommends conditions regarding noise mitigation to be attached to any permission granted and subsequently enforced.
- Public protection (air quality) - no objection subject to four conditions being applied to any permission that are intended to protect the health of future occupants.
- Public Protection (contamination) - no objection subject to conditions requiring details of gas protection measures, plus phase II (site investigation) and phase ii (remediation strategy) report.
- Waste and Recycling: No objection subject to the provision of suitable and compliant waste and recycling facilities.
- Thames Water: No comment
- Fire brigade; No hydrant would be required
- Transport for London – initially raised concern with respect to the provision of sufficient cycle storage space. The revised scheme has addressed the issue. .
- LBH Education Services and Skills: No objection.
- Economic Development requiring training during construction phase.
- Highways England - no objection
- Essex and Suffolk Water - no objection.
- Metropolitan Police - specific concerns raised and that there should be a Secured by Design planning condition being attached to the permission, as detailed in Section

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

- The principle of development (Supply of housing)
- The aesthetic quality of the development

- The quality of housing provided
- The impact upon amenities of the existing and the future occupiers of the site and neighbours in terms of loss of privacy, daylight, sunlight and sense of enclosure, noise disturbance
- Ecology
- Energy Efficiency
- Impact upon community infrastructure

The principle of development;

- 6.1.1 The provision of additional housing is supported by the Local Development Framework (LDF) policy CP1, The London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2019) as the application site is within a sustainable location in an established urban area.
- 6.1.2 The proposal will cover an area of land which has most recently been used for car parking associated with the former office building on site. The site is not designated or protected employment land and as such a redevelopment for residential use does not conflict with any land use designation.
- 6.1.3 On 13 February 2020 the Government published the 2019 Housing Delivery Test (HDT) results. The results show that within the London Borough of Havering 33% of the number of homes required were delivered over the three year period of 2016-17 to 2018-19. Therefore the tilted balance referred to in Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is triggered until such a time as the new Local Plan is formally adopted as it details an alternative method for calculating delivery. The presumption in favour of sustainable development outlined in paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is engaged.
- 6.1.4 Para 11(d) states that where the policies which are most important for determining the proposal are out of date, permission should be granted unless (i) the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a clear reason for refusing the development, or (ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Fundamentally 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.

6.1.5 On this basis the proposal is considered to be policy compliant in land-use terms and its continued use for domestic residential purposes is therefore regarded as being acceptable in principle.

6.2 Design and appearance;

6.2.1 The revised NPPF emphasises that the new design should seek to enhance the character of the area and that poor design should be rejected. Havering planning policies (in particular DC61) also require high quality design and require that the development must respect the scale, massing and height of the surrounding context.

6.2.2 The proposed development, post refusal of the earlier scheme, has been subject to significant revisions since it was originally proposed. The Council's planning and urban design officers, the quality design review panel and the strategic development committee have provided valuable advice which has influenced the resulting scheme and the applicants have been cooperative and responsive to the advice it has received.

6.2.3 The built environment within the immediate vicinity is quite mixed, comprising two storey dwellings, low rise commercial building. The B & Q store has a dominant site adjoining the building. The existing building on site is multi storey high and in recent years multi-storey residential blocks have been formed on the adjacent site.

6.2.4 The application buildings in terms of its configuration, siting, bulk, scale, design would add a new blocks to the area.

6.2.5 One of the significant concerns with respect to the proposal has been in relation to the overdevelopment and cramming of the site with significant degree of the building blocks. In response to the comments from the Quality Review Panel, Strategic Planning Committee and Officers the applicant has reviewed the design of the scheme.

6.2.6 The amendments have resulted in reduction in the height of the proposed blocks, improvements to the amenity spaces, increase the number of family units, the breaking up of two large angled trapezoid and trapezium shapes of Blocks (B and C), on the eastern site to 3 blocks to provide open space between the buildings, keeping the distance away from the boundary from B&Q by 5m, addressing concern with respect to measures recommended through secure by design with consequent reduction in the number of dwellings (from 104 to 82) compared to the earlier refused proposal.

6.2.7 The main block (A) still provides the tallest block (9 storey reduced from 11 at pre-app stage) fronting onto the main road. The proposed block at 9 storey would be comparable with the height of the recent consented development on the adjoining blocks (one already formed and in the pipeline with permission on

the adjacent land to the west). Therefore, it is considered that the proposed block A would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.

- 6.2.8 The refused scheme incorporated two blocks of 8 storeys at the boundary with the B & Q site (eastern side). Due to its scale, bulk and height the refused blocks would have created an oppressive environment and its scale would have not related appropriately to the small scale buildings to the north of the site. The current proposal would provide 3 blocks on the eastern boundary with height from falling from 7 storeys 5, creating a gradual transition to the existing lower scale development at South Street / Clydesdale Road. The proposal would consequently better respond to the surrounding environment. Further, the proposed open spaces between the blocks, would allow improved penetration of light and allowing opportunity for greenery, thereby alleviating the oppressive feel which would have resulted from the development of the previously refused scheme.
- 6.2.9 In summary the proposal has improved through the pre-application process and the applicant has been responsive in taking on comments. The quantum of development has decreased during this process, and is now at a level that could be reasonably accommodated within this site from an urban design point of view. It is considered that the revised scheme, in terms of bulk, scale, massing and configuration would respond well to the surrounding and would not appear as incongruous feature in the surrounding streets.
- 6.2.10 The current scheme has also been carefully designed. All blocks would incorporate setbacks at upper levels to add visual interest to the development. The proposed building would largely be in bricks and articulated with features such as setbacks, terraces and hierarchy of fenestrations.
- 6.2.11 It is considered that the proposal in terms of its design and massing would have an acceptable impact upon the character of the area.

The quality of the proposed accommodation;

- 6.3.1 One of the significant issues with respect to the proposed development relates to the quality of the accommodation provided. The quality of accommodation relates to a number of factors; sufficient internal floor space, adequate daylight, sunlight and outlook, aspects of the dwellings, privacy, noise, air pollution and private and public amenity space. All these factors would be addressed individually. ,

Floor space standards;

- 6.3.2 The 'DCLG Technical Housing Standards - nationally described space standard' specifies minimum internal space standards required for new dwellings. The Technical Housing Standards stipulate minimum gross internal

floor areas (GIAs) for dwellings/units based on the number of bedrooms, intended occupants and storeys, minimum bedroom sizes of 7.5m² for single occupancy and 11.5m² for double/twin occupancy, plus further dimension criteria for such spaces. London Plan Policy 3.5 and the Housing SPG echo such requirements and the SPG provides further criteria to ensure an acceptable quality of accommodation is provided for users including in relation to entrance and approach routes, access to private open space, outlook, daylight and sunlight.

- 6.3.4 The proposed development in terms of the provision of internal floor space would broadly comply with the national space standards for the habitable rooms as well as the dwelling sizes.

Daylight and Sunlight Standards

- 6.3.5 Standard 32 of the Housing SPG says that 'all homes should provide for direct sunlight to enter at least one habitable room for part of the day. Living areas and kitchen dining spaces should preferably receive direct sunlight'.
- 6.3.6 The accompanied daylight and sunlight assessment provided by the applicant indicates that there would be some flats on the lower level where the proposal would not strictly comply with the standards. However, there would be only three flats out of 82 units that are shown as being below the ADF as follows;
- 6.3.7 Block A, first and second floor two flats would achieve 1.5% ADF with respect to the meeting living room target but fails default kitchen target of 2% as the kitchens placed at the rear of the space so is designed to be artificially lit. One flat in block C, would achieve 1.88% ADF, exceeding 1.5% ADF target for living areas and slightly below default 2% ADF target for kitchens.
- 6.3.8 From a scheme of 82 units only parts of three flats would not meet the standard tests, it is considered that these would be marginal and overall the proposal in terms of the quality of natural light is considered acceptable.

Floor to Ceiling Heights

- 6.3.9 Standard 31 of the Housing SPG says that a minimum ceiling height of 2.5 metres is strongly encouraged for at least 75% of the gross internal area. Based on the levels on the sectional drawings, the proposal meets this standard.

Environmental Performance, Energy and CO₂

- 6.3.10 For the reasons set out in the Sustainability section of this report, the proposal is considered broadly in compliance with the following policies: 5.7 of the London Plan; and DC50 of the Havering Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008).

Air Quality

6.3.11 Standard 33 of the Housing SPG and policy 7.14 of the London Plan - Minimise increased exposure to existing poor air quality and make provision to address local problems of air quality: be at least 'air quality neutral' and not lead to further deterioration of existing poor air quality (such as areas designated as Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs)). Furthermore, the proposed dwelling would be equipped with MVHR (Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery). All equipment associated with MVHR will be contained within the individual flats and as such there is no potential for impact on the external appearance of the building. A heat recovery ventilation system properly fitted into a house provides a constant supply of fresh filtered air, maintaining the air quality whilst being practically imperceptible.

6.3.12 Council's Public Protection team have indicated that they do not object to the proposal, subject to conditions being applied to protect the health of future occupants.

Dual aspect

6.3.13 Standard 29 of the Housing SPG states that 'developments should minimise the number of single aspect dwellings. Single aspect dwellings that are north facing, or exposed to noise levels above which significant adverse effects on health and quality of life occur, or which contain three or more bedrooms should be avoided'. Paragraph 2.3.38 of the Housing SPG defines dual aspect dwellings as having 'openable windows on two external walls, which may be either on opposite sides of a dwelling or on adjacent sides of a dwelling where the external walls of a dwelling wrap around the corner of a building (the provision of a bay window does not constitute dual aspect). One aspect may be towards an external access deck or courtyard, although the layout of the dwelling needs to be carefully considered in these cases to maintain privacy'.

6.3.14 The proposed apartments within blocks B, C and D are all double or triple aspects with sufficient degree of outlook.

6.3.15 However, there are 5 single north aspect units and 15 south facing single aspect units in Block A. Emerging policy in the London Plan Housing cites that development should maximise the provision of dual aspect dwellings and normally avoid the provision of single aspect dwellings. A single aspect dwelling should only be provided where it is considered it can be demonstrated that it will have adequate passive ventilation, daylight and privacy, and avoid overheating.

6.3.16 Whilst not to an optimum level the proposal has seen a reasonable improvement with respect to previously refused scheme which incorporated a significant degree of single aspect units, angled trapezoid blocks. In particular

the number of single aspect dwelling units facing north have been reduced to 6% of the total number dwelling units.

Privacy

6.3.17 One of the major issue with respect to the previous scheme, related to the overlooking between the existing Neopost House and the two blocks of flats on the eastern boundary adjacent to B&Q site. The appeal inspector was highly critical of the distance 15m between the blocks. The present scheme has ensured that the distances between these blocks would be 18m which is an acceptable distance protecting the privacy.

Other qualities

6.3.18 Private bin stores for each building have capacity for sufficient refuse and recycling bins for each building block B, C and D and can be accessed external to the proposed building

6.3.19 Of the 82 units 90% of the units comply with Part M4 (2) accessible and adaptable standards. A total of 9 units (10% of the total) are designed to meet M4 (3) wheelchair user standards. These are distributed evenly between the different tenures, flat sizes and levels.

6.3.20 Each of the lobbies to each of the blocks A, B, C and D have a lift and a staircase to upper floors.

The provision of amenity space and play space;

6.3.21 One of the significant issue with respect to the proposed scheme has been in relation to the provision of adequate amenity space.

The Council's SPG does not recommend minimum out door amenity space requirement. The latest revised London Plan recommends; a minimum of 5m² of private outdoor space should be provided for 1-2 person dwellings and an extra 1m² should be provided for each additional occupant. The proposal would incorporate a range of amenity space provision in the form of private gardens, communal open space and private balconies.

6.3.22 The demand for play space arising from the proposed residential units and the consented scheme for the 6 rooftop flats over the existing neo post house would amount to 243m². The proposal would provide play space offer comprises a consolidated area between Block A and Block B and further locations between the Mansion Flats. The overall amount of play space proposed is 283m² which exceeds the required standards.

6.3.23 Almost every dwelling would include a private balcony or terrace throughout the development in line with the above standards – albeit, a number of terraces

would be likely to suffer a degree of noise associated with the road traffic (see below).

6.3.24 The proposal also includes about 100m² of landscaped amenity space between the proposed blocks which helps to soften built form. In addition there is a public amenity space directly adjoining the application site and the Grenfell Park, within 200 metres of the site. The applicant has offered financial contribution towards the improvement of these parks which would be secured through legal agreement.

6.3.25 There are also other parks nearby including Park Lane Recreation Ground lies within 0.7km from the site and provides equipped play suitable for 5-11-year olds within a large open space with football pitch markings. Or the Hylands Park, within 1.4km of the site includes a children's playsuit, multi-use games area, and outdoor gym and tennis courts.

6.3.26 Every possible attempt has been made to add greenery to the site. The detailed landscaping strategy prepared by the landscape architects appointed by the applicant indicates that any loss of existing trees will be mitigated through the planting of new trees/shrub planting which is considered to deliver gains in amenity value in the long term. One of the significant improvement of the current scheme over the previous scheme relates to the treatment of the boundaries along South Street and Roneo Corner have been greened as far as possible,

6.3.27 The landscape strategy informs that there would be a new understorey of attractive and robust planting, with year-round interest together with new trees and shrub planting along the Roneo Corner frontage with shrub planting along the boundary to provide a degree of privacy to lower level apartments and create a degree of defensible green edge.

Whilst not ideal, it is considered that reasonable measures have been adopted to improve the amenities for the future occupiers of the site as well as improving the greenery of the site.

Noise

6.3.28 Noise Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application, explaining the existing site conditions, how they might impact upon the proposed development, and any mitigation measures needing to be incorporated through design and construction. The assessment begins by providing an overview of the regulatory context and methodology used for the survey. It is explained that for outdoor living areas, noise levels exceeding 50 dB cause moderate levels of noise annoyance, indoors the level reduces to 35 dB, and at night time sleep is disturbed above 30 dB.

- 6.3.29 The background noise level varies across the site. The noise surveys were undertaken records up to 75dB in the area suffering the highest level of noise disturbance. These include the areas adjacent to Roneo Corner and the access way to B&Q car park/service area. Consequently the areas including the communal gardens near Havering Well Green and the balconies on the south side of Block A, would be subject to a high levels of background noise. A slightly less level of noise disturbance would be experienced by residents using balconies along the rear (eastern) elevation of Blocks B, C and D which face the B&Q service yard and car park. Although it is noted that noise emissions from B& Q would be limited to trading and delivery hours, with no vehicle movements expected between 13:00 and 07:00.
- 6.3.30 Except for a number of balconies which would suffer from undue noise disturbance, Environmental protection team have explained that with appropriate mitigating measures the proposed development would be capable of providing acceptable level of standard within the flats.
- 6.3.31 Overall, there is some concern with respect to the excessive level of noise to the balconies otherwise the proposal subject to mitigating measure is considered to adequately address policies CP15 and DC55 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies; 7.15 of the London Plan; D13 of the Draft New London Plan, or standard 30 of the Housing SPG.

Impact on neighbour amenities;

- 6.4.1 Policy DC61 of Havering Councils states; "Planning permission will not be granted where the proposal results in unacceptable overshadowing, loss of sunlight/daylight, overlooking or loss of privacy to existing and new properties."

Privacy

- 6.4.2 The most significant impact would be in relation to the buildings in South Street and Clydesdale Road, with Myddleton Court being the nearest building.
- 6.4.3 Minimum distances between the new and existing buildings are particularly important to ensure that the development would not result in loss of light and outlook and that privacy between the existing and new developments is maintained. Havering Residential Design Guide does not recommend a particular minimum separation distance between buildings or between the buildings and the garden boundaries. The guidance recommend rather than keeping distances to minimum level, any scheme should come up with appropriate mitigating measures to ensure the privacy of the adjoining neighbours are safeguarded.
- 6.4.4 Normally (within the urban area such as London context), a minimum separation distance of 18 metres at first floor level are recommended to be achieved between rear elevation of new houses and the existing to prevent loss

of privacy. Further, a minimum distance of 9 to 11m should be maintained from the upper levels to boundaries with adjoining gardens.

- 6.4.5 The proposed block D building would be closest to Myddleton Court Road. However, this building would maintain a 35 distance to the windows of this neighbouring building and 14m to its garden boundary. Therefore, the proposal would not have significant impact upon the privacy of this neighbouring building or the other houses in Clydesdale Road
- 6.4.6. The other building which would be likely to be affected is in regards to the consented scheme on the adjacent site to the west, which is yet to be constructed. The proposed building at upper levels would assume a distance of 20 to 26m to this consented scheme. But at lower levels the distance is reduced to around 14m which is less than the acceptable standards. However, the windows on the consented scheme at lower levels would face the public foot path and hence would be subject to overlooking from at a closer range than the proposed development.
- 6.4.7 It is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable standard in terms of privacy issues.

Daylight

- 6.4.8 The application is accompanied by a Daylight and Sunlight in accordance with the Building Research Establishment (BRE) report 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice' 2011. The report identify the most affected dwellings immediately surrounding the application site as well the dwellings which are emerging within the Neo House building following the prior approval scheme as well as the consented phase two building of the Vickers house which is yet to be built.
- 6.4.9 The DSO assessment confirms that the proposed roof areas on Block A and the main play space adjacent block A comfortably meet the default target of at least 50% of their area receiving in excess of 2 hours of sun.
- 6.4.10 In overall conclusion, the results should be considered acceptable particularly as they reflect the flexibility provided for in national / regional planning policy, where the site is a brownfield site in a highly accessible location in which housing potential is expected to be maximised.
- 6.4.11 The applicant has also provided shadow diagram studies which indicate that the proposal is also in compliance with the sunlight standard set out in BRE guidance, including the roof terraces as well as the play spaces/amenity areas.
- 6.4.12 It is therefore concluded that the proposal would not result in a significant loss of daylight or sunlight to the neighbouring buildings.

- 6.4.13 Overall it is considered that by reason of its location, height and depth the proposal would not have a significant impact upon the amenities of the adjoining occupiers. The proposal will comply with the Building Research Establishment guidance.

Impact upon highways condition

- 6.5.1 The NPPF recognises that sustainable transport has an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also contributing to wider health objectives. In particular it offers encouragement to developments which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and those which reduce congestion. The NPPF also outlines that developments which generate significant vehicle movements should be located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport options can be maximised. It is also expected that new development will not give rise to the creation conflicts between vehicular traffic and pedestrians.
- 6.5.2 London Plan Policy 6.3 and Policies T1 - T6 of the Draft London Plan seek to ensure that impacts on transport capacity and the transport network, at both a corridor and local level, are fully assessed. Development should not adversely affect safety on the transport network. This is also echoed by DC33 of Havering Councils CS and DCPDPD which indicates proposals will not be supported where they would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the capacity or environment of the highway network. The London plan seeks to ensure a balance is struck to prevent excessive car parking provision that can undermine cycling, walking and public transport use and through the use of well-considered travel plans aim to reduce reliance on private means of transport.
- 6.5.3 The application is accompanied by a Transport Assessment. The existing access would be retained. 69 car parking spaces for the proposed development as well as the 115 units already consented under prior approval scheme would be provided, including the provision for 3% blue badge provision and 1no car club bay. This would be at a ratio of 0.34 spaces.
- 6.5.4 Car clubs are a mode of transport which compliments the public transport upgrades being proposed for the local area. Car clubs are attractive to buyers and tenants as their property comes with access to a car without the high purchase and running costs. In addition, car clubs contribute towards reducing congestion and encourage a sustainable and economical alternative to car ownership. The applicant has agreed to provide each new household forming part of the development with 1 year free membership plus £50 driving credit.
- 6.5.5 The Car Club bay, will be operated by ZipCar and a draft agreement between the developer and ZipCar appears to have been formalised. The agreement includes the provision of free membership for residents and a commitment to operate a car club for a minimum of 3 years.

- 6.5.6 In addition, it is proposed to provide 20% of the spaces for charging for electric cars and a further 20% will be passive provision.
- 6.5.7 The previous refuse scheme included 127 car parking spaces. The applicant have been mindful of the objection raised by Transport for London with respect to the excessive number of car parking spaces provided for the refuse scheme and hence the reduction in the level car parking to almost half that level.
- 6.5.8 A Travel Plan has also been submitted in support of the application. The Travel Plan recommends that a co-ordinator be appointed to implement and manage the Travel Plan that each unit would be provided with a Travel Information Pack (TIP), sustainable modes of transport to the site would be promoted on the developer's website, cycle parking, in addition to the car club membership as discussed above.
- 6.5.9 Reducing car dependency has an important role to play in making London's air cleaner. The current London Plan sets a maximum parking standard of 1.5 parking spaces per unit. The reduction of the parking space for higher density proposal in urban and central areas would be in line with the Mayor of London strategic target with the ambition to achieve 80 per cent of all trips in London to be made by foot, cycle or public transport by 2041.
- 6.5.10 Given the proximity to public transport, reduction of parking numbers may be considered but only if it could be concluded that the proposal would have no impact in terms of overspill onto surrounding streets and as part of a comprehensive suite of sustainable transport measures offered including the provision of residential travel plan, funding and subsidy of car club, provision of cycle store facilities but also exemption of the future occupiers to be prevented from applying for parking permit within the adjacent Residential Control Parking Zone. The proposal would be in line with Policy DC2 which requires that parking permits be restricted in certain circumstances for occupiers of new residential developments. In this case, the proposal would be likely to impact on on-street parking pressure in existing residential streets. A contribution of £112 per unit (total £8,364.00) is sought, plus an obligation through the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 to prevent future occupants of the development from obtaining parking permits. The proposed offered measures would be secured through appropriate drafted clauses in section 106 agreement as well as appropriately worded conditions.
- 6.5.11 It should also be noted that sufficient refuse and recycling storage have been provided within the site. Track Diagram provided indicates that the refuse vehicles would be able to enter and exit the site in forward gear manner. Further the submitted plans indicates that deliveries to and servicing of the residential would be achieved without causing any safety issues with the dedicated spaces for loading bays.

6.5.12 Finally, the trip generation analysis has been included in the Transport Statement indicates that the proposed residential development would generate insignificant number of vehicle trips over the course of a typical day. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not have a significant impact upon the safe and free flow of traffic or highways condition.

6.5.13 The London Fire Brigade has raised no objection in principle.

6.5.14 Accordingly, and on the basis of a robust car parking management strategy, the LPA are content with the provision of parking proposed considering the 69 spaces. This element from the proposal adheres to London Plan Policy 6.13 Parking, and Policy DC33 Car Parking of the LDF.

6.6 The dwelling mix

6.6.1 Policy 3.8 of the London Plan states that DPD policies should offer a range of housing choices, in terms of the mix of housing sizes and types, taking account of the housing requirements of different groups. Policy DC2 of the LDF provides guidance in relation to the dwelling mix within residential developments.

6.6.2 Policy DS2 of the Core Strategy sets out an indicative mix for market housing of 24% 1-bedroom units, 41% 2-bedroom units, and 34 % 3-bedroom units.

6.6.8 The dwelling mix would comprise 24 unit one bed, 34 units 2 bed and 24 units 3 bed. This would equate to 29% 1-bedroom units, 41% 2-bedroom units and 29% 3-bedroom units. Whilst the proposal would not strictly comply with the policy requirement, the difference is rather marginal and given the site's constraints the proposal in terms of mix of dwellings is considered to be acceptable.

6.7 Affordable housing

6.7.1 Currently, the Council has an aspiration to achieve 50% of all new homes built as affordable and seeks a split of 70:30 in favour of social rented (policy CP2). All major developments should meet at least 35% affordable unless they are able to demonstrate that this is not possible. London Plan Policy 3.13 emphasises that Boroughs should normally require affordable housing provision on a site which has capacity to provide 10 or more homes. Policy 3.12 sets out that "negotiations on sites should take account of their individual circumstances including development viability and in support of this, the London Plan requires a tenure split of 60:40 in favour of affordable rented.

6.7.2 The preferred tenure split as set out in the Mayor's Affordable Housing SPG is 30% of affordable housing to be delivered as social/affordable rent, 30% as intermediate to include London Living Rent and shared ownership. The remaining 40% is to be determined by the LPA

- 6.7.3 The applicant has offered 41 units affordable units (52% by habitable room). However it has explained that this would dependent upon the partnership with a Registered Provider for the scheme. In the event that this is not possible, the scheme would be subject to a viability appraisal which will be less than the currently proposed 50%.
- 6.7.4 In this case whilst the proposal would exceed the minimum requirement for affordable housing at 35%, the offer for affordable housing is a split of 27 shared ownership and 14 affordable rent. This would equate to 34% Affordable Rented and 66% Intermediate (Shared Ownership).
- 6.7.5 In order to achieve policy compliance, the tenure mix should include 20 affordable rent, which would be a shortage of 6. However, the proposed affordable rent comprises generally larger family houses. Calculation would indicate in terms of habitable rooms the proposed shortage would be 12.

The proposed mix of affordable housing is as follows;

Tenure	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed
Social/affordable rent	1	6	7
Shared ownership	8	12	7

- 6.7.6 The proposed tenure mix would be accommodated as follows;

- Block A — 41 x private flats and 5 Intermediate flats
- Block B - 14 X Affordable Rent flats
- Block C — 12 x Intermediate Flats
- Block D — 10 x Intermediate Flats.

- 6.7.7 The application is accompanied by a financial viability assessment which indicates, 35% affordable housing provision is not viable. However, the Applicant is willing to deliver a greater level of affordable housing than can viably be justified based upon partnership with a registered provider.

- 6.8.12 Despite the overall generous level of affordable housing, the provision for the number of dwelling for affordable rent would be below the proportion desired under the current policies. Hence, the FVA has been subject to review by the council's appointed consultants. The final outcome of the review is awaited. If the report is not available to update committee, given that 50% affordable is currently being offered, it is considered that subject to the review being in agreement with the applicant's viability position, that the committee delegate power to approve the application to the Assistant Director Planning. Should the review indicate that a greater proportion of rented units can viably be provided, then unless the applicant achieves this, the application would be refused or reported back to this committee with a further justification in regard to affordable housing provision.

6.8.13 Given the circumstances the terms of the legal agreement with respect to affordable housing would be in line with the proposed offer by the applicant.

6.8.14 It should also be noted that the design strategy would ensure that units of different tenure across the scheme are indistinguishable from one another in terms of design quality and appearance.

6.9 SUSTAINABILITY/ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Flood Risk & Drainage

6.9.1 The site is located within Flood Zone 1 (defined as indicating a 0.1% chance of annual flooding from rivers or seas), therefore no flood risk assessment was required to be submitted with the application. The site is covered in hardstanding and therefore necessary conditions are recommended demonstrating how the proposal incorporates sustainable drainage - aiming to meet policies 5.13 of the London Plan and SI13 of the Draft New London Plan.

Land Contamination

6.9.2 A Phase 1 Desk Study Report was submitted with the application to explain the anticipated ground conditions of the site. The site and surrounding land were historically used for manufacturing and gravel extraction. Like many similar brownfield sites, the land around Neopost House might contain contaminants. Potential pathways through which contaminants might travel are identified, along with potential receptors - the impacts on whom are predicted to have a low to medium risk. The report recommends that a Phase 2 ground investigation be undertaken to better understand the ground conditions and identify any mitigation measures to further reduce the risk of harm from contaminants during construction and operation of the site.

6.9.3 Subject to appropriate conditions (as recommended by LB Havering Public Protection Officers), the proposal would comply with policies 5.21 of the London Plan and DC53 of the Havering Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008).

Energy Efficiency

6.9.4 A Sustainability Statement has been prepared to explain how the proposal has considered sustainability within its design. The overall reduction in CO2 emissions for the development (from 2013 Part L building regulations) would be over 30% compared to a target within the Mayoral SPG on Sustainable Design and Construction of 35%. A payment of £60 per tonne over a 30 year period is levied on the shortfall - attracting a contribution of £94, 823.00 to be secured as part of a Section 106 Agreement. Energy will be produced renewably on site through photovoltaic cells placed on the roofs. Water use within the development will be minimised through the installation of efficient

sanitary ware and irrigation - meeting the 105 litre per person per day target within Part G of the building regulations. Building materials have not yet been specified or sourced and therefore their embodied energy cannot be calculated. A site waste management plan has not yet been developed but should aim to divert 80% of waste from landfill. The development should be implemented by a recognised Considerate Contractor who is able to operate the relevant standards.

- 6.9.5 The development proposal subject to contributions being sought would comply with Policy 5.7 of the London Plan, and DC50 of the Havering Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008). Appropriate conditions are recommended to ensure that the sustainability credentials of the development are demonstrated throughout the detailed design, construction and operation stages.

Ecology and Biodiversity

- 6.9.6 The applicant has submitted a study which evaluates the ecological value of the site and provided advice as to how appropriate measures to be taken to safeguard the future ecological value of the site.
- 6.9.7 The submitted study suggests the current site has a low quality ecological value.. A Bat Survey Report has also been submitted with the application which indicates there are no bat roosting or any bat activity within the site.
- 6.9.8 Given the low ecological value, the proposal offers a range of measures including the provision of extensive, substrate based biodiverse roofs on all suitable flat roof areas; living roof enhancement features including log piles and sandy piles and provision of bird and bat boxes suitable for pipistrelles, house sparrow and swifts along with wildlife friendly landscaping including planting of native berry producing tree and shrubs.
- 6.9.9 Further the applicant would retain as many as existing trees plus planting additional trees which would allow opportunities for nesting birds to be attracted to the site.
- 6.9.10 Conditions are recommended for the completion of an Arboricultural Method Statement and a detailed landscape plan with supporting strategy, prepared by a qualified Landscape Architect as well as the following measures;
- Biodiversity enhancement measures to be incorporated into the landscaping scheme in order to maximise the ecological value of the site;
 - The semi-mature trees on site are of intrinsic value and would generally be retained where possible. Any trees to be retained would be protected.

Vegetation and building clearance need to be undertaken outside of the nesting season (generally taken to be March to September).

- Measures be taken to avoid the spread cotoneaster, butterfly-bush and cherry laurel to spread.
- Any excavations needing to be left over-night should be covered to prevent mammals becoming trapped

6.9.11 Subject to the above conditions, the proposal is considered in accordance with policies 7.19 and 7.21 of the London Plan; policy DC59 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies; and standard 40 of the Housing SPG.

Wind

6.9.12 A wind assessment has been submitted by a qualified consultant to assess the wind microclimate around the proposed Neopost House development.

6.9.13 The study concludes that, although there would be some issue during the winter months around the entrances to the blocks, overall the proposed development is not expected to have any significant impact on the pedestrian level wind conditions within the surrounding area, which are expected to remain generally suitable for existing or the future occupiers. In conclusion the proposed development is not expected to have any significant impact on the pedestrian level wind conditions within the surrounding area, which are expected to remain generally suitable for existing uses,

Air quality

6.9.14 An Air Quality Report (including air pollution impact) has been submitted with the application. This has been reviewed by the Council's Environmental Protection officers have examined the report and are satisfied subject to condition the proposal would be acceptable.

6.9.15 In particular it should be noted that the concerns had been raised with respect to overheating of some flats during the consideration of the previous scheme. Hence, an Overheating assessment has also been undertaken and submitted with the application. The applicant has proposed to provision of smart mechanical ventilation with heat recovery (MVHR) units, with enhanced rates of ventilation (as discussed above).

6.9.16 It is considered that through appropriate measures including the provision of suitable boilers the proposed development would not have significant negative effects on the environment.

Trees and landscaping

6.9.17 An Arboricultural Implications Assessment has been which suggests there are 19 trees and one hedgerow. There are no Category A (high value) and 5 Category U trees identified on the site.

6.9.18 The proposed development would result in loss of low or moderately value trees but instead the detailed landscaping strategy indicates that the loss would be mitigated through the planting of new trees/shrub planting which is considered to deliver improvement in amenity value in the long term.

6.9.19 The proposal would therefore accord with guidance from within policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2016 and Policy DC60 of the LBH's 'Development Plan Document' 2008 and LBH's SPD on 'Protection of Trees' 2009

7 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY

7.1 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.

7.2 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.

7.3 The proposed development comes forward within the setting of an existing employment site. The site is some distance away from the nearest residential unit and given the existing site context and uses, it is not considered that the development would unduly harm any particular groups protected by the above Act.

7.4 Therefore in recommending the application for approval, officers have had regard to the requirements of the aforementioned section and Act and have

concluded that a decision to grant planning permission for this proposed development will comply with the Council's statutory duty under this important legislation.

- 7.5 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.

8 Financial and Other Mitigation

- 8.1 The council introduced the Community Infrastructure levy (CIL) with effect from 15th September 2019. The CIL charge covers a wide range of infrastructure as set out in the regulation 123 list. CIL is chargeable on the relevant net additional floorspace created by the development. The charge is non-negotiable and is calculated at the time that planning permission is granted. In this case the proposal is liable for the Mayor of London Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Havering CIL (HCIL). Mayoral CIL is calculated at £25.00 per square metre, subject to indexation. HCIL is charged at an approved rate of be £125/m² of GIA, subject to indexation. The net additional floor space would be 7702m². The development would be liable for a Mayoral CIL at the rate of £192,550 and Havering CIL at rate of £962,750.
- 8.2 Other financial contributions have been identified in respect to the heads of terms.

9 Conclusions

- 9.1 The proposal would contribute towards meeting the housing need in the Borough and would make effective use of a sustainable site. The layout of the proposed development would provide an acceptable standard of amenity for the future occupiers and there would not be a significant loss of amenity to neighbouring properties. The design of the proposed building is acceptable and meets policy guidance. All other relevant policies and considerations have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out the recommendation