

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|  <p data-bbox="336 257 794 472">Havering LONDON BOROUGH</p> | <p data-bbox="837 271 1262 443">Strategic Planning Committee 17 June 2021</p> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Application Reference: | P0761.20 |
| Location: | Waterloo Estate, land bound by Waterloo Road to the east; the Great Eastern Main Line to the South Cotleigh Road to the west London Road to the North |
| Ward: | Romford Town |
| Description: | Hybrid (part outline, part detail) planning application for the demolition and redevelopment of the site to provide up to 1,380 (C3) residential units (40% affordable), built over 3-16 storeys, flexible commercial floorspace (Use Class A1-A4, B1, D1/D2), community floorspace, open space and associated public realm improvements, parking, play space, highways improvements and central cycle route. Outline with all matters reserved (except access) and Detailed Full Planning for Phase 1. |
| Case Officer: | John Kaimakamis |
| Reason for Report to Committee: | The application is of strategic importance and has been submitted in partnership with the London Borough of Havering. The Local Planning Authority is considering the application in its capacity as local planning authority and without regard to the identity of the Applicant. |

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 1380 units with 40% affordable housing units. The application is supported by the Greater London Authority (GLA) and the LBH's housing divisions as it would contribute to the housing demand in the Borough.
- 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 Although the maximum parameters (as revised) of this hybrid planning application would result in a moderate level of 'less than substantial harm' to the setting of designated heritage assets (Grade II listed St. Andrew's Church and Salem Chapel), it is considered that the level of public benefit provided by the proposals outweighs the 'less than substantial harm' to the heritage assets. The public benefits include a significant uplift of 1090 (net increase) in the total number of residential units on the estate including 212 social rented units, 197 affordable rent units and 147 intermediate units. Other benefits include the provision of modern residential accommodation, improved design quality of the streets and public open spaces, associated pedestrian and cycle improvements and reprovision of community facilities. St. Andrew's Church, an existing landmark, will form the focus of the development on one side of the intersection of the streets and a new public open park fronted by active community uses on the other side.
- 1.4 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 (s amended) and all other enabling and other enabling powers, with the following Heads of Terms:

- Early, mid and late Stage Viability Review Mechanisms attached.
- Affordable housing split 60:40 (units 824:556), consisting of Social Rent (212 units), Affordable Rent (197 units) and Intermediate (147 units).
- Phasing of Affordable housing delivery
- 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 sixty pounds (£60.00) per tonne that falls below the 100% threshold, for a period of 30 years, duly Indexed,
- Job Brokerage 4 per 10,000spm of development
- Travel Plan (including the appointment of a Co-ordinator)
- Highways contribution for the creation of a CPZ.
- Contribution to Cotton's Park improvement given shortfall in designated child's play space
- Employment and training
- Active transport contribution towards the review and improvement of cycling access, parking and pedestrian access around the site and in Romford Town Centre, including contribution to Liveable Neighbourhoods improvement t the ring road, Indexed.
- On-street cycle parking contribution
- Car free restriction on obtaining parking permits 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

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 September 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 of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

Conditions

1. Time Limit
2. Reserved Matters to be Submitted
3. Timing of Reserved Matters Submission

4. Timing of Reserved Matters Commencement
5. Approved Plans
6. Approval of Reserved Matters
7. Phasing Plan
8. Design Code
9. Dotted Line Parameter Plans (Blocks 09 and 10)
10. Existing and Proposed Site levels
11. Maximum number of residential units (1380)
12. Partial Discharge – Allows for Phasing of development
13. Approval of Materials
14. Access to Phases
15. Accessibility and Management Plan - Residential
16. Accessibility and Management Plan- Non-Residential
17. Accessibility of Public Realm
18. Car and cycle park design management plan
19. Occupier Cycle Parking
20. Visitor Cycle Parking
21. Travel Plan
22. Compliance with Design Code
23. Secure by Design
24. Accessibility and Adaptability
25. Provision of Amenity Space
26. Refuse Storage and Segregation for Recycling
27. Carbon Reduction- Residential
28. Carbon Reduction- Non-Residential
29. Energy compliance
30. Photovoltaic panels – Energy hierarchy
31. Energy Efficiency
32. Overheating – Phases 2 - 5
33. Overheating – Phase 1
34. Urban Greening Factor
35. Ecological Appraisal, Bat Survey Report and Environmental Statement
36. Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy
37. Wildlife Sensitive Lighting Design Operational Scheme
38. Landscape and Ecological Management Plan
39. Further Surveys for Developments Phased over a Long Period
40. Landscaping, public realm, play space and boundary treatments
41. Living Roofs
42. Nesting Birds and Bat Roosts
43. Protection of Trees
44. Vegetation Clearance
45. Examination of Trees for Bats
46. Air Quality Assessment
47. Boiler and Combined Heat Power
48. Noise and Vibration (A3 or A4 use)
49. Kitchen Ventilation Equipment
50. Noise Assessment (Scheme of Glazing, Ventilation and Control for Thermal Comfort)
51. Sound Insulation

- 52.Noise levels from plant and machinery
- 53.Noise from Commercial Units
- 54.Noise from Entertainment
- 55.Hours of Operation- Non-Residential – 0700 to 2300 (Deliveries 0700 to 2100)
- 56.Hours of Operation- Outdoor Sports – 0700 to 2200
- 57.Lighting Strategy- South Corridor
- 58.Flood Risk
- 59.Sustainable Urban Drainage
- 60.Drainage Strategy
- 61.Drainage Maintenance
- 62.Piling Method Statement
- 63.Non-Road Mobile Plant and Machinery (“NRMM”)
- 64.Oil Interceptors
- 65.Contamination Remediation Scheme
- 66.Unexpected Contamination
- 67.Construction Environmental Management Plan
- 68.Demolition and Construction Hours(8am to 6pm Mon-Fri, 8am to 1pm Sat, none Sunday and Bank Holidays)
- 69.Piling Vibration
- 70.Foundation Design
- 71.Permitted Development
- 72.Satellite Dishes
- 73.Fire Safety
- 74.Bird Hazard Management Plan
- 75.Outline Delivery and servicing plan for residential uses
- 76.Outline- Delivery and servicing plan non-residential uses
- 77.Daylight\sunlight
- 78.Glare
- 79.Cranes
- 80.Parking
- 81.Phase 1 - Delivery and servicing plan for residential uses
- 82.Phase 1 - Delivery and servicing plan for non-residential uses
- 83.Phase 1 energy strategy
- 84.Archaeology (Written Scheme of Investigation)
- 85.Archeology (Display and Interpretation)

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. Precommencement 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 application site covers an area of approximately 4.5 hectares and is commonly known as the Waterloo and Queen Street Estate. The site is bounded by London Road to the north, by Waterloo Road (A125) to the east, a railway line to the south and Cotleigh Road to the west.
- 3.2 The existing site previously comprised of 290 residential homes, as the site has been decanted but the buildings still stand. The homes were broken down as follows:
 - Waterloo Estate – total 242 residential units (general needs) comprising 171 Council tenants (social rented affordable housing and 77 leasehold and freehold units (private tenure);
 - Queen Street Older Persons Housing – total 31 residential units; and
 - Hostels Unit – total of 12 temporary accommodation residential units.
- 3.3 In addition to the above, the estate also comprised of the Prince Albert Public House, the St. Andrew's Parish Community use building, areas of surface car parking and amenity green space, a multi-use games area (MUGA) and a small playground.
- 3.4 The above uses and residential units within the estate were contained within various building typologies which included two-storey houses and flats, three-storey blocks of flats, four-storey stacked maisonettes, as well as two 11-storey residential towers (Thomas England House and William Pike House).
- 3.5 The site is bounded by 2 storey semi-detached housing to the west, 2-4 storey commercial buildings to the north and the A125 dual carriageway to the east, the ring road which effectively encloses Romford town centre. On the opposite

side of the A125 is the prominent flank elevation of the Brewery retail development and associated car park. To the south is a steep embankment and the railway used by a range of services including Shenfield to London Liverpool Street (Crossrail). The railway embankment is designated in the council's Local Plan as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) of Borough Importance.

- 3.6 The site does not fall within a conservation area and there are no listed buildings on site. However there are 2 Grade II listed buildings adjacent to the site (St Andrews Church and Salem Baptist Chapel) located at the western and northern edges of the applications site.
- 3.7 The land adjacent to the railway is within an Archaeological Priority Area. Romford Train Station is within walking distance and there are a number of bus routes on Waterloo Road and London Road. The PTAL for the site ranges between 2(Poor) and 6a (Excellent).
- 3.8 The site also falls within an Air Protection Zone.

4 PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The application seeks hybrid planning permission (part outline, part detail) for the demolition and redevelopment of the Waterloo and Queen Street Estate site to provide up to 1,380 (C3) residential units (40% affordable), up to 1.375 square metres of flexible commercial floorspace (Use Class A1-A4, B1, D1/D2), and up to 550 square metres of community floorspace (Use Class D1).
- 4.2 The full planning permission (detailed part) sought covers Phase 1 within the south eastern corner of the site with the erection of two blocks (Blocks 1 and 2) which range in height between 6 and 16-storeys, and comprises of 370 residential units and 475 square metres of flexible floorspace.
- 4.3 The outline planning permission sought covers Phase 2-5 for the remaining part of the site with the erection of 8 further blocks (Blocks 3-10) ranging in heights from single storey to 14-storeys. The remaining quantum of flexible floorspace is to be used by Use Classes A1, B1, D1 and D2.
- 4.4 The outline part of the scheme is covered by a Development Specification Document, Parameter Plans and a Design Code, which subsequent Reserved Matters Applications will require to comply with. Parameter Plans cover matters in relation to development zones, ground floor land uses, access and movement, maximum heights and landscaping areas.

- 4.5 As originally submitted, the application was accompanied by an illustrative masterplan and indicative phasing to demonstrate how the scheme could be brought forward in line with the specifications and requirements of the originally submitted maximum parameters and design code.
- 4.6 Following concerns raised by officers regarding the disproportionate flexibility between the originally submitted parameter plans and illustrative masterplan, the application was revised so that the originally submitted illustrative masterplan became the amended maximum parameters for the proposal. These are referred to as 'maximum parameter plans (as revised)' from here onwards within this report and the officer assessment below is conducted on the basis that these are the formally submitted parameter plans.
- 4.7 Additionally, following concerns raised by officers with regard to the demonstrable negative impact Blocks 09 and 10 (on the basis of the maximum parameters as revised) would have on the amenity of neighbouring properties in Cotleigh Road, the applicant submitted further illustrative proposals with dotted lines of Blocks 09 and 10 with reduced heights and massing to address these concerns. These are referred to as 'dotted line parameters of an illustrative proposal for Blocks 09 and 10' from here onwards within this report.

5 PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 The following planning applications are relevant to the site:

- **Z0004.18:** Request for Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Opinion – Screening opinion issued 15 August 2018 that EIA would be required.
- **Z0012.18:** Request for an Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Opinion – Scoping opinion issued 28 February 2019.
- **F0011.20:** Prior approval for the demolition of buildings at land bound by Waterloo Road to the east; the Great Eastern Main Line to the south Cotleigh Road to the west; and London Road to the north. Prior Approval Consent granted 04 March 2020.
- **P1187.20:** Demolition of Nos. 67-69 London Rd, the Prince Albert Public House and associated structures, construction of a new vehicular access to London Road and associated works. Planning Permission granted 08 March 2021.

5.2 The following planning applications are relevant to Havering's wider estate regeneration programme:

Napier House and New Plymouth House, Dunedin Road

- **P0751.19:** Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site comprising a number of buildings ranging between 3-10 storeys, providing 197 residential dwellings (Class C3), public and private open space, formation of new accesses and alterations to existing accesses, associated car and cycle parking and associated works. Planning permission granted 06 April 2020.
- **P1464.20:** Section 73 Application (Minor Material Amendment) to vary Condition 2 (Approved Plans) of Planning Permission Reference P0751.19 dated 06 April 2020 for the demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site comprising a number of buildings ranging between 3-10 storeys, providing 197 residential dwellings (Class C3), public and private open space, formation of new accesses and alterations to existing accesses, associated car and cycle parking and associated works. The minor material amendments sought are to make external changes to the external appearance of the building, layout and landscaping. Planning Permission granted 27 April 2021.

Solar Court, Serena Court, Sunrise Lodge, Sunrise Avenue.

- **P1809.19:** Demolition of existing buildings, construction of five buildings built over 3-10 storeys comprising 175 residential units including ancillary communal facility (Class C3), associated car & cycle parking, landscaping and other associated works. Planning Permission granted 27 April 2021.

6 STATUTORY CONSULTATION RESPONSE

6.1 A summary of consultation responses are detailed below:

- **Historic England (GLASS):** Conditions are recommended for staged archaeological fieldwork, pre-demolition recording of the pub and a scheme of heritage interpretation and display in the final development.
- **Transport for London:** 640 cycle paces and 11 short stay spaces meet the required London plan minimum. 20% to be in Sheffield stands at normal spacing. Concern at higher level of car parking provision given part of the site is in PTAL 6a. 80 car spaces allocated for disabled use and concern that this could be misused for normal parking use. Car Parking and Design Management Plan should be secured by condition. Permeability between

land parcels to be improved to create better links with Waterloo Rd, town centre station and bus stops. Travel Plan, Construction Logistics Plan and Delivery and Servicing Plan to be secured via condition.

- **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 estate regeneration, land use principle, housing and affordable housing, urban design and heritage, climate change and transport. In addition the below should be secured under a S106:
 - Early implementation, mid and late stage review mechanisms should be secured for the affordable housing units.
 - Annual housing cost (including servicing charges, rent and any interest payments) should be secured as no greater than 40% of the housing cost.
 - Overheating checklist and dynamic heating analysis is acceptable.
 - The approach to urban greening has been maximized within the proposed development
 - A Fire Strategy should be secured
 - A Travel Plan
 - Therefore the development is acceptable subject to further details conditions and a Draft S106 agreement.
- **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.
- **Place Services (Ecology and Biodiversity):** Conditions relating to compliance with submitted appraisal, bat survey report and environmental statement, construction environmental management plan, biodiversity enhancement strategy, wildlife sensitive design operational scheme, and landscape and ecological management plan.

- **Place Services (Heritage):** Parameter Plans (as revised) would result in a moderate level of 'less than substantial' harm on the two designated heritage assets adjacent to the site.
- **NATS Safeguarding:** No safeguarding objection.
- **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 Policer 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 Business Development:** No meanwhile uses form part of the proposal between demolition and construction.
- **LBH Children's Services:** CIL contribution to go towards the cost of education.
- **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.

- **Anglian Water:** No comment as the site is outside the Anglian Water area.

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. In addition, it should be noted that a significant majority of residents have already been moved to new homes. Some with the right to return.

8 PREAPPLICATION DISCUSSIONS

Quality Review Panel (QRP) Comments

- 8.1 The application was presented to the QRP for comments on the 27th June 2018 and the 18th July 2019. Final comments received from the panel were as follows:
- The panel supports the work done so far on developing the Design Code, but further detail is required to sustain the quality of development over the envisaged 12 year build-out period.
 - The Design Code's hierarchy of elevations lacks distinctiveness between each level, and there is little that is sufficiently distinctive to Romford within the architectural language, despite the character studies that informs it.
 - The masterplan leaves some significant aspects of the site unresolved, with some of the edges potentially problematic: the 'peninsula' between St Andrews Road and Cotleigh Road is still exposed, and the relationship between the scheme and the backs of the buildings along London Road and Cotleigh Road the scheme is clumsy, with unfinished edges creating an unsatisfactory boundary.
 - The ground floor units within the buildings of Phase One, and especially the corner unit at the junction of St Andrews Road and Waterloo Road, could feel exposed.
 - The first floor single aspect units along Waterloo Road in building two are unlikely to provide attractive living accommodation. The set-back will limit the amount of daylight they receive and their only view will be onto a busy road, the noise from which will be very intrusive. The panel recommends that the approach to these units should be reconsidered.
 - The commercial units along Waterloo Road are wide and shallow, which may further restrict their appeal to prospective occupants.
 - The shape of Building One is awkward, and creates a number of issues, not least an unsatisfactory unit on the ground floor at the entrance to the development.

- The arrangement of the cores in Building Two is successful, except for that in the south east corner, which is totally enclosed. Further, the core in Building One creates an overly long blind corridor.
- Within the courtyard gardens, the panel would like to see the potential for direct access from units at that level to be explored.
- The courtyard garden within Building Two could suffer become noisy, especially on summer evenings, and the panel would like the design team to consider how to mitigate this.
- The panel feels that the proposed strips of defensible space outside ground floor units are too narrow to be of much value to residents. These strips should be made more generous or removed with other devices to improve privacy depending.
- The entrance lobbies to the Phase One buildings need to carry through the quality and ambition of the exteriors.
- The different character areas are not sufficiently distinctive in resolution. More could be done with varying the paving and other services.
- Waterloo Road is a very polluted and hostile place and the panel asks that the design team need to give further thought to the kind of environment that can realistically be created there along that frontage.
- The proposed colonnade is a positive response, providing some shelter from the road, but the panel thinks that the space could be made more generous. The potential to continue the colonnade as a continuous line along Waterloo Road should also be explored.
- The panel notes that the trees indicated along Waterloo Road, in both the visualisations and on the model, are very unlikely to be present in reality, not least because of the presence of services beneath the pavement.
- In particular, the panel recommends that a thorough analysis of wind, shading and other factors is required to ensure that planting will be sustainable and maintainable, to avoid its failure and the subsequent degradation of the public realm.
- While the St Andrews Road spine is developing well, there are still issues to be resolved. First the layering of uses creates relatively tight spaces for each function, including a service road, a cycle way, a swale, a footpath, and a defensive strip to the ground floor units, with planting to the front.
- Although St Andrews Road is primarily a pedestrian and cycling route, the crossings within the roadway appear to give priority to vehicles.
- The panel thinks that the locations where on-street car parking is concentrated will impair the quality of the public realm in those areas.
- The panel is not convinced that the proposed water feature is a valuable addition to the scheme as shown, and would like to see a much stronger rationale for it, how it will be used and maintained.
- The panel is comfortable with the revised massing of the scheme and welcomes the reduced heights. It feels that the way in which the buildings step down along Waterloo Road is largely successful

- The panel noted that too many modes and uses have been loaded onto the primary access point to the site, off London Road, and there is a real risk of severe congestion, with service and delivery vehicles competing with cycle commuters, pedestrians and residents more generally, in a constrained space.
- The point of arrival, at the Waterloo Road crossing from The Batts, is still not successfully resolved. In particular, the panel feels that an oddly-shaped ground floor unit within building one makes for an unsatisfactory 'gateway'.
- The planted triangle proposed is also problematic, and the panel recommends that a more urban feel would be more appropriate, for example combining trees with hard surfaces.
- Further thought needs to be given to how the cycle route continues beyond the site, in particular from the crossing at Waterloo Road towards the station.
- The scheme will have a major visual impact on the approach to Romford, obscuring well-known local landmarks, and it will be essential to have a full appreciation of this aspect of the scheme's impact on the townscape.
- Despite the character analysis undertaken, the elevations are rather generic and do not create a distinctive sense of place, much less locate the scheme in Romford.
- The elevations of the buildings in Phase One are too busy in terms of materiality in that there are a number of material changes that do not necessarily relate to the building articulation. This undermines the strong contrasts suggested by the analysis of Romford's character. Simplifying and calming the materials, and concentrating effort and attention on key moments and the lower elevational treatment with high quality materials, would strengthen the architecture.
- The panel welcomes the attempt to signal entrances, but feels these could be more ambitious.
- Further consideration should be given to the treatment of balcony balustrades.
- The panel suggests that the balustrades could become integral to the story of the place and the buildings' architectural language.

8.2 The proposals have evolved considerably since being presented to the QRP on the 18th July 2019. A number of positive changes to the overall masterplan concept have been incorporated into the final scheme, whilst a number of the detailed elements relating to the detailed part of the application (Phase 1) were made to the scheme prior to submission, as well as further amendments post submission with the council's design officers. 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 (8th November 2018, 28th February 2019 and 9th January 2020)

8.3 A summary of comments received by the Committee on the 28th February 2019 were as follows:

- Further detail sought on the unit/tenure mix proposed relative to what exists at present.
- Further detail also sought on the nature of the private rental product and the management thereof.
- Underground refuse storage welcomed.
- Give consideration to 'neighbour contracts' to prevent anti-social behaviour and encourage positive relationships between neighbours.
- What was the allocation policy for returning residents?
- Would CCTV be included?

8.4 Comments received from Members on the 9th January 2020 presentation were as follows:

- The applicant was invited to consider the housing mix and the level of 3 bed+ provision being made
- Whether there is an opportunity to recess the upper floors of the blocks
- A wish to see a strong and lengthy marketing process for the units, with a Havering resident first emphasis
- A keenness to ensure that a crossing across Waterloo Road is provided to ensure that residents of the scheme can safely walk to the town centre
- The applicant was invited to provide more details of their refuse strategy, with a keenness to see a 'top quality solution'
- A wish to understand the sustainability credentials of the development, with an emphasis on low carbon

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 454 neighbouring properties being notified of the application and invited to comment. Comments have been received from 31 neighbours.

9.3 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- Romford Civic Society objects to this application on the following grounds; - Excessive density - By virtue of its height, bulk and massing, negative impact on the streetscene in London Road, Waterloo Road and views from the conservation area. - Insufficient information on how the whole

development would improve the setting of listed buildings at St. Andrew's Church and Salem Baptist Church. - Negative impact on the amenity of residents in Cotleigh Road, by virtue of excessive height behind their properties, overlooking, loss of sunlight in back gardens, noise, disturbance and smells from cooking, kitchen noise and living space in the proposed flats behind them.

9.4 The following Councillor(s) made representations:

- None.

9.5 The following neighbour representations were received:

- 25 objectors
- 6 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

- Objection to a refurbished social housing estate being pulled down.
- Concerns about property boundary arrangements with the rear of Cotleigh Rd properties.
- The development would overlook into the rear of Cotleigh Rd properties, that is rear windows and also in the rear garden areas.
- Concern whether adequate parking facilities being provided for the number of homes proposed.
- Too many 1-bed properties proposed and feeling Council does not care about Romford.
- Concerns over the height of buildings overlooking Cotleigh Rd properties.
- Increase in density very concerning
- Loss of access to garages between Cotleigh Rd properties and the south western corner of the site
- Proximity of buildings to Cotleigh Rd properties will affect daylight, sunlight, privacy and cause nuisance via noise
- Increase in parking issues for residents and visitors and any plans for a CPZ should not include Cotleigh Rd

- Amount of housing will create congestion and all buildings should be reduced by half to allow for more green spaces and trees on the site
- Result in the erosion of Romford's cultural heritage and charm whereby Cotleigh Rd and St Andrew's Church will have their setting impacted upon.
- New buildings will lead to unacceptable overshadowing where none exists today.
- Objection to the height of existing buildings on the estate neighbouring Cotleigh Rd properties being increased from 2-storeys.
- Concern new residents to be able to apply for parking permits to use in Cotleigh Rd.
- Loss of amenities and views from the rear of Cotleigh Rd properties.
- Environmental impact during the course of construction in terms of a quiet environment.
- Development will lead to noises and smells through open windows.
- Insufficient information on how the whole development would improve the setting of listed buildings at St. Andrew's Church and Salem Baptist Church.
- By virtue of its height, bulk and massing would have a negative impact on the streetscene in London Rd, Waterloo Rd and views from the conservation area.
- The density of this development exceeds all government guidelines and the sheer height and bulk of the design will have a negative on the view of the town centre.
- Consider the development overpowering and hideous in design.
- Will the children's' playspace be segregated from the public.
- Buildings along Waterloo Rd will create a wind tunnel.
- Concern on how the increased density will impact on the local road and public transport infrastructure
- Will additional infrastructure be provided for additional increased number of people in the area
- Concern the 10 year phasing plan of construction would have on small businesses on London Rd.

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.

- New commercial units along Waterloo Rd will draw people away from existing business on London Rd.

Procedural issues

9.8 No procedural issues were raised in representations.

10 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)

- 10.1 In August 2018 an EIA screening request was made to the Council for the comprehensive redevelopment of the estate. In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the London Borough of Havering determined the proposal as EIA development and that an Environmental Statement would be required.
- 10.2 Subsequent to the above, a scoping opinion was issued by the Council in February 2019 outlining what would be required within the Environmental Statement.
- 10.3 The current hybrid 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, Conservation and Heritage 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 The existing site previously comprised of 290 residential homes and these were broken down into a total of 242 residential units comprising 171 Council tenants

(social rented affordable housing and 77 leasehold and freehold units (private tenure), a total of 31 residential units within an older persons home and a total of 12 temporary accommodation residential units within a hostel. Further, the estate also comprised of the Prince Albert Public House, the St. Andrew's Parish Community use building, areas of surface car parking and amenity green space, a multi-use games area (MUGA) and a small playground.

- 11.3 The proposal seeks to replace the above and comprehensively regenerate the estate with up to a maximum of 1,380 residential units, 1,375 square metres of flexible floorspace (Use Class A1, B1, D1 and D2) and 550 square metres of community floorspace (Use Class D1).

Residential Housing

- 11.4 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.
- 11.5 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. It also seeks to enable high density mixed use development within Romford. Policy DC1 of Havering's Development Control Policies seeks to resist planning permissions that would result in the net loss of existing housing except in exceptional circumstances.
- 11.6 The proposal would result in a net increase of 1090 residential units on the existing site which would make a significant contribution towards meeting the above targets for net additional housing provision, whilst a total of 371 of these units would be brought forward as part of Phase 1 of the development.
- 11.7 The site is located in Romford just on the edge of the Town Centre and the brownfield site is surrounded by an area with a mix of uses in nature and parts of the site have excellent transport links. As such, the development would be in compliance with the aims and objectives of the above policies and the principle of a residential-led scheme on the site is considered appropriate subject to compliance with all relevant policies of the development plan.

Community Facilities

- 11.8 Policy S1 of the London Plan supports the provision of high quality, new and enhanced social infrastructure facilities and state that the loss of social infrastructure in areas of defined need should only be permitted where replacement infrastructure is provided, or where proposals form part of a wider infrastructure delivery and investment programme to meet future populations needs and services.
- 11.9 Policy CP8 of the Havering Core Strategy seeks to ensure major developments provide community facilities to meet new demand and where significant growth in the number of residents is planned. Policy DC26 of Havering's Development Control Policies outlines Romford as a preferred location for new community facilities and Policy DC27 seeks suitable alternative provision where redevelopment of existing facilities takes place.
- 11.10 The proposal seeks to re-provide the existing community facility at the St. Andrew's Parish Community Centre with a new facility that is 550 square metres in size. This would form part of proposed Block 06 which would be delivered under Phase 3 of 5 of the development. The delivery and securing of the community centre would form part of the section 106 legal agreement.
- 11.11 It should be also noted that in addition to the above, the proposal includes the provision of 1,375 square metres of flexible floorspace which could potentially include the provision of further community space. As such, the development would be in compliance with the aims and objectives of the above policies and the principle of a community facilities on the site is considered appropriate subject to compliance with all relevant policies of the development plan.

Public House

- 11.12 Policy HC7 of the London Plan seeks to protect public houses where they have a heritage, economic, social or cultural value, whilst Policy DC17 of Havering's Development Control Policies protects existing arts and entertainment facilities.
- 11.13 Redevelopment of the estate would require the demolition of the Prince Albert Public House, which is located in the centre of the wider proposed masterplan site and it is in this location that a new public open space and mixed use buildings at ground floor level would be proposed. The public house has not been designated as an Asset of Community Value. Further, whilst it does not benefit from a statutory listing or heritage protection, it is a Locally Listed Building and as such would still be considered a non-designated heritage asset under the NPPF.
- 11.14 Whilst its loss would be regrettable under these proposals, in the context of the overall estate regeneration its retention would create a difficult constraint on the

overall masterplan design, and could potentially jeopardise the extent of housing to come forward as part of those proposals, and this includes affordable housing.

- 11.15 The proposals have been updated to replace the pub with a like for like use within the commercial floorspace coming forward and this is to be secured via condition. Given the overall benefits of the estate regeneration scheme in terms of housing delivery, the replacement of the pub and the lack of any statutory protection of the pub in heritage terms, it is considered that refusal of the application on this basis would not be warranted.
- 11.16 It is for the above reasons that planning application Ref: P1187.20 for the demolition of Nos. 67-69 London Road, the Prince Albert Public House and associated structures, construction of a new vehicular access to London Road and associated works was granted planning permission in March of this year.
- 11.17 Demolition would normally not have been granted for the demolition until replacement proposals (including floorspace for public house use class) had been granted planning permission. In this instance, it was considered that given the logistics and phasing aspects including decanting, demolition and site clearance of an urban renewal project providing up to 1380 residential units, retention of the public house until planning permission is granted for the hybrid scheme could jeopardise key timings in bringing forward the wider benefits for the community.
- 11.18 The location of the public house is located in the centre of the wider Waterloo Estate and its retention whilst all other buildings are demolished would have served minimal benefit to the community. As such, the development would be in compliance with the aims and objectives of the above policies and the principle of a like for like replacement drinking establishment on the site is considered appropriate subject to compliance with all relevant policies of the development plan.

Hostel and Sheltered Residential Accommodation

- 11.19 Policy H8 of the London Plan applies to hostel and other specialist and supported forms of residential accommodation and require satisfactory re-provision to an equivalent or better standard.
- 11.20 Policy CP2 of the Havering Core Strategy seeks to ensure that the needs of those households with special needs, including the elderly are met, while Policy CP8 seeks to retain or re-provided community facilities where a need exists and this includes residential care facilities.

- 11.21 The site previously included a total of 31 residential units within an older persons home and a total of 12 temporary accommodation residential units within a hostel. These are not being reprovided as part of the proposals and as such would result in a net loss of hostel and sheltered accommodation. The applicant has stated the loss of the hostel is required to facilitate the redevelopment and regeneration of the site to deliver new housing, including additional affordable housing to what currently exists. The previous occupants of these uses will be re-accommodated in suitable alternative accommodation within the borough prior to the commencement of works.
- 11.22 Nonetheless, the loss of the existing hostel and sheltered accommodation would not be in compliance with the above policies. It is unclear into what types of suitable alternative accommodation these residents would be rehoused into and any such proposals do not form part of the current planning proposal under consideration in this application. However, given the significant scale of development as part of the regeneration of the estate and the net increase in both overall and affordable housing proposed, it is considered that these public benefits of the scheme and other considerations as a whole could outweigh the harm caused through non-compliance with the above policies in relation to specialist sheltered and hostel accommodation. These other considerations are covered elsewhere in this report.

Flexible Floorspace

- 11.23 The proposal also includes 1,375 square metres of flexible floorspace (Use Class A1, B1, D1 and D2) and this is to be located along Waterloo Road on the eastern boundary of the estate opposite the Brewery Shopping and Leisure centre. The inclusion of such flexible floorspace would meet the objectives of a number of the above stated policies in contributing to a mixed used development of the site.

Estate Regeneration

- 11.24 Policy H8 of the London Plan resists the demolition of affordable housing unless it is replaced by an equivalent amount of affordable housing floorspace, and affordable housing floorspace is reprovided on a like for like basis and integrated into the development to ensure mixed and inclusive communities. All estate regeneration schemes should take into account five key principles, which are looked at in turn below.
- 11.25 The existing site previously comprised of 290 residential homes and these were broken down into a total of 242 residential units comprising 171 Council tenants (social rented affordable housing and 76 leasehold and freehold units (private

tenure), a total of 31 residential units within an older persons home and a total of 12 temporary accommodation residential units within a hostel.

- 11.26 The proposal would increase the number of social rented units across the site from 171 to 212 units (+41) and there would also be a net increase in the number of total habitable rooms (+87) and overall floorspace (+917 square metres). Whilst this overall increase may not account for the existing 31 sheltered units and 12 hostel units given there is no like for like replacement, given the net increase in both overall and affordable housing proposed, it is considered that adequate replacement affordable housing is provided within the scheme.
- 11.27 It should also be noted that the existing Council tenants on long-term secure tenancies would be offered a right to return to the site and re-housed within the proposed development on the same terms and security of tenure. With regard to the 76 leasehold and freehold units (private tenure) affected by the estate regeneration, they have been treated fairly and fully compensated with a full market payment, a home loss payment and other moving/legal costs.
- 11.28 In order to secure GLA funding as part of the scheme, the applicant has engaged in a public consultation process with current and former occupants and set out the details in the submitted Statement of Community Involvement, whereby 98% of the 197 residents stated they were satisfied with the rehousing process.
- 11.29 Finally, Policy H8 of the London Plan states that alternative options should first be considered before demolition and rebuilding are considered as any benefit must be assessed against the wider social and environmental impact. In this instance, the current application forms part of a wider regeneration programme seeking to improve the quality of housing across the borough. The existing estate suffered from constraints relating to its overall layout, whilst the quality of the existing buildings was very low. As such, it was considered that a comprehensive redevelopment of the estate provides a better outcome.
- 11.30 For the reasons outlined above, it is considered that the proposal would accord with the requirements and key principles for estate regeneration.

Design, Tall Buildings Assessment and Heritage Considerations

- 11.31 The existing buildings on the estate consist of various building typologies which include two-storey houses and flats, three-storey blocks of flats, four-storey stacked maisonettes, as well as two 11-storey residential towers (Thomas England House and William Pike House). These buildings are dated and make a negative contribution to the townscape in terms of their poor quality design, materials and condition.
- 11.32 The site itself is not located within any heritage designations, however the Grade II listed St. Andrew's Church and Salem Chapel are immediately adjacent to the site boundary. The Romford Conservation Area is to the northeast within the Town Centre on the other side of the ring road and includes a number of Grade II and Grade II* listed buildings.
- 11.33 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.
- 11.34 The delivery of high quality design including the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment 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.
- 11.35 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.
- 11.36 NPPF Chapter 15 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' sets out the criteria for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment in the strategy of local plans as well as relevant criteria for assessing and determining planning applications. Consideration includes harm posed to both designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting.

- 11.37 At the regional level, Policies D1-D3 and D8 of the London Plan apply to the design and layout of development and set out a range of urban design principles relating to the quality of the public realm, the provision of convenient, welcoming and legible movement routes and the importance of designing out crime by optimising the permeability of sites, maximizing the provision of active frontages and minimizing inactive frontages.
- 11.38 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), DC66 (Tall Buildings and Structures), DC67 (Buildings of Heritage Interest) and DC68 (Conservation Areas) of the Havering Development Control Policies.
- 11.39 The estate is undergoing transformation as part of the 12 Estates regeneration scheme led by Havering Council. The project will deliver 1380 mixed-tenure homes, community and commercial uses, new and enhanced connections and public open spaces. The site is bound by Waterloo road to the east, the railway tracks to the south, London Road to the north and a mid-density residential neighbourhood to the West, Situated in a highly connected location, at easy walking distance from the Market Place, Romford station, Cottons Park, and other socio-cultural amenities; the site has been identified as appropriate for intensification and densification, addressing the housing shortfall in the borough, and delivering much needed additional capacity and amenity.
- 11.40 The masterplan is organised around a legible and permeable street grid, with two main diagonal streets St. Andrew's and Queen Street and a network of smaller streets and residential lanes. Streets will be designed with enhanced public realm with trees and street furniture, comfortable for walking and cycling, alongside accommodating cars and service vehicles. The role of St. Andrew's Road would be strengthened and enhanced by being transformed into green link and movement corridor, comprising a dedicated pedestrian and cycle route, landscaping, and sustainable urban drainage systems, which will provide convenient and legible access to Romford Station and the town centre to the southwest and Cottons Park to the northwest with terminating views of the Grade II listed St. Andrew's Church retained.
- 11.41 The community will have access to a series of small open spaces, distributed along the lanes, streets and within blocks, creating a network of places to meet, recreate and relax. St. Andrew's Church, an existing landmark, will form the

focus of the development on one side of the intersection of the streets and a new public open park fronted by active community uses on the other side.

- 11.42 The new buildings will complete street frontages forming a compact, dense neighbourhood with overlooked and safe streets and public realm. The proposed block typologies respond to the existing edge conditions on site, such as Waterloo Road and the railway tracks to the south. The proposed massing strategy reflects these edge conditions with taller volumes in east and south that decrease gradually towards the north and west with a more sensitive approach to the setting of St. Andrew's Church and existing neighbourhood, forming the backdrop looking east.
- 11.43 A stronger and more defined development frontage would be created along Waterloo Road with active commercial ground floor frontages and public realm and landscaping improvements. A series of secondary streets and mews which would be well activated by ground floor residential flats, duplex units and townhouses served by front doors and landscaped front boundaries, ensuring greater east-west permeability towards the town centre.
- 11.44 Parking would be appropriately located under raised podiums and communal courtyards that would be surrounded by both residential and commercial units so as to avoid dead frontages. The development as proposed along the southern boundary, which includes the location of a proposed energy centre, would also include a landscaping corridor so that the site has a natural buffer from the rail line.
- 11.45 The proposed development aspires to provide a high quality development with place-making at the centre, encouraging sustainable and healthy lifestyles, responding to the local character, whilst at the same time reflecting growth and urban renewal within the town centre near key public transport hubs. 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.
- 11.46 The application is accompanied by a Design Code and parameter plans which provide a relatively flexible design framework for the later phases of the proposed outline application with the Design Code setting out design rules and general principles on a character area basis. These include design elements such as entrances, minimum and maximum set back distances, front boundary treatments and the design and distribution of communal core entrances, whilst allowing a degree of flexibility in terms of building lines and block layout.
- 11.47 With regards to Blocks 1 and 2 which form the detailed part of the scheme, the proposal also aspires to a high standard of architectural and materials quality. The buildings would have a simple brick finish with balconies and window openings grouped formally in consistent lines to emphasise the building angles,

edges and relatively slender vertical appearance. These two buildings would consist of the tallest elements within the whole application site and located at the southeastern entrance would define the new key gateway into the site along St. Andrew's Road. Two different tones of light brown and grey brick are proposed with bronze and grey metal cladding and perforated bronze balconies. The base of the buildings would also be appropriately emphasised through double height ground floors and set within brick colonnades. The design detail of these two blocks has been extensively discussed with the Council's urban design officers and a number of alterations to the proposals have been made in order to ensure that they can achieve a high quality outcome.

- 11.48 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.
- 11.49 Overall, in terms of detailed architectural design, the proposals for Phase 1 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. It should also be noted that these conditions are also to be included for the subsequent phases in order to ensure that the aspiration to achieve an appropriate standard of design across the whole site is maintained.

Tall Buildings Assessment

- 11.50 As noted above, the existing buildings on the estate range from single storey to 11-storeys and the surrounding context is varied with relatively taller and larger buildings located to the east within the Romford Town Centre and to the south of the railway line, whilst there are lower rise two and three-storey suburban properties to the west and north.
- 11.51 The proposed buildings as part of the hybrid scheme would consist of up to 16-storeys (detailed application Phase1) and up to 14-storeys (outline application Phases 2-5).
- 11.52 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.

- 11.53 The policy is clear that “Tall buildings shall only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans”.
- 11.54 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.
- 11.55 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. The proposal is for a number of the buildings to 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.
- 11.56 The site sits within the Romford Strategic Development Area of the emerging Local Plan, Policy 1. Policy 1 states that tall buildings may be acceptable in the vicinity of the station. The justification for the policy states that the Romford Masterplan will be developed to identify locations for tall buildings. The Romford Masterplan is being prepared with the aim to be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.
- 11.57 Given the above, whilst the proposals would be contrary to Policy D9 of the London Plan as the site is not currently designated as an area allocated for tall buildings, within the context of the emerging plan and the site’s location near the station and on the edge of the Romford Town Centre, and also within the emerging Romford Strategic Development Area, it is considered that there is reasonable grounds and justification for the proposal to depart from Policy D9 of the London Plan. This should also be seen in the light that the GLA have not objected to the proposal with regard to the tall buildings policy.
- 11.58 The proposals improve pedestrian permeability through the site whilst public realm improvements and active frontages are proposed at ground level. The proposed buildings would provide a high quality landmark in longer distance

views. Whilst the proposals would result in less than substantial harm to heritage assets this is outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme, as the proposals form part of a wider regeneration programme across the borough 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.

- 11.59 The site is located on the edge of the Town Centre and benefits from good public transport accessibility. The proposed height and massing strategy has located the taller elements along Waterloo Road and in the southeast corner of the site along the railway, whilst the height of buildings steps down towards the residential suburban context to the west and north and Grade II listed buildings immediately adjacent to the site. The taller elements are distributed across the blocks and generally located on street corners to emphasise the legibility of the proposed layout. Subject to the reduced heights and massing of Blocks 09 and 10 via condition (as noted above), the overall approach is considered appropriate.
- 11.60 The submission includes an Environmental Statement that outlines the development would not have an adverse impact on the micro-climate, aviation and telecommunications. Further, the south facing block elevations are reduced in height to allow for daylight and sunlight penetration into blocks and internal courtyards. 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.
- 11.61 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.

Heritage Views and Assessment

- 11.62 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's policies for decision making on development proposals. At the heart of the framework is a presumption in favour of 'sustainable development'. Conserving heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance forms one of the objectives that define sustainable development. Section 16 sets out how the historic environment should be conserved and enhanced.
- 11.63 Specifically, the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance is the value of the heritage asset

because of its heritage interest, which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic, and may derive from a heritage asset's physical presence or its setting'.

- 11.64 Where a proposed development will lead to 'substantial harm' to or loss of the significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. Where a proposal will lead to 'less than substantial harm', the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
- 11.65 Further, The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out the tests for dealing with heritage assets in planning decisions. In relation to listed buildings, all planning decisions should *"have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses"* and in relation to conservation areas, special attention must be paid to the *"to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area"*.
- 11.66 At a regional level, Policy HC1 of the London Plan states that development should conserve heritage assets and avoid harm. At a local level, Policy CP18 of the Core Strategy 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, while Policies DC67 (Buildings of Heritage Interest) and DC68 (Conservation Areas) of the Havering Development Control Policies also reinforce this policy objective.
- 11.67 The site itself is not located within any heritage designations, however the Grade II listed St. Andrew's Church and Salem Chapel are immediately adjacent to the site boundary. The Romford Conservation Area is to the northeast within the Town Centre on the other side of the ring road and includes a number of Grade II and Grade II* listed buildings.
- 11.68 The existing buildings on the site make a neutral contribution to the townscape in terms of their poor quality design, materials and condition, and their replacement are welcomed subject to the conditions outlined above.
- 11.69 The application is accompanied by a Heritage, Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment (HTVIA) in order to demonstrate the potential impact of the proposals on the settings of local heritage assets and views. The HTVIA demonstrates that the proposals have the potential to be seen in the near and middle distance views of some of the Conservation Areas and listed buildings nearby. The scheme would form part of the foreground or background views which take in existing large scale and tall buildings of differing architecture,

quality and age. A Built Heritage and Townscape Addendum letter from the applicant has also been submitted providing an assessment of the initially submitted illustrative plans, which during the course of the application superseded the originally submitted parameter plans. Therefore, for the avoidance of doubt the assessment below is on the proposed maximum parameter plans (as revised), which were originally submitted as illustrative proposals.

- 11.70 The main heritage considerations is the potential for development to impact on the setting of the Grade II listed St. Andrew's Church and Salem Chapel. Views within the HTVIA show the background setting of the Grade II listed St. Andrew's Church and Salem Chapel would be altered by the development. The existing 11-storey towers are visible within the background setting of these two listed buildings. However, the proposed scheme would increase the scale and mass of buildings in the background setting. As part of the HTVIA Addendum, a wireline view from Honiton Road of the Church of St Andrews has been provided, however no wirelines of the maximum parameters (as revised) to show the impact on the Salem Chapel have been provided.
- 11.71 The application was referred to Place Services, the Local Planning Authority's heritage consultant to provide comment on behalf of the Council. They have stated that the maximum parameters (as revised) would result in a moderate level of 'less than substantial harm' to the Church of St Andrew's having reviewed the additional information contained within the HTVIA and addendum. They have also stated that on the basis of all information submitted, it is likely that the proposed maximum parameters (as revised) would also result in a moderate level of 'less than substantial harm' to Salem Baptist Chapel given no updated wireline view was provided from Cottons Park to better understand the potential impact on the setting of the Chapel and the resulting level of harm.
- 11.72 Place Services further advised that whilst the maximum parameters (as revised) may have reduced the level of harm from high to moderate, further reductions in massing would reduce this level of harm further. Paragraph 194 of the NPPF requires 'clear and convincing justification' for any harm caused and paragraph 193 attributes great weight to the conservation of heritage assets, therefore, any amendments that could reduce harm should be explored.
- 11.73 As stated elsewhere in this report, the scale, massing and height of Blocks 09 and 10 have been reduced in order to address amenity concerns. These two blocks are located to the north and south of the Grade II listed church. The changes have been reflected in the submission of dotted line parameters of an illustrative proposal for Blocks 09 and 10. Officers consider that should outline permission be granted, there will be a condition securing that the scale, massing and height of Blocks 09 and 10 be no greater than dotted line

parameters of the illustrative proposal. These reductions would further lessen the harm on the Grade II listed church given their close proximity.

- 11.74 Opportunities for mitigating harm further may also arise in the consideration of the detailed design of the outline scheme at reserved matters stage. The maximum parameters (as revised) offer a firm basis for further mitigation through design measures at reserved matters stage.
- 11.75 It should also be noted that the GLA have also assessed the proposal in terms of the impact on the adjoining designated heritage assets and are of the view that the proposed scheme would cause less than substantial harm. Finally, Historic England have not objected to proposals and stated that the scheme should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of the Council's specialist conservation advice.
- 11.76 'Substantial harm' is a high test and is considered to represent harm that is destructive to the significance of a heritage asset. As indicated by the Planning Practice Guidance, it is a matter of judgement whether or not a proposal causes 'substantial harm' or 'less than substantial harm', and indeed it is considered perfectly reasonable to conclude that within the parameters of the phrase 'less than substantial harm', some impacts can be more harmful than others. Having given consideration to the significance of the designated heritage assets, and the views of the Council's Urban Design officers, the Council's heritage consultant, the GLA and Historic England, it is considered that the overall harm to their significance does not amount to substantial harm, and is therefore considered to represent less than substantial harm.
- 11.77 In cases where the degree of harm is considered to be 'less than substantial', Paragraph 196 of the NPPF is of relevance and this indicates that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The public benefits include a significant uplift of 1090 (net increase) in the total number of residential units on the estate including 212 social rented units, 197 affordable rent units and 147 intermediate units. Other benefits include the provision of modern residential accommodation, improved design quality of the streets and public open spaces, associated pedestrian and cycle improvements and reprovision of community facilities.
- 11.78 The community will also have access to a series of small open spaces, distributed along the lanes, streets and within blocks, creating a network of places to meet, relax and other recreational activities. St. Andrews Church, an existing landmark, will form the focus of the development on one side of the intersection of the streets and a new public open park fronted by active community uses on the other side.
- 11.79 The effect of the duties imposed by section 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is that where harm is

identified, that harm should be given considerable importance and weight in the planning balance. An overall assessment is carried out later in this report.

Quality of residential accommodation

- 11.80 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.
- 11.81 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.
- 11.82 With regard to the detailed part of the application (Phase 1 consisting of Blocks 01 and 02), the two mixed tenure blocks comprise of approximately 57% dual aspect units with the remaining amount single aspect. However, only 12 of the remaining ones are north-facing single aspect units out of a total of 370 units. Balconies and private terraces serve all units, while the core per floor ratio ranges from 7 to 8, with one instance of 10 units per core in Block 01 for eleven floors. 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.
- 11.83 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. Phase 1 of the development proposes 371 units containing a total of 991 habitable rooms. A total of 80% of rooms would meet the minimum targets set by the BRE guidelines. Only 57% of combined living/dining/kitchen rooms, which are the primary living space, would meet this guideline however given the constraints and density of the proposal this matter in itself would not warrant refusal. Similarly, the one instance of 10 units per

core in Block 01 for eleven floors being above the recommended level of 8 units per core would also not warrant refusal.

- 11.84 Overall, given the density, design and layout of the perimeter and open courtyard blocks proposed, it is considered that the number of dual aspect units has been maximised and the number of north facing single aspect units minimised, which have also been provided with relatively shallow floorplans and staggered/projecting elevations, and as such on balance the quality of the residential units would be satisfactory.
- 11.85 With regard to the outline part of the application (Phases 2-5 consisting of Blocks 03 to 10), a total of 1009 residential units would be provided in 8 blocks. Indicative diagrammatical floor plans showing how the blocks could be designed to ensure that 1009 residential units could be accommodated in a manner whereby they would achieve a sufficient standard of residential accommodation have been submitted.
- 11.86 The outline block layouts in terms of depth of plan and length of frontage demonstrate that it is therefore likely that acceptable unit layouts could potentially be achieved. Further, they demonstrate how the outline blocks could be resolved in a way that avoids more than 8 units/core/floor and also how the blocks could be resolved in a way that avoids single aspect north facing units in all but one location per floor (within Block 3). There are approximately 600 units that would be single aspect, however this could rise depending on whether some properties with balconies are being counted as dual aspect. Since these indicative plans are for an outline scheme, and given the plans are constrained, it may not necessarily be possible to achieve all the units proposed should the number of single aspect units be required to be less. As such, a condition is to be recommended that the maximum number of units achievable may be less subject to detailed consideration of the reserved matters.
- 11.87 Given these drawings are for outline purposes only, there is limited detail in order to assess some of the more detailed matters. This includes the size of some of the 3 bed units at ground floor level, access to podium landscaped areas is not shown for some cores, the relationship between the podium landscape and private terraces needs careful consideration at first floor level in order to avoid overlooking issues, and the rationale is not clear when looking at projecting and inset balconies, as some layouts have balconies too close together and may have overlooking issues, which will either be dealt with at reserved matters stage or through an update to the Design Code.
- 11.88 Furthermore, a commitment to achieving equivalent compliance, where London Plan guidance around single aspect north facing and number of units/core is adhered to with only singular exceptions in specific circumstances would

provide reassurance that the submitted outline scheme could provide 1009 units of an adequate residential quality. The current Design Code suggestion that adherence to London Plan guidance will be 'maximised' is not considered sufficient and it is recommended that the Design Code be updated via the imposition of a condition. Similarly, current Design Code does not provide a clear commitment to achieving minimum daylight standards in line with BRE guidance and as such the suggestion that these would be 'maximised' is not sufficient. Again, it is recommended that the Design Code be updated to reflect this and secured by condition.

- 11.89 It should also be noted that the reductions in height, massing and scale of Blocks 09 and 10 and highlighted in illustrative dotted parameter plans, which are to be secured via condition, would result in impacting on the number of units that could potentially be accommodated within Blocks 09 and 10. The applicant has provided limited indicative material on how the units lost within Block 09 and 10 could be potentially accommodated in Blocks 03 to 08 of the outline proposal, however given the lack of indicative diagrammatical floorplans, officers are unable to confirm if this could be done in a fashion that would result in adequate residential quality.
- 11.90 Given the above with regard to the outline application, a condition is recommended should permission be granted restricting the maximum number of dwellings to be constructed on the application site pursuant to the development to a maximum of 1009 dwellings. The maximum number achievable may be less subject to detailed consideration of the reserved matters and requirement to achieve an acceptable mix of unit sizes and types, good standards of residential quality for future occupiers and acceptable amenity impacts to neighbouring properties. In conclusion, it is considered that the imposition of this condition would be an acceptable way to ensure future quality in the outline phases is secured.

Inclusive Design

- 11.91 Policy D5 of the London Plan requires that all new development achieves the highest standards of accessibility and inclusive design, whilst Policy DC7 of the Havering Development Control Policies seeks 10% of all new homes to be wheelchair accessible.
- 11.92 Further, Policy D7 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'.
- 11.93 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.

- 11.94 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.

Secured by Design

- 11.95 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.
- 11.96 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.
- 11.97 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

- 11.98 The development seeks to provide 1380 residential units on a site area of 4.44 hectares which equates to a density of 311 units per hectare. The site is an area with a public transport accessibility levels (PTAL) that range from 2 to 6a (on a scale of 0 to 6b where 6b represents the highest level of public transport access).

- 11.99 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.
- 11.100 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".
- 11.101 In this instance, when considering the existing context and location on the edge of a Town Centre, the public transport accessibility and re-provision of existing 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

- 11.102 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.
- 11.103 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.
- 11.104 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.

- 11.105 The 824 private housing units would have a mix of 7% studios, 32% 1-bedroom units, 50% 2-bedroom units and 11% 3-bedroom units. The 409 social rented/affordable rent units would have a mix of 13% studios, 30% 1-bedroom units, 32% 2-bedroom units and 25% 3-bedroom units. The 147 intermediate units would have a mix of 14% studios, 33% 1-bedrooms, 47% 2-bedrooms and 7% 3-bedrooms. Overall, the housing mix would consist of 10% studios, 31% 1-bedrooms, 44% 2-bedrooms and 15% 3-bedrooms.
- 11.106 The proposed mix for social rent/affordable units has been led by the Council's local housing need and therefore meets the relevant suggestions in the Housing Strategy. It should also be noted that the percentages of the affordable mix of housing also has taken on board the need to reprovide the existing mix of social rented housing and there would be no less 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom units that previously existed on the site. The intermediate housing would have a shortfall of the suggested percentage of 3-bedrooms, as does the proposed amount of private market units when compared against the indicative mix of Policy DC2 and Draft Policy 5 of the Local Havering Plan. However, in this instance it is considered that the overall housing mix would provide a good mix of unit sizes when taking into account the site's location on the edge of a Town Centre, the public transport accessibility and the fact that the unit size mix of social rent accommodation has been led by local need. It should also be noted that the provision of further 3-bedroom units within the private market tenure units would potentially make the scheme even less viable than it currently stands and as outlined further above. Finally, the affordability levels of the 52 (13%) affordable rent studio units will need to be clarified and this is to be secured via the s106 legal agreement.
- 11.107 As such, it is considered that the overall proposed mix of housing would be appropriate in this instance.

Affordable Housing and Viability

- 11.108 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.

- 11.109 Policies H5 and H8 of the London Plan sets out that all estate regeneration schemes which propose demolition are required to follow the 'Viability Tested Route' and are not eligible for the 'Fast Track Route', whilst these types of schemes are also expected to provide an uplift in affordable housing in addition to the baseline requirement for like for like replacement of existing affordable housing workspace.
- 11.110 The hybrid proposal as a whole proposes 40% of affordable housing by unit numbers and habitable rooms, with a 75/25% tenure mix in favour of low cost rent (social rent and affordable rent). Phase 1 of the development (detailed planning application) would comprise 49 social rent units, 26 affordable rent units, 46 intermediate units and 250 private units which represents 33% affordable housing by both unit and habitable room, with a 62/38% tenure mix in favour of low cost rent. Once the baseline requirement for the like for like reprovision of the existing 171 social rent units is accounted for, the level of affordable housing on the net uplift in housing would be 25% by habitable room, with a 60/40% tenure split between low cost rent accommodation and intermediate housing. However, this does not account for the existing hostel and sheltered housing on site (as referred to in Paragraphs 11.21 and 11.22), which is also in affordable housing tenure.
- 11.111 The application is accompanied by a Financial Viability Appraisal (FVA) given it is following the 'Viability Tested Route' under the London Plan. The applicant's FVA uses a fixed land cost of £1 as a benchmark land value, which is considered reasonable for estate regeneration schemes, and arrives at a residual profit equivalent to 5.69% on Gross Development Value, which is lower than the blended target profit of 14.62%.
- 11.112 The submitted FVA has been reviewed by the Council's independent assessor, whilst advisory comments were also provided by the GLA's viability team. After an initial review, further information was sought relating to the applicant's internal rate of return (IRR) approach, build costs, target profit rate and value attributed to social rent housing, as well as the assumed decant costs and finance rates. In response, the applicant submitted an addendum to the FVA with further information that was requested.
- 11.113 Knight Frank have reviewed the FVA and Addendum and concluded that whilst they would arrive at a slightly higher residual profit equivalent above 5.69%, their figure is still significantly less than the 14.62% blended target profit rate. Even accounting for any sensitivity in the input figures, the proposal would not

achieve the 14.62% profit rate. As such, it is considered that the proposal has sought to provide the maximum possible amount of affordable housing.

- 11.114 Given the size and timescales of the development in delivering up to 1380 residential units over 5 phases, an early, mid 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. Additionally, the phasing of the affordable housing delivery by tenure will also be secured via the s106 legal agreement.
- 11.115 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 212 social rented units as part of the proposal are to be secured in the s106 legal agreement by reference to Social Target Rent levels. The provision of 197 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.
- 11.116 The application also includes 147 units of intermediate housing that have been described by the applicant as 'low cost ownership products'. In order to comply with the definitions of intermediate housing set out in the development plan, intermediate 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, whilst annual housing costs (including service charges, rent and any interest payment) should be no greater than 40% of net household income. These requirements are to be secured via the s106 legal agreement.
- 11.117 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

- 11.118 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.

- 11.119 The existing estate does not have any areas of designated open spaces, a corridor of trees runs along the southern boundary of the estate, which is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). This provides both an acoustic and visual buffer from the railway line and is to be maintained as part of the proposals.
- 11.120 Within the existing estate, there is a relatively generous amount of communal open space which is undesignated and distributed across the site in the form of amenity lawns and areas of hard landscaping in between the residential blocks. Some of these spaces do not appear to have a clear function or sense of ownership in relation to the adjacent properties and in some instances do not have a particularly high amenity or biodiversity value.
- 11.121 As part of the proposals, the open space would be rationalised and reconfigured to provide a more formal open space framework comprising landscaped green corridors, a public square and streets, with more defined private and communal gardens at podium level. Overall, across the whole site there would be a net reduction of 1,400 square metres in open space. Given the existing condition of the open space within the estate, the objective to increase the density of the estate in order to provide more housing, the site's close proximity to Cotton's Park, and the aspiration to seek a high quality landscaping and public space as part of the proposals, there is no objection to the net loss of open space in this instance. This would also be subject to an off-site financial contribution to Cotton's Park for improvements in play space provision as outlined below.
- 11.122 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.
- 11.123 The GLA's play space calculator (2019) would generate a requirement of 1,340 square metres of play space for Phase 1 (Blocks 1 and 2 of the detailed part of the scheme), as the housing mix would anticipate 134 children. The applicant has stated that Phase 1 would provide 720 square metres of play space within St. Andrew's Road and the podium and courtyard gardens, resulting in a 620 square metre shortfall. This shortfall is proposed to be mitigated through a financial contribution to improve off-site play space provision at Cotton's Park,

which is just north of the site. The principle of mitigating the shortfall with an off-site contribution is considered acceptable, however it is considered that the shortfall is much greater than 620 square metres. The 720 square metre figure of provision by the applicant in essence includes all of the communal open space within Blocks 1 and 2, 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. As such, the financial contribution for off-site provision will be calculated on an accurate assessment of designated play space within the proposal only.

11.124 The same would also apply for the outline part of the scheme. The play space calculator would generate a requirement of 4,770 square metres based on the mix of housing contained within Blocks 03 to 10 within Phases 2 to 5 of the outline proposal. Approximately 1,000 square metres would be provided in the form of the new central open space within the estate and another 2,780 square metres would consist of the communal open spaces and podium for the remaining blocks. It is suggested that this would leave a shortfall of 990 square metres. As such, the principle of mitigating the shortfall with an off-site contribution is considered acceptable, however the financial contribution for off-site provision will be calculated on an accurate assessment of designated play space within the proposal only.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

11.125 The proposal site is in relatively close proximity to a number of adjoining properties. 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.

11.126 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.

11.127 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.

11.128 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.

11.129 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.'

11.130 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).

11.131 The following properties have been considered for the purposes of neighbouring amenity impacts as a result of the proposed development:

- Nos. 9~51 Cotleigh Road (odd numbers only) opposite Development Block 09
- Nos. 6~24 Cotleigh Road (even numbers only) opposite Development Block 10
- Nos. 1-14 Verity House opposite Development Plot Block 10
- Nos. 53-65 London Road opposite Development Block 05

Maximum Parameters (Revised)

11.132 The proposed outline maximum parameters (revised) contain Development Block 10 opposite Nos. 6~24 Cotleigh Road (even numbers only) and Nos. 1-14 Verity House, which consists of a part 4, part 5 and part 6-storey building with varying heights between 14.6 and 21.4 metres. Given the staggered nature of the Cotleigh Road properties and the new Development Block 10, the distances between the two would vary from 13 metres to 21 metres.

11.133 Further, the proposed outline maximum parameters (revised) contain Development Block 09 (consisting of two parts) opposite the rear facing elements of properties at Nos. 9~51 Cotleigh Road (odd numbers only). The northern part of Block 09 would consist of a part 2, part 3 and part 4-storey building with varying heights between 8.3 and 14.6 metres. Given the staggered nature of the Cotleigh Road properties and the northern part of Block 09, the distances between the two would vary from 7 metres to 24 metres.

11.134 The southern part of Block 09 would consist of a part 4, part 6, part 8 and part 9-storey building with varying heights between 14.8 and 30.6 metres. Given the staggered nature of new and existing development, the distances between the two would vary from 21 to 45 metres between the rear elevations of the neighbouring properties and between 4 and 20 metres from the rear boundaries of the neighbouring properties.

11.135 An assessment of the above information with regard to maximum heights and distances from adjoining properties resulted in significant concerns from the impact proposed Blocks 09 and 10 development plots would have on the outlook of the above mentioned neighbouring properties.

11.136 The application was accompanied by a sunlight and daylight report within the Environment Statement, which provided an assessment of the originally submitted Illustrative Masterplan, which has now become the new revised maximum parameters 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].

- 11.137 With regard to the impact of Block 09 on the amenity of neighbouring properties, given the level of transgressions above the BRE guidelines, officers considered that the proposed maximum parameters would have a minor to moderate adverse impact on daylight, a major significant adverse impact on sunlight, and a major significant adverse impact on overshadowing.
- 11.138 In terms of Block 10 impacting on the amenity of neighbouring properties, given the level of transgressions above the BRE guidelines, officers considered that the proposed maximum parameters would have a significant adverse impact on daylight and significant adverse impact on the sunlight of some properties in Verity House.
- 11.139 Therefore, when considering the combination of all the above assessments (outlook, daylight, sunlight and overshadowing), it was considered that the maximum parameters (as revised) would have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties and this was considered to be demonstrable harm. As such, the proposed maximum heights and massing of Blocks 09 and 10 needed to be revised so as to lessen the significant impact on the outlook to these neighbouring properties, as well as reducing the number of losses outside of the BRE guidelines so that any transgressions would be of a negligible to minor adverse impact.

Dotted Line Parameters for Development Blocks 09 and 10

- 11.140 In response to the above officer assessment, the applicant has submitted dotted line parameters of an illustrative proposal for Blocks 09 and 10 with reduced heights and massing. In summary, the proposed reductions are as follows:

Block 10

- Removal of 6-storey element, reduction in size of the 5-storey element, an increase in setback to 4-storey element from 1600mm to 2400mm, and a reduction in overall maximum height to no more than 3.2m per storey, i.e. 3-storey (9.6 metres), 4-storey (12.8 metres) and part 5-storey (16 metres).

Block 09 (Northern Part)

- Removal of part 2, part 3 storey dog leg extension, an increase in setback to 4-storey element from 1600mm to 2300mm, and a reduction

in overall maximum height to no more than 3.2m per storey, i.e. 3-storey (9.6 metres) and 4-storey (12.8 metres).

Block 09 (Southern Part)

- Removal of part 4, part 6 storey dog leg extension, reduction of 6-storey element to 5-storeys, reduction of 8-storey element to 7-storeys, reduction of 9-storey element to 8-storeys, and a reduction in overall maximum height to no more than 3.2m per storey, i.e. 5-storey (16.0 metres), 7-storey (22.4 metres) and 8-storey (25.6 metres).

11.141 An assessment of the dotted line parameters with regard to maximum heights and distances from adjoining properties would result in a reduction of the significant harm proposed Blocks 09 and 10 (as per the maximum parameters as revised) would have on the outlook of the above mentioned neighbouring properties in Cotleigh Rd. Whilst there would still be some degree of harm in terms of outlook, given the scale and massing of Blocks 09 and 10, it is considered that this harm would be of a minor to moderate impact on the outlook of these properties.

11.142 Further, additional sunlight and daylight information was submitted by the applicant for information purposes only. This was based on an illustrative proposal that although not identical to the dotted line parameters was virtually similar for the purposes of assessing the dotted line parameters of Blocks 09 and 10 with regard to 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].

11.143 When considering the additional sunlight and daylight information relating to the impact of Blocks 09 and 10 on the amenity of neighbouring properties, there was a reduction in the level of transgressions above the BRE guidelines, and as such officers consider that the proposed dotted line parameters would predominantly have a minor adverse impact with some isolated instances of moderate impact on daylight, sunlight and overshadowing to some of the properties in Cotleigh Road. It should be noted that this limited impact does not apply across all of the tests above to individual properties but rather in some instances of one or two of the tests above. Similarly, there would also be some instances of impact on some properties in Verity House but as above this impact would only be limited to one or two of the tests above and not all of them.

11.144 As such, the submitted dotted line parameters of an illustrative proposal for Blocks 09 and 10 with reduced heights and massing would result in lesser harm to the neighbouring properties than the harm that would be caused by the maximum parameters (as revised). 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. As such, it is considered the predominantly minor impact with some isolated instances of moderate impact on amenity is outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme. Should outline permission be granted, there will be a condition securing that the scale, massing and height of Blocks 09 and 10 be no greater than the dotted line parameters of the illustrative proposal.

Environmental Issues

- 11.145 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.
- 11.146 A Contaminated Land study was undertaken with details submitted under the application. These were reviewed by the Council's Public Protection officer who recommended conditions seeking a remediation strategy and verification report. It should also be noted that the site is brownfield land and currently benefits from residential use. Therefore some remediation and contamination works would be required to secure the site for future use. These will be secured via conditions.
- 11.147 The proposed development is located within an area of poor air quality which suffers from high concentrations of nitrogen dioxide. Therefore it has been designated as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). To safeguard against additional unnecessary impacts to air quality, conditions are recommended to mitigate future impacts during the construction and operational phases of the development, including details to protect the internal air quality of the buildings as well as a requirement for ultra-low carbon dioxide boilers.
- 11.148 The Environmental Health Noise officer has reviewed the Noise report submitted which states that given the location of the site there is unlikely to be significant noise generated that may represent greater harm to neighbouring residents. Therefore subject to conditions governing future machinery use the proposed development would be acceptable on noise grounds. These conditions would be imposed should planning permission be granted.

Transport and Highways

- 11.150 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.

- 11.151 Policy DC33 seeks to ensure all new developments make adequate provision for car parking. In this instance, the proposals would comprise of 370 car parking spaces, which represents an overall car parking ratio of 0.27 car parking spaces per residential unit (1380). A total of 80 of the above mentioned car spaces would be for disabled designated spaces, which represents 5.8% of the units. The detailed part of the scheme (Phase 1) would comprise 43 car spaces (0.12 car spaces per unit), with the remaining outline part of the scheme (Phases 2-5) capped at a maximum of 0.3 spaces per unit. The PTAL of the site ranges between 2 and 6a, however this varies across the estate with the predominant part of the site in PTAL 2-3. London Plan policy would seek car free developments for sites within PTAL 5-6, whilst sites with a PTAL of 2-3 in Outer London would trigger a maximum car parking standard of 0.75 car spaces.
- 11.152 There are currently 316 existing car spaces across the site and this is being increased to 370 of which 80 would be for disabled bays. Given the number of spaces required for existing residents as part of the like for like replacement of social rented accommodation, and the PTAL rating of the site, it is considered that the proposed number of spaces are appropriate. These provisions have been reviewed by officers with the Highways team and TfL and are considered sufficient to meet the needs of the end users. However, (20% active and all remaining spaces passive) electrical vehicle charging points in line with the London Plan are required and will be secured via condition, whilst a Car Parking Design and Management Plan will be secured via condition to ensure that the disabled car parking is used only by Blue Badge holders and arrangements for meeting any future demand for such provision.
- 11.154 Cycle parking is proposed for 640 long stay cycle spaces and 11 short stay spaces. This provision would be in line with Policy T5 of the London Plan. TfL have commented that at least 20% cycle spaces be Sheffield stands at normal spacing and a further 5% should be provided as Sheffield stands at wider spacing. 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).

- 11.153 Council's Highway Officer has also recommended a condition for a restricted CPZ to be introduced to the area and legal obligations placing restrictions on parking permits and a financial obligation towards the creation of a controlled parking zone. The Local Highway Authority has raised no objection subject to the applicant entering into a Legal Agreement to secure these sums. 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.
- 11.154 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

- 11.155 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.
- 11.156 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.
- 11.157 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.

- 11.158 The submission has been accompanied by an energy strategy which proposed a 50% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions on the residential element of the scheme, of which 10% would be achieved through energy efficient measures. This exceeds the minimum on-site carbon reduction targets set out in the London Plan. A 36% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions is proposed on the non-residential element of the scheme, of which 8% would be achieved through energy efficiency measures. This falls short of the 15% on-site target set out in the London Plan, however this only relates a very small element of the scheme given the non-residential floorspace in the context of the scheme as a whole.
- 11.159 A site-wide heat network supplied by a centralised energy centre is proposed which would provide heat for all the residential units, and which would be powered by a combination of Air Source Heat Pumps and efficient gas boilers. Although there are no existing or planned district heat networks, the scheme should be future proofed to enable connection to a DHN should one come forward at a later date and this is to be secured via the legal agreement.
- 11.160 A total of approximately 1,120 solar panels are proposed across the scheme which would be incorporated with green/brown roofs. These are to be secured via condition on later reserved matters applications. The submission has assessed the potential for overheating in residential units taking into account climate change and it was concluded that they have a low risk of overheating. Phasing conditions are required to ensure that all latter phases of the outline are to be connected to the site wide energy centre that is to be provided under Phase 1 of the development. Any remaining shortfall in CO2 emissions would be met through a carbon off-set payment secured via the legal agreement.

Flooding, Drainage and Urban Greening Factor

- 11.161 Guidance under the NPPF seeks to safely manage residual risk including by emergency planning and give priority to the use of sustainable drainage systems.
- 11.162 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.

- 11.163 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.
- 11.164 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.
- 11.165 The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 in an area benefitting from flood defences and generally has a low and very low risk of surface water flooding with some high risk areas located along Waterloo Road, St. Andrew's Rd and Queen Street. 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 while the Environment Agency has stated that given the distance of the site from the nearest river and its flood status, there are no objections. Therefore subject to conditions the proposal is acceptable.
- 11.166 Sustainable urban drainage systems have been incorporated into the proposal including two swales, two rain gardens, a pond, green/brown roofs at rooftop and podium level which would serve landscaped courtyards with soft landscaping and planting. There would also be a total of 25 attenuation tanks below the ground. The above ground SUDS measures would provide biodiversity benefits and in combination with the below ground storage tanks, help to provide a 55% 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.
- 11.167 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 detailed part of

the scheme (Phase 1), which achieves a score of 0.28. 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, a rain garden and flower planting in pocket parks and podium courtyard spaces. Whilst the 0.28 score falls short of the London Plan target score, this should be read in the context that the existing UGF of Phase 1 land area would be 0.15 and the proposal would represent a net gain in UGF. Finally, should outline planning permission be granted a condition would be imposed seeking UGF assessment for phases 2-5 of the proposals.

Community Infrastructure Levy

11.168 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.

11.169 The London Borough of Havering's CIL was adopted in September 2019. As the proposed floor area for the development is 15,354sqm and the CIL charging schedule applies a charge of £125 per sqm to any development in Zone A (any development north 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. Such tilted balance does not apply to the consideration of impact of the development on designated heritage assets – the assessment in this regard is provided in this report.

- 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. Other than a separate consideration on the impact on designated heritage assets, 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. Council's Highway officer has also recommended a condition for a restricted CPZ to be introduced to the area and legal obligations placing restrictions on parking permits and a financial obligation towards the creation of a controlled parking zone. Additionally, the shortfall in designated children's play space is to be mitigated through a financial contribution to improve off-site play space provision at Cotton's Park, which is just north of the site.
- 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. The Council has undertaken an Equality Impact Assessment for its 12 sites regeneration programme which considers the impact of the proposed schemes on the protected characteristics. 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 hybrid planning permission (part outline, part detail) for the demolition and redevelopment of the Waterloo and Queen Street Estate site to provide up to 1,380 (C3) residential units (40% affordable), up to 1.375 square metres of flexible commercial floorspace (Use Class A1, B1, D1/D2), and up to 550 square metres of community floorspace (Use Class D1).

- 15.4 In land use terms, the proposal would result in a net increase of 1090 residential units on the existing site which would make a significant contribution towards meeting the above targets for net additional housing provision, whilst a total of 371 of these units would be brought forward as part of Phase 1 of the development. 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 The main heritage considerations is the potential for development to impact on the setting of the Grade II listed St. Andrew's Church and Salem Chapel. It is considered that the maximum parameters (as revised) would result in a moderate level of 'less than substantial harm' to these designated heritage assets.
- 15.6 Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require decision-makers to give considerable weight and importance to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings, and to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. Paragraph 196 of the NPPF states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
- 15.7 It is considered that the level of public benefit provided by the proposals outweighs the 'less than substantial harm' to the heritage assets. The public benefits include a significant uplift of 1090 (net increase) in the total number of residential units on the estate including 212 social rented units, 197 affordable rent units and 147 intermediate units. Other benefits include the provision of modern residential accommodation, improved design quality of the streets and public open spaces, associated pedestrian and cycle improvements and reprovision of community facilities. The community will have access to a series of small open spaces, distributed along the lanes, streets and within blocks, creating a network of places to meet, recreate and relax. St. Andrews Church, an existing landmark, will form the focus of the development on one side of the intersection of the streets and a new public open park fronted by active community uses on the other side.
- 15.8 Subject to a condition securing that the scale, massing and height of Blocks 09 and 10 be no greater than dotted line parameters of the illustrative proposal, it is considered that the development would result in lesser harm to the neighbouring properties which is considered to be of a minor to moderate impact on amenity and outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme outlined above.

- 15.9 Further, subject to a condition restricting the maximum number of dwellings to be constructed on the application site and that the maximum number achievable may be less subject to detailed consideration of the reserved matters and requirement to achieve an acceptable mix of unit sizes and types, good standards of residential quality for future occupiers and acceptable amenity impacts to neighbouring properties, it is considered that this would ensure future quality in the outline phases is secured.
- 15.10 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.
- 15.11 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.