



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

## 1 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 There are no in principle objections to the proposals and through the application of conditions and a legal agreement officers are able to secure a development that would make an important contribution to housing delivery within the

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

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

## **2 RECOMMENDATION**

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

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

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

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

- 2.2 That the Assistant Director of Planning is delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above and that if not completed by the 30th May 2022 the Assistant Director of Planning is delegated authority to refuse planning permission or extend the timeframe to grant approval.
- 2.3 That the Assistant Director of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

### **Conditions**

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

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

#### Informatics

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

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

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

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

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

## 4 PROPOSAL

4.1 Full planning permission is sought to amend Plot 16 and Block I of the masterplan approved under P1125.19 to introduce 99 additional units (for a total of 190 units, instead of 91), by:

- Replacing 16 three-storey dwellings on Plot 16 with a 4-10 storey apartment block (Block Y) containing 111 units; and
- Increasing the height of Block I from 4-6 storeys to 4-8 storeys to provide 9 additional units (for a total of 79 units).

## 5 PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 The following planning applications are relevant to the site:

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

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

## 6 STATUTORY CONSULTATION RESPONSE

6.1 A summary of consultation responses are detailed below:

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

- Revisions to the proposals to reduce car parking and vehicle movements are necessary to improve the air quality impacts of the scheme. Additionally, revisions to the air quality assessment and mitigation measures are required in order to meet the requirements of London Plan Policy SI1(B). Other issues on energy, whole life-cycle carbon assessment, and circular economy also require resolution.

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

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

## 7 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

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

## 8 PREAPPLICATION DISCUSSIONS

### Quality Review Panel (QRP) Comments

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

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

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

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

*Strategic Planning Committee Developer Presentation Feedback (9<sup>th</sup> July 2020)*

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

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

- The loss of houses to apartments does not contribute towards the promised vision of a 'garden suburb'
  - The introduction of Blocks would result in an inner city urban landscape and further erodes the family friendly community.
  - The proposed parking reduction together with the proposed increase in occupiers would result in further parking pressures.
  - Further details are required on the wider implications of the proposed changes as they relate to overshadowing, walkways etc.
  - Members suggested that a further developer's presentation was required following further design work to address the above
- 8.4 As highlighted in Paragraph 8.2, a number of positive changes have been incorporated into the final scheme prior to submission, as well as further amendments post SPC Developer Presentation with the council's design officers. These changes related to reductions in massing and height, public realm improvements, and meeting the original Masterplan objectives for family housing.

## **9 LOCAL REPRESENTATION**

- 9.1 The application was advertised via a Press Notice and Site Notice displayed at the site for 21 days.
- 9.2 A formal neighbour consultation was also undertaken with 1019 neighbouring properties being notified of the application and invited to comment. Comments have been received from 10 neighbours.
- 9.3 The following local groups/societies made representations:
- None
- 9.4 The following Councillor(s) made representations:
- None.
- 9.5 The following neighbour representations were received:
- 10 objectors
  - 0 comments.
  - No petitions have been received.

- 9.6 A summary of neighbour comments is given as follows (as only material comments can be considered as part of the application assessment, these comments have been divided into “material” and “non-material” comments):

### **Material Representations**

#### *Objections*

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

#### *Support*

- None.

### **Non-material representations**

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

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

## **Procedural issues**

9.8 No procedural issues were raised in representations.

## **10 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)**

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

## **11 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

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

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

### **Principle of Development**

11.2 Policy H1 of the London Plan seeks to optimise potential housing delivery across London, particularly through higher density residential development on brownfield sites with good existing or planned access to public transport and within walking distances of stations and town centres, including through the use of sensitive intensification of existing residential areas. The London Plan has set a 10-year housing target of 12,850 homes a year for the period between 2019/20 to 2028/29.

11.3 Policy CP1 of the Havering Core Strategy aims to meet a minimum housing supply of 535 within Havering by prioritising the development of brownfield land and ensuring these sites are used as efficiently as possible. The wider application site is allocated in both Havering Council's Site Allocation DPD, in the draft Havering Local Plan and in Barking & Dagenham Council's Site

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

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

### **Design and Tall Buildings Assessment**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Tall Buildings Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

### **Quality of residential accommodation**

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

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

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

### **Inclusive Design and Fire Safety**

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

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

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

### **Secured by Design**

- 11.44 In terms of national planning policy, paragraphs 91-95 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) emphasise that planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion. In doing so planning policy should emphasise safe and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas.
- 11.45 The above strategic approach is further supplemented under Policy 7.3 of the London Plan which encompasses measures to designing out crime to ensure that developments reduce the opportunities for criminal behaviour and contribute to a sense of security without being overbearing or intimidating. In local plan policy terms, policies CP17 and DC63 are consistent with these national and regional planning guidance. The SPD on Designing Safer Places (2010), forms part of Havering's Local Development Framework and ensures adequate safety of users and occupiers by setting out clear advice and guidance on how these objectives may be achieved and is therefore material to decisions on planning applications.
- 11.46 In keeping with these policies officers have consulted the Metropolitan Police's Designing Out Crime team to review the submitted application. They have commented that the application is acceptable subject to conditions stipulating that prior to the commencement of development the applicant shall be required to make a full and detailed application for the Secured by Design award scheme and thereafter adhere to the agreed details following approval. These conditions will be attached.

## **Density**

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

## **Housing Mix**

- 11.51 Policy DC2 of Havering's Development Control Policies sets out an indicative mix for market housing of 24% 1 bedroom units, 41% 2 bedroom units, and 34% 3 bedroom units. Policy DC6 states that in determining the mix of affordable housing, regard should be paid to the latest Housing Needs Survey. The Council's Housing Strategy (2014) was informed by an extensive Housing Needs and Demands Assessment (2012), which suggested that 75% of the rented provision should be one or two bedroom accommodation and 25% three

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

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

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

### **Affordable Housing and Viability**

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

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

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

### **Open Space and Children's Play Space**

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

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

### **Impact on Neighbouring Amenity**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Environmental Issues**

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

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

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

## **Transport and Highways**

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

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

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

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

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

## **Energy and Sustainability**

- 11.100 In recognising the importance of climate change and the need to meet energy and sustainability targets, as well as the Council's statutory duty to contribute towards the sustainability objections set out within the Greater London Authority Act (2007), the London Plan requires all major developments to meet targets for carbon dioxide emissions. This is targeted with the eventual aim of zero carbon for all residential buildings from 2016 and zero carbon non-domestic buildings from 2019. The policy requires all major development proposals to include a detailed energy assessment to demonstrate how the targets for carbon dioxide emissions reduction outlined above are to be met within the framework of the energy hierarchy.
- 11.101 The Mayor of London's SPG on *Housing* (2016) applies a zero carbon standard to new residential development, and defines zero carbon homes as homes forming part of major development applications where the residential element of the application achieves at least a 35 percent reduction in regulated carbon dioxide emissions (beyond Part L 2013) on-site. Furthermore, the Mayor of London's SPG on Sustainable Design and Construction (2014) provides guidance on topics such as energy efficient design; meeting carbon dioxide reduction targets; decentralised energy; how to off-set carbon dioxide where the targets set out in the London Plan are not met.
- 11.102 In terms of the Local Plan policy DC50 (Renewable Energy), there is a need for major developments to include a formal energy assessment showing how the development has sought to ensure that energy consumption and carbon dioxide emissions are minimized applying the principles of the energy hierarchy set out in the London Plan.
- 11.103 The submission has been accompanied by an energy strategy which proposes a 43.4% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions on the residential element of the scheme through energy efficient measures, such as 100% low energy lighting and mechanical ventilation with heat recovery. This exceeds the minimum on-site carbon reduction targets set out in the London Plan. Any remaining shortfall in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in meeting the zero carbon policy would be met through a carbon off-set payment secured via the legal agreement.

11.104 Two energy centres have been secured under the site wide Masterplan permission which consist of CHP units in combination with gas boilers providing heating and hot water to the residential blocks. The two blocks under this application within Phase 2a are covered by the east side energy centre. The additional units would fit within the capacity that is available from the energy centre and further efficiency has been achieved as a result of the gas fire boilers associated with the houses of former Plot 16 being replaced with flats with HIU and DH connections being added. Roof mounted solar panels are proposed across the two blocks which would be incorporated with green/brown roofs. These are to be secured via condition.

11.105 The energy strategy is generally compliant with the London Plan energy policies however, additional technical information has been requested by the GLA in relation to further Be Lean measures being required, as well as further information on energy costs, overheating, district heating connection (including the decarbonisation plans for the network) and PV potential. The applicant has been liaising with the GLA regarding these matters and any outstanding matters required can be secured via the imposition of a condition.

11.106 In accordance with London Plan Policy SI2, a Whole life-cycle carbon assessment (WLCCA) is required for submission. A draft assessment has been reviewed by the GLA and considered appropriate however further details are required to be secured by condition. A condition is also required for the submission of a post-construction assessment to report on the development's actual WLC emissions.

11.107 Finally, London Plan Policy SI7 requires development applications that are referable to the Mayor of London to submit a Circular Economy Statement, whilst London Plan Policy D3 requires development proposals to integrate circular economy principles as part of the design process. A draft Circular Economy Statement has been submitted to the GLA who have stated this can be resolved prior to a Stage 2 referral. As such, this requirement shall also be conditioned should permission be granted.

### **Flooding, Drainage and Urban Greening Factor**

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

11.109 In order to address current and future flood issues and minimise risks in a sustainable and cost effective way, the London Plan emphasises that new developments must comply with the flood risk assessment and management requirements and will be required to pass the Exceptions Test addressing flood

resilient design and emergency planning as set out within the NPPF and the associated technical Guidance on flood risk over the lifetime of the development. Furthermore, it stresses that development should utilise sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) and should aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible.

- 11.110 In terms of local planning policies, Policy DC48 of the Havering Development Control Policies emphasises that development must be located, designed and laid out to ensure that the risk of death or injury to the public and damage from flooding is minimised whilst not increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere and ensuring that residual risks are safely managed. The policy highlights that the use of SUDS must be considered. Further guidance of how to meet the requirements as presented in the Core Strategy is supplemented under LBH's SPD on '*Sustainable Design Construction*' 2009 which encourages developers to consider measures beyond the policy minimum and centred on Flood risk.
- 11.111 Policy DC51 seeks to promote development which has no adverse impact on water quality, water courses, groundwater, surface water or drainage systems. Whilst Policy CP15 (Environmental Management Quality) of the Core Strategy seeks to reduce environmental impact and to address causes of and to mitigate the effects of climate change, construction and new development to reduce and manage fluvial, tidal and surface water and all other forms of flood risk through spatial planning, implementation of emergency and other strategic plans and development control policies; whilst having a sustainable water supply and drainage infrastructure.
- 11.112 The application site is located within Flood Zone 3 and as a result proposed levels were set to raise the site out of the predicted flood level of a 1 in a 100 year event. The Council's drainage and flood officer has been consulted as well as the Environment Agency. The drainage officer has confirmed that the submitted details are acceptable subject to conditions. Therefore subject to conditions the proposal is acceptable.
- 11.113 Sustainable urban drainage systems have been incorporated into the proposal including a network of swales and basins to route any water back to the river, whilst green/brown roofs at rooftop and permeable public and communal green spaces would have soft landscaping and planting. The above ground SUDS measures would provide biodiversity benefits and help to provide a reduction on the surface run-off for the existing site. Overall, it is considered that the proposed SUDS measures are satisfactory and these are to be secured via condition.

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

### **Community Infrastructure Levy**

11.115 The Mayor has established a CIL charging schedule with a recent amendment that came into force from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019. The amendment increases the CIL contribution by £5 per square metre to £25. The proposed development would be liable for this charge. Therefore a mayoral levy would be applicable, subject to any relief for social housing.

11.116 The London Borough of Havering's CIL was adopted in September 2019. The proposed floor area of the development would be subject to the CIL charging schedule at a charge of £55 per sqm to any development in Zone B (any development south of the A1306). Therefore the levy would be applicable subject to relief for social housing.

## **12 HOUSING DELIVERY TEST**

12.1 On 19 January 2021 the Government published the 2020 Housing Delivery Test (HDT) results. The results show that within Havering 36% of the number of homes required were delivered over the three year period of 2017-18 to 2019-20. The NPPF (paragraph 11d) states that where the delivery of housing was substantially below (less than 75%) the housing requirement over the previous three years, the policies which are most important for determining the application are considered out of date. This means that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole. This is commonly referred to as the "tilted balance" in favour of sustainable development and is a significant relevant material consideration in the determination of the planning application.

12.2 The proposed development would contribute to boosting housing supply and delivery and this weighs in favour of the development. The assessment of the planning application has not identified significant harm nor conflict with development plan policies and where there is some harm/conflict identified it is considered that these do not outweigh the benefits of the proposal. Therefore, it is considered that in this case the proposal does benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 11 d) of the NPPF.

## **13 FINANCIAL AND OTHER MITIGATION**

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

## **14 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY**

- 14.1 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which came into force on 5th April 2011, imposes important duties on public authorities in the exercise of their functions, including a duty to have regard to the need to:
  - (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
  - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
  - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 14.2 For the purposes of this obligation the term “protected characteristic” includes:- age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; and sexual orientation.
- 14.3 Policy CG1 of the London Plan also seeks to support and promote the creation of an inclusive city to address inequality. In view of the stakeholders affected by the development proposals, the most significant impacts in this case relate to the protected characteristics of age, disability and gender. It is considered

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

- 14.4 Therefore in recommending the application for approval, officers have had regard to the requirements of the aforementioned section and Act and have concluded that a decision to grant planning permission for this proposed development would comply with the Council’s statutory duty under this important legislation.
- 14.5 In light of the above, the proposals are considered to be in accordance with national regional and local policy by establishing an inclusive design and providing an environment which is accessible to all.

## **15 CONCLUSIONS**

- 15.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) requires the Council to determine any application in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. All relevant policies contained within the Mayor’s London Plan and the Development Plan, as well as other relevant guidance and material considerations, have been carefully examined and taken into account by the Local Planning Authority in their assessment of this application.
- 15.2 The preliminary proposals for the site were subject to consideration by the Quality Review Panel and Strategic Planning Committee and comments made in these forums have had some input into the development.
- 15.3 The application seeks planning permission for the redevelopment of Block Y (formerly Plot 16) and Block I within Phase 2A of the wider Beam Park Masterplan Permission Ref: P1125.19 to provide for 190 residential units (minimum 59% affordable) within a residential block (Block Y) comprising of part 4, part 5, part 8 and part 10-storeys, and a residential block (Block I) comprising of part 4, part 5 and part 8-storeys.
- 15.4 In land use terms, the proposal would result in a net increase of 99 residential units (91 to 190) to that previously consented within these 2 blocks in Phase 2A of the consented Masterplan, and would make a significant contribution towards meeting the above targets for net additional housing provision, whilst a total of 113 out of 190 units would be brought forward as various affordable housing tenures. As such, the principle of a residential-led scheme on the site is considered appropriate subject to compliance with all relevant policies of the development plan.

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