

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE

Monday, 12 September 2022
(7:00 - 7:42 pm)

Present: Cllr Muhammad Saleem (Chair), Cllr Simon Perry (Deputy Chair), Cllr Cameron Geddes and Cllr Jack Shaw

Apologies: Cllr Faruk Choudhury, Cllr Edna Fergus, Cllr Mohammed Khan, Cllr Dominic Twomey, Cllr Mukhtar Yusuf and Cllr Sabbir Zamee

7. Death of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II

Before moving to the formal business of the meeting the Chair with great sadness asked the Committee to note the death of her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. Throughout her reign of more than 70 years, the Queen had been an inspiration to people not only from this Country but across the world, through her tireless commitment to her public duties and to her people. She would be sorely missed. May she rest in peace.

The Chair then asked everybody to stand for a minute's silence.

8. Declaration of Members' Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

9. Minutes (11 July 2022)

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 July 2022 were confirmed as correct.

10. 3 Gallions Close, Barking IG11 0JD

The Principal Planner, Be First Development Management Team, introduced a report on an application from Inland Homes seeking a planning permission for the demolition of the existing buildings and structures and the erection of buildings ranging from part 7 storeys to part 15 storeys to accommodate 233 residential units and 275 sqm non-residential floorspace (Use Class E) at 3 Gallions Close, Barking IG11 0JD. The proposals included the delivery of landscaping and public realm, play space, access, car parking and other associated and ancillary works.

In addition to internal and external consultations, a total of 837 notification letters were sent to neighbouring properties together with the requisite statutory notices. A total of three objections were received, the material planning considerations of which were addressed in the planning assessment set out in the report.

The proposed development would see a change of use from industrial use to mixed-use residential led development comprising of 233 new dwellings

including 38 London Affordable Rent (23.3% by habitable room), and 275 sqm non-residential floorspace (Use Class E).

Paul Galgey, planning consultant, representing the applicant provided an overview of the proposed development. He explained that the applicant had been working with Council officers on this project for several years and that following the emergence of the Thames Road strategic masterplan they had over time refined a scheme through a “mini-masterplan” to support the transformation of the area through a process of intensifying industrial land to provide much need new housing. These proposals if approved would sit at the heart of the new residential development and the applicant was proud that their scheme would act as a catalyst for change in the area and the Borough as a whole.

He outlined the housing tenure and mix, the affordable element of which included more 3- & 4-bedroom family units contributing positively towards local housing needs. Reference was made to the amount of Section 106 contributions being made and the studies and work undertaken to ensure the resilience of the development to climate change and to optimise performance in line with both Borough and London Plan policies. The applicant concluded that they were proud of the scheme and thanked officers for their support in getting to this stage.

Opening the debate, a number of comments and observations were made with officer responses as follows:

- Was the scheme “Secure by Design”

This will be achieved by condition at a later date

- It was noted that the Council’s planning policy of providing affordable housing units across these type of developments in what is described as “pepper potting” was generally not supported by registered housing providers, and therefore perhaps the Council should look to drop the policy or at least amend the wording?
- The implications of car free developments generally, particularly for social housing tenants who have limited choice as to where they can live and may need a vehicle for work. This should be kept in mind for future developments.
- The officer comments in the report in respect of addressing flood protection was vague.

This was in response to comments from the EA. It was clarified that residents would receive detailed information about evacuation plans and that similar to fire evacuation, public notices would be placed in prominent locations.

The officer explained that the proposed change of use would be contrary to Policy CE3 (Safeguarding and release of employment land) of the Core Strategy and Policies E4 (Land for industry, logistics and services to support London's economic function) and E5 (Strategic Industrial Locations (SIL)) of the London Plan, owing to the introduction of residential use the designed SIL. The development as presented would represent a departure from the adopted development plan.

However, in mitigation the Council was in the process of preparing the draft Local Plan 2037 which would be an ambitious and forward-looking vision for the Borough setting out how the housing, economic and social targets would be met. The Thames Road Masterplan (albeit unadopted) was designed to guide the transformation of the strategic industrial land into a new community offering high quality housing, addressing local need and annual housing targets. The proposal included the de-designation of parts of River Road Employment Area SIL through the release of industrial land and intensification of the lost employment capacity elsewhere within the designated area. Consequently, the application was considered to be in line with the emerging Development Plan and adopted London Plan, and the proposed transformation would be Plan led. The principle of development was therefore supported by officers, and

Accordingly, the Committee **RESOLVED** to agree the reasons for approval as set out in the report, and in doing so:

1. Delegated authority to the Director of Inclusive Growth (or another authorised Officer to act on their behalf), to grant planning permission subject to any direction from the Mayor of London, and the completion of a S106 Agreement of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) based on the Heads of Terms identified at Appendix 5 and the Conditions listed at Appendix 4 of the report; and
2. That, if by 13 March 2023 the legal agreement has not been completed, the Director of Inclusive Growth (or another authorised Officer to act on their behalf), be delegated authority to refuse planning permission, or extend the timeframe to grant approval, or refer the application back to the Planning Committee for determination.

11. Former Car Park North, Ford Motor Company, Chequers Lane, Dagenham RM9 6PR

The Principal Planner, Be First Development Management Team, introduced a report on an application from Gill Aggregates seeking a planning permission for the construction of three buildings to deliver new homes and a new primary school, together with associated landscaping, public realm, play space, new access roads, car and cycle parking and other associated and ancillary works at the former Ford Motor Company Car Park North, Chequers Lane, Dagenham RM9 6PR. Since the publication of the agenda a number of

typos and inconsistencies had been identified, and accordingly a supplementary report was subsequently published and circulated detailing the inaccuracies and proposed amendments.

In addition to internal and external consultations, a total of 1390 notification letters were sent to neighbouring properties together with the requisite statutory notices. One objection was received, the material planning considerations of which were addressed in Appendix 3 to the report.

Lucy Howes, planning consultant, representing the applicant provided an overview of the proposed development on an underutilised site, one of a number of residential led developments coming forward in the area. She summarised the mix of affordable housing as well as the proposed landscaping, nature corridor and open spaces provision.

She referenced the new 2-form entry primary school which was similar to a school site in Hackney overlooked by flatted accommodation which had previously been visited by Members of the Committee. It was noted that the design of the school in the application had sought to link the residential blocks and school site whilst negating overlooking and ensuring privacy for both residents and school pupils, something that Members had particularly highlighted at the visit.

All homes had been designed to meet modern standards and specifications with high quality private and communal space provided alongside dedicated play space. In line with Borough and London Plan policies the development would be car free with significant cycle parking provision.

Concluding the presentation Ms Howes stated that the proposals would deliver a significant betterment for the community, acting as a high-quality visual signifier for the Dagenham Dock area, complementing proposals on adjacent sites.

The Planning Officer continued that the location had a long-term objective in adopted policy as a regeneration site that could include residential led development. This had been carried through the emerging Local Plan. The proposed development would deliver several key development plan objectives for the area, positively contributing towards housing numbers and would, on balance, provide an appropriate dwelling mix, tenure split, accessible housing, and play space as well as delivering jobs for local residents during the construction phase, to be secured by a Section 106 legal agreement.

Whilst the level of the affordable housing was below the policy level, the under delivery was acceptable, in this instance, given that the applicant had agreed to fully deliver the proposed primary school if funding from the Department of Education could not be secured before the construction starts. However, should the funding for the school be secured, then the applicant would be required to increase the number of units in the affordable tenure in

the later phases of development, which would also be secured by way of a Section 106 legal agreement.

The siting, scale, massing, and height of the development was considered appropriate to the site's context and would result in a high-quality finish. The proposed buildings would respect the amenity of the existing and future neighbouring occupiers. The proposed landscaping strategy would positively contribute to the appearance and public realm in the area and enhance the arboricultural, biodiversity and environmental value of the site and the surrounding area.

The residential quality of the proposed dwellinghouses would meet or exceed the relevant standards both internal and externally. Some of the proposed dwellinghouses would be single aspect, and in accordance with planning policy the applicant had demonstrated that they have been suitably designed and that they would not suffer from overheating. Also, subject to the imposition of an appropriate condition, the development would achieve suitable internal and external noise levels for future residents.

The development had adopted a sustainable approach to transport whilst ensuring an acceptable impact on the local highway and infrastructure. The Energy Strategy submitted as part of the proposed development demonstrated that the proposals would sufficiently reduce carbon dioxide emissions, with any offset to be secured through the Section 106 agreement, and that overall, it had been demonstrated that the development would be acceptable in terms of sustainable and impact on air quality.

Having given careful consideration to the relevant provisions of the NPPF, the Development Plan and all other relevant material considerations, officers had concluded the proposed development to be acceptable; and furthermore, were satisfied that any potential material harm in terms of the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area would reasonably be mitigated through compliance with the listed conditions and associated legal agreement.

Accordingly, the Committee **RESOLVED** to agree the reasons for approval as set out in the report, and in doing so:

- 1 Delegated authority to the Director of Inclusive Growth (or another authorised Officer to act on their behalf), to grant planning permission subject to any direction from the Mayor of London, and the completion of a S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) legal agreement based on the Heads of Terms identified at Appendix 5 and the Conditions listed at Appendix 4 of the report, Condition 2 of which was amended to read as follows:

Condition 2

The development hereby approved shall comprise of 337 residential dwellings and it shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below:

Title	Drawing	Revision
Ground Floor General Arrangement Plan 1 of 2	(90)LP002	00
Ground Floor General Arrangement Plan 2 of 2	(90)LP003	00
Roof Level General Arrangement Plan 1 of 2	(90)LP004	00
Roof Level General Arrangement Plan 2 of 2	(90)LP005	00
Ground Floor Hard Landscape Plan 1 of 2	(90)LP006	00
Ground Floor Hard Landscape Plan 2 of 2	(90)LP007	00
Ground Floor Soft Landscape Plan 1 of 2	(90)LP008	00
Ground Floor Soft Landscape Plan 2 of 2	(90)LP009	00
Roof Level Hard Landscape Plan 1 of 2	(90)LP010	00
Roof Level Hard Landscape Plan 2 of 2	(90)LP011	00
Roof Level Soft Landscape Plan 1 of 2	(90)LP012	00
Roof Level Soft Landscape Plan 2 of 2	(90)LP013	00
Proposed block plan	2113-P002-S2	P0
Proposed site plan, ground floor	2113-P100-S2	P1
Proposed Basement Plan	2113-P110-S2	P0
Proposed Ground Floor Plan	2113-P111-S2	P1
Proposed 1 st Floor Plan	2113-P112-S2	P1
Proposed 2 nd Floor Plan	2113-P113-S2	P0
Proposed 3 rd to 7 th Floor Plan	2113-P114-S2	P0
Proposed 8 th Floor Plan	2113-P119-S2	-
Proposed 9 th to 10 th Floor Plan	2113-P120-S2	P0
Proposed 11 th Floor Plan	2113-P122-S2	P0
Proposed 12 th Floor Plan	2113-P123-S2	P0
Proposed 13 th to 14 th Floor Plan	2113-P124-S2	P1
Proposed 15 th to 16 th Floor Plan	2113-P126-S2	P0
Proposed Roof Plan	2113-P130-S2	P0
Proposed Site Elevations	2113-P200-S2	P0
Proposed Elevations Block A – North	2113-P210-S2	P0
Proposed Elevations Block A – South	2113-P211-S2	P0
Proposed Elevations Block A – East	2113-P212-S2	P0
Proposed Elevations Block A – West	2113-P213-S2	P0
Proposed Elevations Block B and C – North	2113-P220-S2	P0
Proposed Elevations Block B and C – South	2113-P221-S2	P0
Proposed Elevations Block B and C – East	2113-P222-S2	P0
Proposed Elevations Block B and C – West	2113-P223-S2	P0
Proposed Elevations Block D – North	2113-P230-S2	P0
Proposed Elevations Block D – South	2113-P231-S2	P0
Proposed Elevations Block D – East	2113-P232-S2	P0
Proposed Elevations Block D – West	2113-P233-S2	P0
Proposed Long Section	2113-P300-S2	P0
Proposed Section 1 – Block A	2113-P310-S2	P1
Proposed Section 2 – Block A Courtyard	2113-P311-S2	P1
Proposed Section – Block B	2113-P320-S2	P0
Proposed Section – Block D	2113-P330-S2	P0
Proposed Internal Layouts – Block A Basement	2113-P400-S2	P0
Proposed Internal Layouts – Block A Ground Floor	2113-P401-S2	P0
Proposed Internal Layouts – Block A 1 st Floor	2113-P402-S2	P1
Proposed Internal Layouts – Block A 2 nd Floor	2113-P403-S2	P0
Proposed Internal Layouts – Block A Typical Upper Floors	2113-P404-S2	P0

Proposed Internal Layouts – Block B and C – Basement	2113-P405-S2	P0
Proposed Internal Layouts – Block B and C – Ground floor	2113-P406-S2	P1
Proposed Internal Layouts – Block B and C – 1 st floor	2113-P407-S2	P1
Proposed Internal Layouts – Block B and C – 2 nd floor	2113-P408-S2	P0
Proposed Internal Layouts – Block B and C – Typical upper floors	2113-P409-S2	P0
Proposed Internal Layouts – Block B – 12 th floor	2113-P410-S2	P0
Proposed Internal Layouts – Block B – 13 th and 14 th floor	2113-P411-S2	P1
Proposed Internal Layouts – Block D – Basement, Ground, and 1 st floor	2113-P412-S2	P0
Proposed Internal Layouts – Block D – 9 th and 10 th floor	2113-P414-S2	P0
Proposed Internal Layouts – Block D – Typical Upper Floors	2113-P413-S2	P0

No other plans apply.

Reason: To ensure that the development is undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and documents.

2. That, if by 12 March 2023 the legal agreement had not been completed, the Director of Inclusive Growth (or another authorised Officer to act on their behalf), be delegated authority to refuse planning permission, or extend this timeframe to grant approval, or refer the application back to the Planning Committee for determination.