

**MINUTES OF
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Monday, 14 February 2022
(7:00 - 7:45 pm)

Present: Cllr Muhammad Saleem (Chair), Cllr Faruk Choudhury, Cllr Cameron Geddes, Cllr Kashif Haroon and Cllr Foyzur Rahman

Apologies: Cllr John Dulwich, Cllr Olawale Martins and Cllr Dominic Twomey

26. Declaration of Members' Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

27. Minutes - 20 December 2021

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 December 2021 were confirmed as correct.

28. Gascoigne Estate East, King Edwards Road, Barking - Approval of Reserved Matters (21/01913/REM)

The Development Management Officer (DMO), Be First, presented a report on an application from the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham for the approval of reserved matters (following outline approval 20/01251/VAR) relating to Phases 2B, 2C, 2D of a development comprising up to 546 units, commercial space, community space and a new park at Gascoigne Estate East, King Edwards Road, Barking, as follows:

Variation of condition 2 (approved parameter plans) in respect of permission 19/00310/FUL. To amend approved parameter plans in relation to Development Parcels I and J.

Consented development Hybrid (part full/part outline) application for the phased comprehensive redevelopment of the site for a maximum of 1,575 residential dwellings (Use Class C3); 21,550 sq. m of Education (Use Class D1); 1,355 sq. m Medical facility (Use Class D1); 1,200 sq. m of Employment (Use Class B1); 1,400 sq. m of Community facilities (Use Class D1/D2); 1,850 sq. m of flexible commercial floor space (within Use Classes A1, A2, A3, and B1); 1,000 sq. m to be used as a place of worship (Use Class D1) or employment (Use Class B1); and Energy Centre (all figures given as maximum gross external area); with associated means of access, car parking, landscaping, service infrastructure and other associated works and improvements.

Full planning permission sought on Phase 1A comprising 2.39 Ha. of the site for 348 residential dwellings; 1,355 sq. m floor space to be used as a medical centre (Use Class D1) or Residential (Use Class C3); 300 sq. m of flexible

commercial floor space (within Use Classes A1, A2, A3, B1); Energy Centre; internal road layout and associated means of access, car parking, landscaping and other works and improvements; and Phase 1B comprising 0.38 ha of the site for 73 residential dwellings with associated means of access, car parking, landscaping and other works and improvements.

Outline planning permission sought on 13.59 ha of the site, with all matters reserved for a maximum of 1,154 residential dwellings (Use Class C3); 21,550 sq.m of Education (Use Class D1); 1,200 sq.m of Employment (Use Class B1); 1,400 sq. m of Community facilities (Use Class D1/D2); 1,550 sq.m of flexible commercial floor space (within Use Classes A1, A2, A3, and B1); 1,000 sq.m to be used as a place of worship (Use Class D1) or employment (Use Class B1) (all figures given as maximum gross external area); with associated means of access.

In response to questions from the Committee, the DMO stated that:

- At this stage, limited details had been provided as to who would occupy the proposed community centre space; however, a condition had been included that would require these details to be submitted.
- It was possible to request that samples of the proposed main materials for the development be provided to the Committee, when the application returned to it for approval in that respect.
- The impact on refuse and storage space as a result of proposed underground parking arrangements were considered acceptable when they were presented previously to the Committee as part of reserved matters. No further changes had been proposed since, in that regard.

The Committee **RESOLVED** to agree:

1. The reasons for approval as set out in the report,
2. To delegate authority to the Director of Inclusive Growth in consultation with the Head of Legal Services to grant approval of reserved matters, subject to the completion of a deed of variation under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), based on the Heads of Terms identified at Appendix 6 and the Conditions listed in Appendix 5 of the report, and
3. That if by 27 March 2022, the legal agreement has not been completed, the Director of Inclusive Growth is delegated authority to refuse approval of reserved matters or extend this timeframe to grant approval.

29. Barking Riverside Ltd - Plot H West, Renwick Road, Barking - Reserved Matters

The Deputy Chief Planner, Be First, presented a report on an application by Bellway Homes Partnership and Barking Riverside Limited for the approval of reserved matters, S106 Strategies and Discharge of Conditions in relation to a

proposed development at Plot H West, Barking Riverside Area, Renwick Road, Barking, as follows:

21/02206/AOD - Details pursuant to Conditions 7 (stage and Zone), 33 (Sub framework plan (A-T)), 34 (statement indicating how the conditions have been complied with (A-T)), 36 (Code of construction management) and 37 (nature conservation and landscape) for Plot H West SFP only, attached to planning consent 08/00887/FUL dated (23/07/2009); and

21/02256/REM - Application for the approval of reserved matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) pursuant to Conditions 45 (zone details) following outline approval '08/00887/FUL' for Plot H West at Barking Riverside.

The proposed development comprised the erection of 167 dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated parking, landscaping and provision of affordable housing. This application also sought the partial discharge of conditions 7 (stage/ zone relationship), 15 (ecological monitoring scheme), 46 (remediation), 49 (landscape management), 53 (drainage) and 56 (plot level access plan) in relation to Plot H West, Barking Riverside.

The outline planning application was an EIA application for which an environmental statement was submitted.

The Planning Committee **RESOLVED** to agree:

1. The reasons for approval as set out in this report.
2. Delegate authority to the Director of Inclusive Growth (or authorised Officer), in consultation with the Head of Legal Services, to approve the Sub-Framework Plans (21/02206/AOD); and
3. Delegate authority to the Director of Inclusive Growth (or authorised Officer), in consultation with the head of Legal Services, to approve the Reserved Matters (21/02256/REM), subject to the Conditions listed in Appendix 6 of the report.

30. 34-42 East Street, Barking

The Principal Development Management Officer (PDMO), Be First, presented a report on an application by Mobin Properties Ltd seeking planning permission for a proposal to provide a 5 - 8 storey building comprising up to 59 residential units (Use Class C3) with retail units (Use Class E) at ground and part first floors, with associated landscaping and highway works at 34-42 East Street, Barking.

By way of background, the PDMO stated that the application was a resubmission of two previously refused applications, which sought the residential-led redevelopment of the site, retaining retail on the ground floor. The first application (19/00770/FUL) sought permission for the development of a 6 - 9 storey building comprising 79 units and ground floor retail space and

was refused for eight reasons. The second application (21/00159/FULL) sought permission for the development of a 5-9 storey building comprising 65 residential units, with ground floor retail units and was refused for three reasons, which, in summary, were:

- i. Poor place-making, density and impact on the setting of the Grade II listed former Barking Magistrates Court.
- ii. Loss of sunlight and daylight to neighbouring residential occupiers, in particular, at flats within the former Barking Magistrates Court and the Bath House buildings; and
- iii. Insufficient information submitted to demonstrate that there would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety in respect of the location of the blue badge car parking spaces.

Two letters of objections had been submitted against the current application, which related to concerns around congestion, local heritage, privacy, and the loss of light to neighbouring properties.

The remainder of the PDO's presentation focussed on the improvements made to the proposal in relation to the above three reasons for refusal, as detailed in the report, which formed the basis of the officer recommendation to approve the application. The reasons for recommending approval were summarised as follows:

The architecture of the proposal had advanced from the previously refused scheme in respect of the architectural strategy, particularly in relation to the northern corner adjacent to the former Magistrates Court. Officers welcomed the attention to detail that had been paid to introduce architectural interest through the proposed window arches as well as the window reveals that would contribute to somewhat enlivening an otherwise dead portion of frontage along East Street. The change in materiality from the previous scheme was also considered to be a welcome improvement, which was more in keeping with the surrounding area and reduced the dominance of the building. Officers considered that the progression from the previously refused schemes to the current proposal were such that the proposed development would accord with design policies.

The reduction in height from 9 to 8 storeys was welcomed, as this assisted in reducing the impact of the development from a number of views, and the reduction from part of the East Street frontage from 6 storeys to 5 storeys also ensured that the development would not appear too dominant along East Street, especially when viewed from the western site. Whilst at 5-8 storeys high, the development was tall for a town centre/high street location, the site sat in an area as being identified in the emerging Local Plan as suitable for tall buildings. The regeneration benefits that would be achieved through the proposed development, and introduction of residential dwellings to the site was welcomed; and

The proposed development was a highly sustainable, well-connected site, and the proposals sought to promote active travel. The previous reason for refusal pertaining to the location of the disabled parking bays had been suitably resolved through securing a financial contribution. Subject to the necessary conditions and obligations, it was considered that the development was acceptable in terms of transport and highways, in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF, the London Plan and the adopted development plan and emerging Local Plan.

In relation to the objections received against the application, Members commented that they did not feel the proposal would impact on local heritage negatively, nor that it would lead to overcrowding. Whilst the impact of the proposal on daylight and sunlight was still the weakest aspect of the application, the site's allocation and context had to be taken into consideration, and Members considered that the benefits in bringing 59 new homes, including family housing and affordable housing to this site, outweighed the concerns with regards to daylight and sunlight impacts. Members also strongly welcomed the introduction of architectural interest through the proposed window arches that would contribute to enlivening a portion of the frontage along East Street.

The Planning Committee **RESOLVED** to agree:

1. The reasons for approval as set out in the report.
2. To delegate authority to the Director of Inclusive Growth, in consultation with the Head of Legal Services, to grant approval of reserved matters, subject to the completion of a deed of variation under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), based on the Heads of Terms identified at Appendix 6 and the Conditions listed in Appendix 5 of the report; and
3. That if by 14 August 2022, the legal agreement has not been completed, the Director of Inclusive Growth is delegated authority to refuse planning permission or extend this timeframe to grant approval.