

**SUPPLEMENTARY 2**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Monday, 21 December 2020**

**Agenda Item 4.      12 Thames Road, Barking (Pages 1 - 3)**

Contact Officer:      John Dawe  
Telephone:              020 8227 2135  
E-mail:                    [John.dawe@lbbd.gov.uk](mailto:John.dawe@lbbd.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

Working in partnership


**Barking &  
Dagenham**

## ADDENDUM REPORT

<b>Barking and Dagenham Council Planning Committee addendum report</b>		<b>Date:</b> 21 December 2020
<b>Application No:</b>	19/01970/FUL	<b>Ward:</b> Thames
<b>Address:</b>	12 Thames Road, Barking, IG11 0HZ	
<b>Development:</b>	Construction of up to 5,086 sqm (GEA) of industrial floorspace (Classes B1c, B2 and B8); up to 156 residential units; up to 185 sqm (GIA) of cafe (Class A3); and, associated works.	
<p><b>1.0 Summary</b></p> <p>1.1. Following the publication of the committee report, there has been further information received or published. Whilst this does not alter the officer recommendation, it has necessitated the production of this addendum report, which is to be read in conjunction with the published committee report. The report considers the following matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Update on the London Plan (Intend to Publish Version)</li> <li>2. Further representations on the planning application</li> <li>3. Further information submitted to the Greater London Authority in response to the Stage 1 response by the applicant.</li> <li>4. Changes to a condition and s106 obligation arising party from point 3 above.</li> </ol> <p>1.2. The following section discusses each of the above matters in more detail.</p> <p><u>Update on the London Plan (Intend to Publish Version)</u></p> <p>1.3. On 9 December 2020 the Mayor of London (MoL) wrote to Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) setting out his intention to formally approve the draft of the London Plan. The letter sets out an intended date to publish the London Plan on 21<sup>st</sup> December 2020.</p> <p>1.4. On 10 December 2020, the Secretary of State (SoS) responded to the Mayor of London. The response directs the Mayor of London to make two further changes to the draft London Plan, in addition to the 11 previous directions issued.</p> <p>1.5. Some of the directions relate to policies that are material in the assessment of this application. In particular, there is a direction to amend paragraph 6.4.5 and delete paragraphs 6.4.6 to 6.4.11 (and the accompanying table).</p> <p>1.6. The effect of these changes can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Removing the requirement of no overall net loss of industrial floorspace</li> <li>- Removing the 65% plot ratio requirements</li> <li>- Removing the table (table 6.2) which sets out the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham as a limited release of Industrial Floorspace</li> </ul>		

- 1.7. Direction 4 also seeks to remove policy E5(D) which as currently worded states Development proposals for uses in SILs other than those set out in Part A of Policy E4 Land for industry, logistics and services to support London's economic function, (including residential development, retail, places of worship, leisure and assembly uses), should be refused except in areas released through a strategically co-ordinated process of SIL consolidation. This release must be carried out through a planning framework or Development Plan Document review process and adopted as policy in a Development Plan or as part of a co-ordinated master planning process in collaboration with the GLA and relevant borough.
- 1.8. Officers have considered all the directions proposed by the SoS and consider if these directions were to be adopted by the MoL they would not alter the recommendation to approve this application.

#### Further representations on the planning application

- 1.9. Following publication of the committee report two representation have been received. One representation is in support of the development and one in objection.
- 1.10. The letter in support is from CNC Building Supplies at 10 Thames Road and can be summarised as follows:
- The principle of development is strongly supportive
  - The scale and design is supportive
  - No daylight/Sunlight assessment has been done to assess the impact on 10 Thames Road which lies to the west. It is suggested a 'mirror-test' approach should be taken to set alternative target values ensuring any redevelopment of 10 Thames Road is not prejudiced by the proposal.
- 1.11. The above is noted. In response to the mirror test approach whilst this is mentioned in the BRE Guidelines, the absence of this is not considered unacceptable to this development. Officers would expect any future applications on other sites within the masterplan area to follow the urban design principles of the masterplan.
- 1.12. The letter in objection to the application is from local resident Mr Andrew Boff. The following are the grounds of objection.
- The building is much higher than any others around and there is no masterplan to support tall residential buildings in this area.
  - Barking has a critical overcrowding problem, yet this plan intends to build flats which will not help resolve this issue.
  - There is no overcrowding plan in the application to encourage downsizers.
  - The adjacent Barking Riverside is a low-rise residential area with a high proportion of high-quality family homes. This plan is totally out of keeping with the ambition of building homes that people want to live in. Those in housing need are given little choice and the absence of a supply of low-rise homes with gardens means that families get placed in tower blocks like this with all the deleterious effects on children's development.
  - Passing this plan just because it stacks up financially yet putting the wishes of those in housing need at the back of the queue is a recipe tried in the failed post-war estates.
  - Children located in the tower blocks will have a considerable distance to travel to access the play areas and parents will have difficulty remotely supervising them.

1.13. Many of the above matters are covered within the committee report. In summary, officers consider a masterplan led approach to support the proposed tall buildings has been adopted. References to overcrowding are noted, however there is no requirement for an overcrowding plan to encourage residents to downsize. Notwithstanding this, it is also considered the proposed development will help address a housing need which is strongly supported by policy. In relation to housing choice it is noted that the surrounding area has a mix of flatted and residential household houses and therefore, officers consider there is adequate choice within the immediate area.

1.14. Lastly in relation to child play space the proposed development fully meets its child play space requirements on site.

1.15. Overall, the above representations are noted and considered within the assessment of this application.

Further information submitted to the Greater London Authority in response to the Stage 1 response by the applicant.

1.16. The applicant has provided further information to the Greater London Authority to address the stage one response. Officers consider the proposed development is acceptable having had regard to the stage one response. The further information provided by the applicant to the GLA does not alter this conclusion. However, it is considered a slight change is necessary to condition 30 circular economy. The change is to the wording of the condition to require the submission of further information.

Changes to a condition and s106 Obligation arising partly from point three above.

*Revised Condition 30*

- a. Prior to commencement of development a circular economy statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The statement shall have regard to the GLA memo dated 20.10.20 prepared by the GLA as part of the Stage 1 response.
- b. A post completion report must then be provided and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the first occupation of any phase of the development.

Reason: In the interest of creating safer, sustainable communities

*Revised s106 obligation*

1.17. Lastly, the s106 obligation requiring a contribution towards a CPZ is to be amended slightly so it can also cover a Traffic Management Order in the event this is a preferred option.

1.18. The revised obligation is listed below:

- A financial contribution £20,000.00 payable on commencement of development towards the setting up of a controlled parking zone and/or a Traffic Management Order.

**Recommendation:**

The Officer recommendation remains unchanged, however is now subject to the changes in wording to condition 30 and the section 106 obligation to include a Traffic Management Order as outlined above.

<p><b>Contact Officer</b> Nasser Farooq</p>	<p><b>Title:</b> Principal Development Management Officer</p>	<p><b>Contact Details:</b> Tel: 020 8227 5834 E-mail: <a href="mailto:nasser.farooq@befirst.london">nasser.farooq@befirst.london</a></p>
---	---	--

This page is intentionally left blank