

SUPPLEMENTARY 1

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Monday, 20 May 2024

**Agenda Item 7. The Bull Inn, Rainham Road South, Dagenham RM10
8AQ - 23/01494/FULL (Pages 1 - 8)**

Contact Officer: John Dawe
Telephone: 020 8227 2135
E-mail: John.dawe@lbbd.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Barking and Dagenham Council Planning Committee		Date: 15 May 2024
Application No:	23/01494/FULL	Ward: Village
Reason for Referral to Planning Committee as set out in Part 2, Chapter 9 of the Council Constitution	The application is a strategic development which is of a scale and importance that should be determined at Planning Committee.	
Address:	The Bull Inn, Bull Inn Rainham Road South, Dagenham, RM10 8AQ	
Development:	Demolition of all existing buildings and structures in connection with the construction of 72 no. residential units (Class C3), provision of car parking, landscaping, and other ancillary works.	
Applicant:	Major Dwellings.	
ADDENDUM		
1. <u>The following sections have been amended/ replaced. The changes are underlined unless otherwise indicated.</u>		
1.20	<p>As detailed above policies support developments for new homes in particular where they contribute to providing a range of housing types, sized and tenures. In addition, policies also seek to preserve and enhance the setting and historical significance of non-designated heritage sites. The site is a non-designated heritage asset, <i>as such, any loss of building must have regard to section 209 of the NPPF which states ““The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”</i>. <i>In line with policy</i> a balanced assessment will be carried out which weights up the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the asset against the proposed use. Officers acknowledged the sites proximity to the Dagenham Village conservation area. Assessment of the proposal <i>on the Dagenham Village Conservation Area and Listed Buildings: Stoneford Cottage, 621 Rainham Road, Cross Keys Inn Public House, The Old Vicarage and Church of St Peter and St Paul can be found in section 3.23-3.43 of the report.</i></p>	
Section 1.26 is to be replaced with the below:		
1.26	<p>Overall, it is clear the Bull Public House has a long history in the area, albeit it has only been it is current location since 1920. Officers consider the character and appearance to be of historical significance. Although it is acknowledged that the building itself has been extended and altered several times, hence the significance of the historical asset remains low.</p> <p>It is acknowledged the site is near the Dagenham Village Conservation Area and several Grade Listed Buildings. The application site is located a significant distance from the conservation area and Grade Listed Building. Officers do not consider the application site to add value to the setting or the historical significance of these assets. The loss of the non-designated asset is considered to have a less than significant impact on these sites.</p>	

The proposal seeks to remove the existing building and replace this with 72 new residential units. The scheme will deliver high quality units with a sufficient quantum of family sized units and 35% affordable housing at a tenure split of 50% Discount Market Rent and 50% Social Rent.

Whilst officers consider the harm caused by the loss of the non-designated heritage asset to be substantial. Noting the low historical significance of the existing building and the separation between the site and nearby grade listed buildings and conservation areas and taking into consideration section 209 of the NPPF when balanced against the public benefits this scheme would deliver. Officers consider the benefits to demonstrably outweigh any harm caused by the loss of the non-designated heritage asset. On this basis in line with the NPPF, the loss of the non-designated heritage asset to be acceptable.

1.33 At present there are currently 2 retail units on site. As detailed above policies support development which contributes to the vitality and viability of town and neighbourhood centres as such where possible commercial uses should be located within these areas. As noted, the site is not located within a designated town or neighbourhood centre. Nevertheless, as shown on google maps the existing retail units on site are convenience stores which sell fresh food. *It is noted that both these units are now vacant.* Policy BE3 of the Borough Wide DPD protects existing individual out of town shopping areas particularly where they sell fresh food.

2.13 The proposal falls short of the 40% target set by the Core Strategy DPD, nevertheless, this is reasonably justified by the flatted nature of the development and site constraints. It is noted that of the 21 family units, 5 will be social rent and 4 discount market rent. *The London Plan Classified Discount Market Rent units as an Intermediate Product which is not a genuinely affordable product. Notwithstanding, policy DMH1 of the Draft Local Plan sets out that affordable housing should be genuinely affordable for the people they are intended for. The forms of affordable housing this policy references includes Discount Market Rent Units. As per the Draft Local Plan this tenure would be considered genuinely affordable. Discount Market Rent offers rent levels at 80% of the market rent, longer tenancies of 3+ years and do not require large deposits, as such they will remain affordable to residents noting the low market rates in the area. Officers therefore take the view that these would be genuinely affordable in line with policy DMH1. On this basis the scheme will deliver 35% genuinely affordable housing at a tenure split of 50% social and 50% discount market rent.*

3.31 It is noted that the application site is located over 300 metres from 621 Rainham Road South and Stoneford Cottage. Noting the location, design and siting of these buildings' officers do not consider the proposal to have an unacceptable impact on the historical significance of these buildings. As shown in the submitted heritage and visual impact assessment the proposal will be visible from these two sites. These are verified viewpoints. However, noting the siting of these buildings and the separation from the proposal officers are confident that the development will not have an unacceptable impact on the setting of these two listed buildings. *With regard to the NPPF officers consider the development to result in less than substantial harm to the significance of these buildings.*

3.38 Notwithstanding, it is noted that the proposed development is located 200 metres from the conservation area and heritage assets. Whilst it will be visible behind the Church of St Peter and St Paul and from within the Courtyard given its separation to these assets it is noted that the development will not be in the foreground rather sit in the background. On this basis officers consider the harm caused to the heritage assets to be mitigated by the distance. Officers consider the development to result in less than substantial harm to the architectural and historical significance of these buildings. Instead, matters are limited to the impact of the proposal on the setting of these buildings and the Dagenham Village Conservation Area. Further, it is noted the Church of St Peter and St Paul and its church yard benefits from a having a large number of trees. These provide high leaf overage which contribute to screening the development. Verified viewpoints have been provided showing the impact of the proposal in May and in the Winter months. It is evident that in the winter there will be fewer leaves as such the coverage would be less when compared to the Spring when there is high leaf coverage. Nevertheless, as noted above officers given the separation the impact on these heritage assets is already minimal. The presence of trees and the level of coverage further mitigates the impact of the long-term views. However, regardless of trees noting the development will not be prominent in the long-term views of the Church of St Peter and St Paul and Churchyard South officers consider the heritage impacts to be acceptable.

3.41 The Be First Heritage Officer was consulted. They have commented on the viewpoints noting that the proposal could have a detrimental effect on several heritage/open space viewpoints. Therefore, they have recommended that additional tree planting could be used to soften the impact of the buildings on the viewpoints provided. Officers note this comment and acknowledge the importance of protecting the viewpoint from the heritage sites and open spaces. It is noted that tree planting proposed by the applicant will be limited to provision from within the redline boundary. As detailed in section 12.17 the development seeks to provide a high number of proposed trees along the boundary with Ibscott Close. Noting the separation between the application site, the heritage sites and open spaces officers do not consider an increase in the number of trees on site to result in further screening. Given the perspective additional trees would be required adjacent to the heritage sites or within the open space to have an impact on the viewpoints. Officer considers the harm to these assets to be less than substantial given the separation. Officers consider the harm to be sufficiently mitigated already and the presence of the existing trees will only contribute to additional screening.

5.31 Policy T6.1 of the London Plan sets out that disabled parking should be provided for new residential developments. 3% of dwellings should be provided with at least 1 designated disabled parking bay from onset. The applicant should demonstrate how an additional 7% of dwellings could be provided in future upon request. At submission the scheme was proposed to deliver 4 disabled parking bays which equated to 5.5% on onsite. Following engagement with the transport officer concerns were raised regarding the safety of access and egress into the site. To enable works to the strip of unregistered land to improve pedestrian, cyclist, and vehicle safety into and out of the site, the number of blue badge spaces was reduced to 3. This would provide the space required to enable the necessary highway and landscape improvements to take place. With 3 blue badge spaces there is provision for 4% of dwellings to have access to 1 disabled parking space at onset which complies with policy.

5.34 The scheme proposes to provide 7 wheelchair accessible units. It is acknowledged that only 3 disabled parking spaces have been provided. Policies require 10% of dwellings to be delivered as Part M(4)3 'Wheelchair Accessible Units' Notwithstanding, policy T6.1 of the London Plan sets out residential developments should make provision for 3% of dwellings to have access to blue badge spaces from onset. An additional 7% of dwellings should be able to access blue badge spaces on request. The scheme meets the policy requirements for blue badge spaces at onset delivering 3 spaces which equates to 4% of dwellings. It is accepted that there is no provision to safeguard the provision of the additional 6%. Notwithstanding, noting the sites proximity to public transport and the existing accessible arrangements which are in place to access these. Given the additional benefits arising from the scheme including the proposed tenure and size mix which aligns with policy requirements. Officers consider the benefits arising from the proposal to outweigh the harm caused by the shortfall of future proofed disabled parking provision. On balance officers consider the proposal to be acceptable and in keeping with the development policies. Should this application be approved it is recommended a condition is attached secured disabled parking.

Section 11- The below table replaces the Delivering Sustainable Development Table:

Delivering Sustainable Development (Energy / CO2 reduction / Water efficiency):	
<i>BREEAM Rating</i>	N/A
<i>Renewable Energy Source / %</i>	62%
<i>Proposed CO₂ Reduction</i>	78%

2. The conclusion is to be replaced with the below:

Conclusion

The proposed development seeks permission for the construction of 72 residential units. It is acknowledged that the site is a non-designated heritage asset and would result in the loss of retail units. Notwithstanding, noting the site is in an out-of-town centre location and there is ample retail provision in the local area. With regard to the non-designation, it is accepted that the historical and architectural significance of the building is limited. This is supported by the fact that the building has never been listed nationally or locally. On this basis officers consider the benefits of the introduction of 72 homes to outweigh any harm arising from the loss of retail units or a non-designated heritage asset. On balance the principle of development is supported.

Further, the scheme will provide 72 good quality homes which all have acceptable internal space standards and access to balconies. The scheme will meet the GLA requirements for 'Fast Track' and provide 35% affordable homes at a tenure split of 50% discount market rent and 50% social rent. At ground level the scheme delivers safe, accessible and useable amenity space with adequate provision for 0–11-year-old play on site. A contribution has been secured to go towards upgrades for 11–18-year-old play off site. In terms of design, the scheme has been designed to reflect and respect that character of the area whilst having an acceptable impact on the nearby Grade listed heritage assets and conservation area. The set back of this development from these assets and the existing screening in place further reduces the impact on the area. Officers consider the design of the scheme to acceptable.

It is accepted that the scheme will result in some loss of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring sites. Nevertheless, noting the benefits arising from the proposed scheme on balance officers consider the benefits of the scheme to outweigh any harm caused to neighbouring residents. It is noted conditions relating to noise and external lighting have been secured.

The scheme will be car free providing 3 blue badge spaces on site. This meets policy requirements of 3% of dwellings to have access to blue badge space from onset. It is noted that no further provision has been provided. Notwithstanding, given the site proximity to public transport links of which there are accessible options in the local area officers welcome the introduction of a car free development in this location to be supported. It is noted S106 Obligations securing removal of CPZ, Car Club Contributions and CPZ Contributions have been secured to mitigate any transport impacts from the development. Ample cycle parking provision has been provided on site to encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport.

The site is reliant on the existing prescriptive right of way across the strip of unregistered land. Necessary works to the access point have been agreed and secured by s106 Obligation. Officers are satisfied that the development will deliver safe access and egress for all pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles. In addition, the Developer/Owner has agreed to a scheme of improvement works across the strip of unregistered land to improve overall visual appearance of the site and visibility at access and egress. The Developer/Owner will be responsible for the maintenance of this works for the lifetime of the development this too will be secured by s106 Obligation. Noting the proposed works officers are satisfied that the scheme will have an acceptable impact on transport and enable safe access and egress onto the highway for all modes of transport.

The scheme will deliver sustainable development which also contributes to enhancing urban greening, ecology and diversity in the area.

Overall, officers consider the benefits arising from the scheme to outweigh any harms caused by the development. On balance the proposal is considered acceptable and in keeping with the development policies. It is recommended that planning permission is granted.

3. Other

- There is no section 6 to this report. Numbering is incorrect. The report jumps from Section 5 (Sustainable Transport) to Section 7 (Employment).
- Condition 31 is updated to include a drawing number. This condition should read:

The proposed blue badge car parking spaces detailed within drawing TM561-LA02 Landscape Ground Floor Illustrative GA [Revision A] dated 26.04.2024 shall be constructed and marked out prior to the first occupation of each relevant phase as accessible parking bays (to be clearly marked with a British Standard disabled symbol). The spaces must be retained as disabled car parking spaces and not used for any other use.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient off-street parking areas are provided and not to prejudice the free flow of traffic or conditions of general safety along the adjoining highway, to ensure and promote easier access for disabled persons.

- Hollybrook is mentioned throughout the report. However, the applicant is Rainham Road South Ltd which is an entity of Hollybrook Homes.

4. Representation from Jon Cruddas MP for Dagenham and Rainham

A representation objecting to the development has been received from Jon Cruddas MP. A summary of the response is below. The full comment can be found in Appendix A.

- Concerns over the impact the pressure will have on existing services and infrastructure in the area.
- The proposed 9 and 6 storey development would be unprecedented, and not in keeping with the character of the area.
- Replacement of historic public house with two blocks would change the character of the area and lead to the disappearance of the 'old village' in Dagenham.
- Car free approach will have an impact on existing residents. It is unlikely families will be arriving at the area without vehicles.
- Loss of natural light to existing residents of the Ibscott Close.
- Flood mitigation infrastructure- Ibscott close has existing history of rising damp and mould. Plans don't seem to outline suitable SuDs infrastructure to reduce the additional impact on flooding.

Officer Comments:

- *The concerns regarding impact on existing services and infrastructure, height, loss of public house, car free development and loss of natural light to residents of the Ibscott Close have been assessed in section 4.9 of the report.*
- *Flood mitigation- the application site is located within flood zone 1 which represents a less than 0.1% chance of flood in any year. Thames Water and LBBB flood officers were consulted. They confirmed they raised no objections to the scheme and consider the flood impacts of the development to be acceptable. Likewise, the LBBB Flood Officer found the proposed drainage strategy to be acceptable. Officers consider the mitigation measures imposed to be acceptable. Conditions have been imposed to ensure the development is constructed in accordance with the submitted details. Further details can be found in section 12.12 – 12.16.*

<p>Contact Officer Kathryn McAllister</p>	<p>Title: Senior Development Management Officer</p>	<p>Contact Details: E-mail: Kathryn.mcallister@befirst.london</p>
--	--	--

Appendix A: Jon Cruddas MP Representation.



HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
Planning Department/Committee
Barking Town Hall,
1 Clockhouse Avenue,
Barking – IG11 7LU

Thursday 16 May 2024

To whom it may concern

RE: The Bull Inn, Rainham Road South, Dagenham RM10 8AQ – 23/01494/FULL

As the Member of Parliament for Dagenham and Rainham I am submitting this formal objection to the above-mentioned planning application, which is due to be heard by the Planning Committee on Monday 20th May. A number of my constituents have contacted me to share their concerns about the proposals, and I have since reviewed the application and now wish to raise these concerns with the members of the Committee.

My primary concern is the pressure a development of this size will put on existing services and infrastructure in the area - such as local GPs, Dental Practices, and schools. Whilst I understand the need to meet housing targets, it is important that we are creating sustainable communities with the services they need to thrive.

In terms of material planning considerations, I share the overwhelming concerns of my constituents, that a 9 storey and 6 storey flatted estate at this location would be unprecedented, and not in keeping with the character of the area.

I note that this site is highlighted in the draft local plan as an area for high density development, however, it is my understanding that planning applications must be considered case by case and cannot be influenced by future proposals. With that, the highest nearby development would be the Leys and Richard Moore Court which are both 4 storeys.

Replacing a historic public house with two high rise blocks of flats will significantly change the character of the area, and the worry is that it sets a precedent which will ultimately lead to the disappearance of the 'old village' in Dagenham.

The key objection from constituents I have spoken to is regarding the 'car-free' approach to this development. This approach will have a detrimental impact on existing residents' ability to park in the Ibscott Close area. Whilst new residents will have no access to the existing Controlled Parking Zone, post 5.30pm and on Sundays they will be able to occupy spaces. It is incredibly naïve to believe that families will be arriving into the area without vehicles, and this has proven to be an issue with other developments throughout the borough.

Jon Cruddas MP
Member of Parliament for Dagenham and Rainham, incorporating South Hornchurch and Elm Park
www.joncruddas.org.uk
TEL: 020 8984 7854



HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

Existing residents on Ibscott Close have also expressed their frustration at the prospect of being towered over by the new builds, reducing their natural light below accepted limits outlined in national planning legislation.

Finally, Ibscott Close is built on top of the Wantz Stream and the existing properties have a long history of rising damp and mould. The plans don't seem to outline suitable SuDs infrastructure to reduce the additional impact on flooding that would be caused by two high rise buildings on a site such as this.

Taking all of this into consideration I am completely opposed to this planning application in its current form. It would need significant reductions in height, with revised parking provision, and investment into flood mitigation infrastructure to protect existing properties in the surrounding area.

I am urging the Planning Committee to take note of these comments and reject the application. Whilst we have a duty to build, we also have a duty to ensure that we are creating sustainable neighbourhoods where both new and existing communities can thrive and put down roots. I do not believe that this development, if approved, would enhance the area.

Yours sincerely

Jon Cruddas MP
Member of Parliament for Dagenham & Rainham

Jon Cruddas MP
Member of Parliament for Dagenham and Rainham, incorporating South Hornchurch and Elm Park
www.joncruddas.org.uk
TEL: 020 8984 7854