

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE

Monday, 21 December 2020
(6:00 - 7:45 pm)

Present: Cllr Muhammad Saleem (Chair), Cllr John Dulwich (Deputy Chair), Cllr Sanchia Alasia, Cllr Faruk Choudhury, Cllr Cameron Geddes, Cllr Olawale Martins and Cllr Dominic Twomey

Apologies: Cllr Irma Freeborn and Cllr Foyzur Rahman

30. Declaration of Members' Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

31. Minutes (30 November 2020)

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 November were confirmed as correct.

32. 12 Thames Road, Barking

The Principal Development Management Officer (PDMO), Be First Development Management Team, introduced a report on an application from LBBD for the 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 at 12 Thames Road, Barking.

Following the publication of the agenda an addendum report was subsequently published and presented, and which provided:

1. An update on the London Plan (Intend to Publish Version)
2. Further representations on the planning application
3. Further information submitted to the GLA in response to the Stage 1 response by the applicant, and
4. Changes to a condition and a Section 106 obligation arising partly from point 3 above the above.

In addition to internal and internal consultations, a total of 364 letters were sent to neighbouring properties together with the requisite statutory site and press notices. Four representations were received of which three objected and one supported the application. The material planning considerations concerning the representations were contained in the planning assessment detailed in the reports.

Two representations were made at the meeting, the first of which from Mr Andrew Boff, a local resident, objected to the application on the following basis:

- Absence of a masterplan to support tall residential buildings,
- Overcrowding and the absence of a plan in the application to encourage downsizers,

- The overall development and lack of tenure to support families was out of character with the adjacent Barking Riverside,
- Lack of easily assessable play areas for children, and the
- Extreme embodied carbon content of the development

Supporting the application Mr Mehmet Sogut explained his interest in the site as the owner of a café in Thames Road, who had been temporarily relocated. He placed on record his thanks for the support of Be First in helping to maintain his business during this difficult time of the pandemic and he welcomed the new development which included a new large space for his café.

Responding to the objections officers from Be First Planning Consultancy (on behalf of the applicant) addressed each of the principle points raised, providing a summary of evidence and supportive documentation which was set out in full in the reports as presented. This included reference to the designation of Thames Road as a transformation area in the emerging Local Plan and published supplementary planning document (SPD) which had identified the area for mixed-use residential and light industrial development.

The heights of the buildings had followed London Plan policies to optimise site capacity and was in accordance with the draft SPD. A full sunlight and daylight assessment had been carried out to assess the effect on neighbouring properties, the results of which were positive. The proposed homes would be connected to a sustainable heating system, and were considered to be of high quality with ample internal space and access to private and communal open space, including both on site child play space and off site recreation space along with soft landscaping at both podium and roof levels. The draft SPD set out a wider framework for the development of public open space in other locations along Thames Road.

It was concluded that bringing forward a 100% affordable housing scheme on this site alongside a modern fit for purpose light industrial space was acceptable in principle.

In response to a questions about the provision of open space and transportation, Be First Consultancy pointed out that the area was rapidly changing with existing spaces in both Barking Riverside and in Thames View to the north, and that the Masterplan supported the development of future open space provision in the area.

Turning to public transport the new Riverside rail link due to open in 2022 was a 10/12 minute walk away, and that a bus stop was located opposite the site with routes to Barking Town Centre.

It was noted that there had been ongoing correspondence between Be First and Thames ward councillors, the concerns of whom regarding aspects of the application included massing and height, had to some extent been addressed. It was acknowledged that so as to reduce traffic congestion in the area it was necessary to limit car parking to the development and that this had to be

considered in the context of better public transport provision generally in the locality.

Referencing Mr Boff's objections, the definition as to so called "overcrowding" was questioned although it was acknowledged that this proposal as well as the wider Riverside developments necessitated further infrastructural investment.

Taking all the above into account and following careful consideration of the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Development Plan and all other relevant material considerations, the proposal was seen as acceptable. Officers 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, and therefore,

The Committee **resolved to:**

1. Agree the reasons for approval as set out in this report,
2. Delegate authority to the Director of Inclusive Growth (or other authorised Officer) in consultation with LBBB Legal Services, to grant planning permission subject to any direction from the Mayor of London, the completion of a Unilateral Undertaking under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), based on the Heads of Terms identified at Appendix 7 of the report, and the Conditions listed at Appendix 6 of the report, as amended in the addendum report; and
3. That, if by 22 June 2021 the legal agreement has not been completed, the Director of Inclusive Growth (or other authorised Officer) had delegated authority to refuse planning permission or extend this timeframe to grant approval.

33. Welbeck Wharf

The Principal Development Management Officer (PDMO) introduced a report on an application from LBBB seeking a planning permission for a change of use of the entire site from Class B8 (storage and distribution) to flexible Class B2 (general industrial), Class B8 (storage and distribution) and Use Class E(g) (iii) (light industrial) at Welbeck Wharf, 8 River Road, Barking.

In addition to internal and internal consultations, a total of 632 letters were sent to neighbouring properties together with the requisite site and press notices. Two objections were received concerning traffic pollution and movements in the area, loss of privacy and overlooking in Waverley Gardens and increased noise and air pollution. The officer comments on the objections were contained in the planning assessment detailed in the report. Following the publication of the agenda an addendum report was subsequently published and presented, and which provided details of a further neighbour representation, and the response to such.

Following careful consideration of the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Development Plan and all other relevant material considerations, officers concluded that the proposed change of use would introduce flexible industrial uses to an existing industrial site, thus supporting the longevity of this SIL location. Therefore, the principle of the development was considered to be acceptable, and the mix of uses would contribute towards an uplift in employment opportunities at the site, to be secured by way of a Section 106 contribution.

Responding to a question from the Chair, regard has been had to the amenity of residential neighbours as a result of the introduction of alternative industrial uses at the site, and the transport, noise and air impacts, and subject to the recommended conditions, officers felt that there would be no adverse impacts in these respects. The conditions and planning obligations as recommended would ensure that the proposal would be a sustainable and suitable use of the site. Accordingly,

The Committee **resolved to:**

1. Agree the reasons for approval as set out in the report,
2. Delegate authority to the Director of Inclusive Growth (or other authorised Officer) in consultation with LBB Legal Services to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a legal agreement 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 21 May 2021 the legal agreement has not been completed, the Director of Inclusive Growth (or other authorised Officer) had delegated authority to refuse planning permission or extend this timeframe to grant approval.

34. 2A Cranborne Road, Barking

The Principal Development Management Officer (PDMO) introduced a report on an application from Mr J Broom seeking a planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a three-storey building to provide 12 flats, together with access, disabled car parking spaces, amenity space and landscaping at 2a Cranborne Road and land adjoining, Barking. This application followed a previous application for a similar development which was refused on the grounds of design, impacts on neighbouring amenity, lack of landscaping provision to offset the loss of existing green space and a failure to provide affordable housing.

In addition to internal and internal consultations, a total of 28 letters were sent to neighbouring properties together with the requisite site and press notices. A petition containing 39 signatures from residents in Cranborne Road was received which questioned the validity of the consultation process and

objected to the application on the grounds of the loss of privacy and light/overshadowing, adequacy of parking provision, impact on highway safety, noise and disturbance, crime, anti-social behaviour and disruption from the associated works. The officer comments on the petition grounds were contained in the planning assessment detailed in the report.

Mr Jeff Watson, the applicant and Mr Ian Phillips, planning consultant made brief statements to the Committee about their involvement in this proposal and their desire to bring forward a high quality scheme for the benefit of the Borough and its residents, including a significant financial contribution to the provision of affordable housing.

In response to the officer presentation clarification was sought as to the change in this application to that previously refused in relation specifically to scale and massing. The PDMO explained that the building lines of that part of the new development adjacent to existing properties in Cranborne Road had been stepped back to ensure that the overbearing nature of the structure on existing properties was reduced overall.

A question was also raised as to the affordable housing element of the new application. The PDMO stated that in negotiations with the applicant agreement had been reached to provide a financial contribution for affordable housing over and above the minimum requirement of the equivalent cost of two units, based on an independent financial viability review. Officers had on balance decided that given its limitations, rather than provide the units on this site it would be preferable to use the monies to support that affordable element elsewhere in the Borough.

Following careful consideration of the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Development Plan and all other relevant material considerations, the proposal was seen as acceptable. Officers 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, and therefore,

The Committee **resolved to:**

1. Agree the reasons for approval as set out in this report,
2. Delegate authority to the Director of Inclusive Growth (or other authorised Officer) in consultation with LBB Legal Services, to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a legal agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), based on the Heads of Terms identified at Appendix 7 and the Conditions listed at Appendix 6 of the report, and
3. That, if by 21 June 2021 the legal agreement has not been completed, the Director of Inclusive Growth (or other authorised Officer) had delegated

authority to refuse planning permission or extend this timeframe to grant approval.