

ADDENDUM REPORT

Barking and Dagenham Council Planning Committee addendum report		Date: 26/04/2021
Application No:	21/00159/FULL	Ward: Abbey
Address:	34-42 East Street, Barking, IG11 9EP	
Development:	<i>Redevelopment of site to provide a 5-9 storey building comprising up to 65 residential units (Use Class C3) with retail units (Use Class E) at ground and part first floors, with associated landscaping and highway works.</i>	
<p>Summary: ADDENDUM</p> <p>This addendum report sets out an update to committee members following receipt of additional documentation and an additional neighbour representation on 26 April 2021.</p> <p><u>Neighbour Representation</u></p> <p>Additional objection received on the basis of demolishing part of Barking town centre and replacing it with inappropriate housing. The immediate area has already been irrevocably damaged by the new buildings round the once beautiful Abbey site. The proposal is an oversized development in the heart of East Street, where it can ruin both the shopping street, and add to the general clutter of the Abbey area.</p> <p>Barking Town Centre is a conservation area. It is a comparatively small area, and does not have the infrastructure to support yet another 65 housing units, none of which, realistically, will be truly affordable for the average family.</p> <p><u>Officer response</u> <i>Officers acknowledge the objection and refer to the committee report where the relevant material considerations are assessed.</i></p> <p><u>Applicant Submission 26 April 2021</u></p> <p>The applicant's additional submission documents comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A letter from Centro Planning dated 26 April 2021; • Proposed Ground Floor Plan Alternative Arrangements, drawing reference 15026-RA-XX-00-DR-A-SK022; • Potential Accessible Parking Arrangement Option A drawing no. 2004-039 SK01, dated 19 April 2021 • A letter from CPMC Chartered Surveying dated 22 April 2021 <p>The additional documentation has been submitted in response to the 3 reasons for refusal, which will be summarised and addressed in turn below.</p> <p><u>Reason 1</u> – The proposed development by virtue of its siting, location, and high density will be a</p>		

stark, crude and isolated development that is piecemeal in nature and represents poor place-making which will unduly impact on the setting of the Grade II listed former Barking Magistrates Court, does not seek to preserve or enhance the character of the Abbey and Barking Town Centre Conservation Area and does not maximise opportunities within the key regeneration area of Barking Town Centre and as such would be contrary to policies CM1, CM2 and CP3 of the Core Strategy, policies BTC16 and BTC19 of the Barking Town Centre Area Action Plan, policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document, draft policies SPP1, SP2, DMD1, DMD2, DMD3, DMD4, DMD5 of the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan, London Plan policies D1, D3, D4, D8, D9, HC1, SD1 and the London Riverside Opportunity Area Planning Framework and the NPPF

The applicant seeks to address the reason for refusal largely through the discursive comments in the letter from Centro Planning, alongside an alternative option for the ground floor to relocate cycle parking entrance from Grove Place and to remove back of house entrance from Grove Place (Drawing reference 15026-RA-XX-00-DR-A-SK022).

Officer response

Officers reject the applicant's claims that 'a great deal of emphasis has been put on the Barking Town Centre Regeneration Strategy, which is not part of the Development Plan'. Officers have based the assessment of the application on the Development Plan, and any reference in the committee report made to documents that sit outside the development plan are to provide a contextual understanding of Barking Town Centre, in which the site sits.

In relation to the urban design comments, officers reiterate the position set out in the committee report, and further note that whilst there are some interventions to the public realm as highlighted in the letter, overall the scheme is not considered to enhance or improve the surrounding area for the reasons set out in the committee report.

In respect of the public benefits that are listed by the applicant in the letter from Centro Planning to address the heritage harm, a number of the benefits listed are neutral factors that are required to accord with policy, rather than public benefits. Officers also disagree that there would be an enhancement of the settings of heritage assets or that the building form sits harmoniously in design and scale with the surrounding development. Officers have assessed the public benefits in the committee report and conclude that these do not outweigh the harm.

Reason 2 – The proposed development will result in the loss of sunlight and daylight to neighbouring residential occupiers and in particular flats contained within the former Barking Magistrates Court and the Bath House buildings. The proposal is considered to impact on the living standards of the neighbouring residential occupiers, contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and the NPPF.

The applicant has submitted a letter by CPMC chartered surveying in response to the reason for refusal pertaining to daylight/sunlight issues largely reiterating the points raised in the application submission. The letter highlights a typo in the reason for refusal on the introductory page of the Committee Report.

Officer response

Officers note the points raised, however it is maintained that the application would result in a demonstrable impact in terms of loss of daylight/sunlight to neighbouring occupants for the reasons set out in the committee report. Officers acknowledge the typo in the reason for refusal in the introduction of the committee report and for the avoidance of doubt, draw Members attention to the wording of the reason for refusal as listed at Appendix 6 and above.

Reason 3 – Insufficient information has been submitted and the application has failed to demonstrate that there would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety particularly in respect of the location of the blue badge car parking spaces conflicting with access to the market, contrary to the NPPF.

The applicant states in the Centro Planning letter that the applicant is happy to work with Transport Officers agree an acceptable alternative location or payment in lieu, submitting drawing 2004-039 SK01 - Accessible Parking Space Option A, as an alternative option for consideration. Drawing reference 15026-RA-XX-00-DR-A-SK022 has been submitted to indicate an alternative arrangement to the ground floor plan to remove a residential bike store access and Back of House access from Grove Place seeking to address comments raised by transport officers in respect of the access strategy.

Officer response

Officers worked with the applicant through the course of the application drawing the applicant's attentions to transport concerns from an early stage, but a satisfactory position was not reached to enable the reason for refusal to be removed and as such transport officers objected to the application, which led to the recommended reason for refusal.

The additional plan submitted 26 April 2021 proposes an alternative location for one of the bays in order to address the potential conflict with market access. However it should be noted that this plan has not been submitted to supersede the original plan, but as an example of an alternative location. Similarly the 'alternative arrangement' plan is submitted as an alternative option should planning permission 16/00204/REG3 come forward to close Grove Place; which has not been submitted to supersede the originally submitted ground floor plan. In submitting the alternative options for consideration on the morning of the planning committee, insufficient time has been provided to enable a full assessment of the alternative options presented.

Overall response

The additional documentation has been submitted at a late stage in the application process that does not enable sufficient time for officers to review in detail. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that the information submitted changes the officer recommendation. If Members were minded to defer the application however, it is considered that officers could work through the reasons for refusal in more detail with the applicant to obtain amendments to the scheme to address the reasons for refusal. Alternatively, officers would welcome future engagement through pre-application discussions should members agree with the recommended reasons for refusal.

Recommendation:

Officer recommendation remains unchanged. The application is recommended for refusal for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by virtue of its siting, location, and high density will be a stark, crude and isolated development that is piecemeal in nature and represents poor place-making which will unduly impact on the setting of the Grade II listed former Barking Magistrates Court, does not seek to preserve or enhance the character of the Abbey and Barking Town Centre Conservation Area and does not maximise opportunities within the key regeneration area of Barking Town Centre and as such would be contrary to policies CM1, CM2 and CP3 of the Core Strategy, policies BTC16 and BTC19 of the Barking Town Centre Area Action Plan, policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document, draft policies SPP1, SP2, DMD1, DMD2, DMD3, DMD4, DMD5 of the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan, London Plan policies D1, D3, D4, D8, D9, HC1, SD1 and the London Riverside Opportunity Area Planning Framework and the NPPF.
2. The proposed development will result in the loss of sunlight and daylight to neighbouring residential occupiers and in particular flats contained within the former Barking Magistrates Court and the Bath House buildings. The proposal is considered to impact on the living standards of the neighbouring residential occupiers, contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and the NPPF.
3. Insufficient information has been submitted and the application has failed to demonstrate that there would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety particularly in respect

of the location of the blue badge car parking spaces conflicting with access to the market, contrary to the NPPF.

Contact Officer Olivia St-Amour	Title: Principal Development Management Officer	Contact Details: Tel: 07925357088 Email: Olivia.St-Amour@befirst.london
---	--	--