

LONDON THAMES GATEWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING: 11 October 2007

ADDENDUM REPORT

CASE NUMBER: LTGDC-06-088-PP **DATE MADE VALID:** 31/08/2006

APPLICATION NO: 06/00702/FUL **TARGET DATE:** 30/11/2006

APPLICANT:	Higgins Homes Plc
AGENT:	David Wood Architects
PROPOSAL:	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a part 6, 7, and 23-storey mixed-use development comprising of ground and first floor commercial space for A1, A2, A3, A4 and B1 use and 148 residential units comprising 13 one-bedroom flats, 130 two-bedroom flats and 5 three-bedroom flats.
LOCATION:	16-34 Cambridge Road, Barking

1. LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING AND DAGENHAM DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD

- 1.1 The application was reported to the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Development Control Board on 2 October 2007.
- 1.2 The minutes of the meeting record that during the meeting individual members raised concerns about the location of the children's play area, objected to the development in general and queried who would decide the colour of the building.

2. AMENITY SPACE PROVISION

2.1 Policy H15 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Unitary Development Plan states that new one bedroom flats should normally provide 20 square metres of outdoor amenity space, and two bedroom flats should provide 40 square metres of outdoor amenity space. In this case, the scheme would have to provide 5,460 square metres to accord with the policy. The application provides 497 square metres (excluding winter gardens) comprising the communal roof garden and a private terrace.

2.2 As stated in Paragraph 9.6.2 of the main Committee Report, the Interim Planning Guidance for Barking Town Centre states that “given the proximity to the large open spaces available in the town centre and balancing the compact city objective, a relaxation of the UDP Policies H14 and H15 relating to residential amenity space may be considered on merit.”

3. COMMENTS FROM CABE

3.1 CABE has now provided comments on the revised proposals and a copy of their letter of 10 October 2007 is included in Appendix 1.

3.2 CABE’s letter of 10 October 2007 re-iterates their comments of 11 January 2007 (see Appendix 2) which related to an earlier version of the proposed development.

3.3 CABE has advised that they do not believe that this proposal meets the quality criteria set out in the joint CABE and English Heritage ‘Guidance on Tall Buildings’, which states that any new tall building ‘should be in an appropriate location, should be of first-class design quality in its own right and should enhance the qualities of its immediate location and setting’. They have advised that while it may be possible that a building of some height would be appropriate in this location, they have seen no evidence of a convincing urban design and contextual analysis justifying this proposal. CABE find the form and massing to be crude and uncomfortable, and are not convinced that the elevational treatment would result in an elegant appearance and feel the base and top of the tower have not been the subject of sufficient design analysis. CABE do not believe this building is worthy of Barking, which they note has been making efforts to upgrade its environment and architectural presence in recent years. CABE advise that this proposal seems to be a backwards step and they cannot support it.

3.4 As stated in Section 9.2 of the main Committee Report, the applicant has sought to address the comments raised in CABE’s letter of 11 January 2007. Accordingly, the detailed design of the building has evolved significantly since those comments were initially made. Design for London has been very involved in the revisions to the scheme and have given their support to the proposed scheme. It is considered that the cladding is now more coherent and of a higher quality. This has benefited the scheme in that it no longer falls into two unrelated parts of a tower and base. Design for London consider that the height of the tower is appropriate for this site, and supports the principles of Barking’s Urban Design Guidance with the building casting its main shadows over the station platforms. Furthermore, Design for

London consider that the massing seems appropriate and the way the tower now reaches the ground and is not raised on round columns, is a great improvement to the relationship of the building and the public realm.

3.5 Having regard to the CABE and English Heritage Guidance on Tall Buildings, it is considered that the revised proposal addresses the criteria for tall buildings (refer Paragraph 9.2.9 of the main Committee Report) and will result in a high quality development.

4.0 S106 CONTRIBUTIONS

4.1 The applicant has advised that *“You will appreciate that over the years that we have all been working on this project, it has always proceeded on the basis of a financial appraisal with a 'residual' amount for S106 contributions. The appraisal has been modified on a number of occasions to respond to your queries so that we can all be sure that it is 'robust'. Therefore, in our view, it is clear that any such 'negotiations' must be on the basis of the 'money in the pot' arising from the financial appraisal and cannot involve any 'increased' expenditure - which clearly cannot be 'afforded'.”*

4.2 The applicant has further advised that *“Surely, the exceptional circumstances are that this is a high quality, high rise scheme that accords with the LBBB masterplan for the town centre and that was 'promoted' by the GLA. This is a low value area in need of regeneration and it is hoped that this development will act as a major catalyst for further regeneration in the town.”*

4.3 Chris Marsh, of Sustainable Property Consultants, acting on behalf of the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation, has reviewed the financial appraisal provided by the applicant and his report has been provided to Committee Members. The advice is that the financial calculations are not yet conclusive and should be reviewed.

4.4 As per the recommendation in the main Committee Report, it is recommended that the application be delegated to the Director of Planning to negotiate further on the S106 contribution, amongst other things.

CASE OFFICER: Adele Williamson

Appendix 1: Letter from CABE dated 10 October 2007.

Appendix 2: Letter from CABE dated 11 January 2007.

10 October 2007

Adele Williamson
Planning Development Officer
London Thames Gateway Development Corporation
9th Floor
South Quay Plaza 3
189 Marsh Wall
London
E14 9SH



Our Ref: DR/DC/2/4441

Dear Adele Williamson

BARKING AND DAGENHAM: 16-34 CAMBRIDGE ROAD
YOUR REF: 06/00702/FUL

Thank you for consulting the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) about this revised proposal. The scheme has been considered by the chair of design review, MJ Long, and members of design review staff. We have not been able to visit the site in this instance, but feel we have a fair understanding of the site and its context from the information supplied. Our views on the material provided (planning application drawings) are as follows. This is our formal response to the planning application.

We think that the amendments to this scheme have not altered it in any significant way. Our comments therefore remain as set out in our previous letter of 11 January 2007, and are repeated below for clarity.

We do not believe that this proposal meets the quality criteria set out in the joint CABE and English Heritage *Guidance on tall buildings*, which states that any new tall building 'should be in an appropriate location, should be of first-class design quality in its own right and should enhance the qualities of its immediate location and setting'. With this in mind we note that, while it may be possible that a building of some height would be appropriate in this location, we have seen no evidence of a convincing urban design and contextual analysis justifying this proposal. We find the form and massing of what is proposed to be crude and uncomfortable, we are

not convinced that the elevational treatment would result in an elegant appearance, and we feel the base and top of the tower have not been the subject of sufficient design analysis.

From the material provided, we do not believe this building is worthy of Barking, which we note has been making efforts to upgrade its environment and architectural presence in recent years. This seems to us to be a backwards step, and we cannot support it.

Please keep us informed of the progress of this scheme. If there is any point that requires clarification, please telephone me.

Yours sincerely



Dan Thomson

Design review advisor

As this scheme is the subject of a planning application, we will publish our views on our website, www.cabe.org.uk.



11 January 2007

Adele Williamson
Planning Development Officer
London Thames Gateway Development Corporation
9th Floor
South Quay Plaza 3
189 Marsh Wall
London, E14 9SH

RECEIVED
12 JAN 2007



Our Ref: DR/DC/2/4441

Dear Adele Williamson

BARKING AND DAGENHAM: 16-34 CAMBRIDGE ROAD, BARKING
YOUR REF: LTGDC-06-088-PP

Thank you for consulting the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) about this proposal. Following my conversation with you, the scheme has been considered by the chair of design review, Paul Finch, and members of design review staff. We have not been able to visit the site in this instance, but feel we have a fair understanding of the site and its context from the information supplied. Our views on the material provided (the design statement, 1:1250 site plan, A3 drawing and visualisation booklet, figure 3: visual and townscape analysis, and planning statement) are as follows. This is our formal response to the planning application.

We do not believe that this proposal meets the quality criteria set out in the joint CABE and English Heritage *Guidance on tall buildings*, which states that any new tall building 'should be in an appropriate location, should be of first-class design quality in its own right and should enhance the qualities of its immediate location and setting'. With this in mind we note that, while it may be possible that a building of some height would be appropriate in this location, we have seen no evidence of a convincing urban design and contextual analysis justifying this proposal. We find the form and massing of what is proposed to be crude and uncomfortable, we are not convinced that the elevational treatment would result in an elegant appearance, and we feel the base and top of the tower have not been the subject of sufficient design analysis.

Commission for Architecture
and the Built Environment

The government's advisor
on architecture, urban design
and public space

Registered in England No. 3831652

7

From the material provided, we do not believe this building is worthy of Barking, which we note has been making efforts to upgrade its environment and architectural presence in recent years. This seems to us to be a backwards step, and we cannot support it.

Please keep us informed of the progress of this scheme. If there is any point that requires clarification, please telephone me.

Yours sincerely



Dan Thomson
Design review advisor



As this scheme is the subject of a planning application, we will publish our views on our website, www.cabe.org.uk.