

# LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY

PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE  
06 Oct 2021

ADDENDUM SHEET

## ITEM 4: Portico Learning Centre, 34 Linscott Road, London, E5 0RD - Application 2021/1651 and 2021/1653

### **Reconsultation:**

As set out in the main report, the re-consultation on the applications ended on 04/10/2021. 3 additional representations have been received since the publication of the report. These are summarised below:

LBH Education Property Services: raise no objection to the proposal.

Natural England: confirm previous comments (no comment to make).

An additional objection has been received. This raises concern over the accuracy of the documentation provided in support of the application, but otherwise raises no new substantive planning matters that have not already been addressed in the main report.

Officers confirm that the documentation provided in support of the application is considered to be adequate for the purposes of explaining the proposals and allowing determination of the applications, and that officers have visited the site and adjoining properties to assess the proposal and the accuracy of the submitted drawings.

### **Amended wording:**

Paragraph 6.2.3 should read "less than *substantial* harm", not "less than *significant* harm".

### **Amended drawings:**

Amended drawings have been received in response to revisions to the car parking layout during the course of the application in the interests of ensuring consistency between drawings. The revisions, which reduce the number of GP parking bays from 4 to 3, increase the number of blue badge parking bays from 1 to 2, and increase the number of electric vehicle charging points from 1 to 2 are discussed in the main report.

Drawing number ADP-XX-00-DR-L-1923 rev S0 P4 (Urban Greening Factor Calculation) has also been revised as the previous iteration omitted the living roofs to the proposed extension, resulting in an uplift in UGF to 0.33.

As a result, the approved drawing schedule should read as follows:

ADP-00-XX-DR-A-0900 rev S2P 2, ADP-00-XX-DR-A-0901 rev S2P 3, ADP-00-00-DR-A-0910 rev S2P 3, ADP-00-00-DR-A-0911 rev D2T 11, ADP-00-B1-DR-A-0920 rev S2P 4, ADP-00-DR-A-0921 rev S2P 4, ADP-00-01-DR-A-0922 rev S2P 4, ADP-00-02-DR-A-0923 rev S2P 4, ADP-00-XX-DR-A-0925 rev S2P 4, ADP-00-XX-DR-A-0940 rev S2P 1, ADP-00-XX-DR-A-0941 rev S2P 1, ADP-00-XX-DR-A-0950 rev S2P 3, ADP-00-XX-DR-A-0951 rev S2P 4, ADP-00-B1-DR-A-1010 rev S2P 10, ADP-00-00-DR-A-1011 rev D2T 13, ADP-00-01-DR-A-1012 rev S2P 6, ADP-00-02-DR-A-1013 rev S2P 8, ADP-00-R1-DR-A-1020 rev S2P 6, ADP-XX-XX-DR-A-1200 rev S2P 8, ADP-00-XX-DR-A-1201 rev S2P 6, 00-XX-DR-A-1202 rev P2, 00-XX-DR-A-1300 rev P6, 00-XX-DR-A-1301 rev P6, ADP-00-XX-DR-A-1302 rev S2P 6, ADP-00-XX-DR-A-1311 rev S2P 3, ADP-00-XX-DR-A-1312 rev S2P 1, ADP-XX-00-DR-L-1900 rev S2 P10, ADP-XX-00-DR-L-1901 rev S2 P10, ADP-XX-00-DR-L-1902 rev S2 P10, ADP-XX-00-DR-L-1903 rev SO P11, ADP-XX-00-DR-L-1904 rev S2 P11, ADP-XX-00-DR-L-1905 rev S2 P8, ADP-XX-00-DR-L-1906 rev S2 P4, ADP-XX-00-DR-L-1907 rev S2 P4, ADP-XX-00-DR-L-1920 rev S0 P3, ADP-XX-00-DR-L-1921 rev S0 P3, ADP-XX-00-DR-L-1922 rev S0 P3, ADP-XX-00-DR-L-1923 rev S0 P4, ADP-XX-XX-M2-A-1650 rev D2T 7, ADP-00-XX-DR-A-1651 rev D2T 8, ADP-00-XX-DR-A-1652 rev D2T 6, ADP-00-XX-DR-A-1653 rev D2T 4, ADP-00-XX-DR-A-4010 rev D2T 2, A-0970 rev D2T 2, A-0971 rev S2P 3, A-0972 rev S2P 3, A-0973 rev S2P 1, 001086-AKSW-XX-ZZ-DR-S-4101 rev P03

**Amended conditions:**

The amendments to the drawings set out above require consequent amendment to the following condition:

2021/1651 Condition 17 landscaping:

Within 6 months of the commencement of superstructure works associated with the development hereby permitted, details showing the hard and soft landscaping scheme for the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

The landscaping scheme shall be based on the approved drawing numbers ADP-XX-00-DR-L-1900 rev S2 P10 and ADP-XX-00-DR-L-1901 rev S2 P10 and shall include the following details:

- (i) Full specification of all planting including trees, shrubs, sub-shrubs, bedding and lawns (common and Latin names, size and pot height; density or number, stock type, tree girth and method of growth e.g. container or open ground) and extent for all landscaped areas, including planting for biodiversity and habitat creation and the planting of a minimum of 5 native trees of recognised biodiversity value and landscape screening to the south boundary of the site; and
- (ii) Details of all surface treatments (which shall all be of permeable construction or otherwise allow water percolation to the ground) including location, materiality, colour and finish, and specifications including suppliers or manufacturers details; and
- (iii) Details of all proposed internal and site boundary treatment types and locations.

Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved drawings, the landscaping scheme will omit any hedging to the access path in the north of the site and the grassed border to the western elevation of the portico and colonnades.

All planting, seeding or turfing shall be implemented in the first planting season following first occupation of the development hereby permitted. Any plants or trees that die or are removed, damaged or diseased within a period of ten years from the substantial completion of the development shall be replaced to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species. All hard landscaping shall be carried out

in full prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted.

The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in full accordance with the details thus approved.

REASON: To ensure that the external appearance of the site is acceptable, and safeguards and enhances biodiversity.

2021/1651 Condition 19 tree protection:

The development shall be undertaken in full accordance with the tree protection measures shown on drawing number ADP-XX-00-DR-L-1905 rev S2 P8 and in accordance with BS 5837 (2012) 'Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction-Recommendations', for the trees identified to be retained. The barriers and/or ground protection shall be erected before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. The siting of barriers/ground protection shall not be altered, nor ground levels changed, nor excavations made within these areas.

In the event of any tree(s) dying, being removed or becoming seriously damaged or diseased within 5 years from the completion of the development, it shall be replaced within the next planting season with another of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

REASON: To safeguard existing trees on and neighbouring the site to be retained and ensure a satisfactory setting and external appearance to the development.

**ITEM 5: Frampton Park Estate, Frampton Park Road, London E9 7PF - Application 2021/1065**

**Cover Pages**

The residential mix table on the cover pages incorrectly states that there are 12 x 3 bed and 1 x 4 bed units. The correct mix is set out in the table below. The number of family sized units is unchanged so this does not affect the assessment.

**RESIDENTIAL MIX:**

Unit size	No. of units	Overall provision (%)
1 Bed	24	35%
2 Bed	32	46%
3 Bed	11	16%
4 Bed	2	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100%</b>

The tenure split table also incorrectly refers to the market units as 'market rent' rather than market sale. The correct tenure mix is set out below.

Tenure	Unit Size	No of units	Proportion
Social Rent	1 bed	5	
	2 bed	10	

	3 bed +	8	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>33%</b>
Intermediate	1 bed	4	
	2 bed	6	
	3 bed +	2	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17%</b>
Market Sale	1 bed 2p	15	
	2 beds 4p	16	
	3 beds 5p	3	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Consultation

Two additional representations have been made by Ward Councillors. The representations are set out in full below

### Cllr Joseph

*The London Plan states (and I quote) **5.1.5 The loss of community infrastructure can have a detrimental effect on a community... and where a development proposal leads to (a loss we should) require a replacement that continues to meet the needs of the neighbourhood it serves..***

*This proposal clearly contradicts this and on this basis alone this application should be rejected.*

*As the report asserts at 6.09, the Housing Supply Programme was designed to make use of **unused** spaces. But the community hall **was** in use. It was used every day by Hackney Quest. If there was any **underuse afterwards**, it was probably due to the fact that residents were no longer able to book the hall as it was removed from the online list, the telephone booking number on the main entrance went unanswered or residents were told that it could not be booked because of noise complaints - and perhaps also due to the fact that the hire rates were up to to £376 a day. The TRA say the bingo club would have preferred to use the hall but had to squash into the Elsdale instead.*

*But even if we were to accept that the hall was underused, the London plan clearly states at 5.1.11 that **unused or underused facilities should be brought back into use**' I am sure if we put our heads together and really tried, we could come up with ways of generating more interest in the hall, say reducing hire rates, rather than demolishing it.*

***Even if you think it is justifiable to knock down the hall to build housing, the London Plan says we need a replacement. So what is this replacement? We have been offered £250k to refurbish The Elsdale Hall. How does the space compare? The two storey community hall is 451***

square metres. I would guess the Elsdale hall is no more than 100 square metres. I have to guess, as the measurements are not given in the report. There are no photos either but if there were you would see that the Elsdale, as well as being small is riddled with asbestos and vermin, has a poorly designed entrance and would not be appropriate for youth activities, or for more than one event at a time. £250k is not enough to develop it into anything comparable to the community hall. The estate has more than 3000 residents – they need proper facilities. This is supported by the NPPF at 8. 93 c.) which says we should ‘guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services’.

The report and Local Plan say it may be acceptable to lose community **infrastructure if after a year of active marketing the facility is no longer required**. Can we honestly say that we have spent a year actively marketing the hall? Should we go ahead and destroy a community hall when we have problems with youth crime and exploitation in the area? At 6.10.2 the officers’ report says **‘the development proposals do not raise any equality issues’** and **‘there is no evidence to suggest that the loss of the hall would affect one protected group more than another’**. But our community members in Hackney often have **several** protected characteristics. Who do we think is using community halls on Hackney estates? It is not the most privileged members of society, this provision is for those who need it who may not be able to access or afford the new shops and bars in the borough. We must protect the community spaces we do have.

The population on Frampton Park is increasing as we infill more and more; it is reasonable to assume that we will need more, not less community space in the future.

Another area of concern is the design of the atrium. With just 13 metres separating it from its neighbours it is too close and spoils the character of the estate. It is also self enclosed - built around a private courtyard - we are told that this is a lobby but it is a gated open space which other residents won’t be able to use – this feels unfair.

As Planning colleagues will know, it is VERY rare that a TRA sends such a strong objection regarding a council led scheme. It is time we listened to people living on this estate about what they want to see.

When this application was deferred we hoped it would come back with a better offer guaranteeing a replacement for the hall . But nothing in the report has changed, except conditioning allowing further work to be done to the Elsdale IF the residents manage to somehow raise the money themselves! The project manager promised a report into funding streams the TRA could look at, but two days before planning this has yet to appear.

Please suggest the applicant comes back with an increased offer for replacement community facilities. This should not be something that is decided later - it should form part of this plan. Make no mistake, these are material planning considerations.

#### OFFICER COMMENT:

- The issues raised above in relation to the use of the Frampton Park Community Hall and how the proposal addresses relevant policies in the London Plan and Local Plan, public sector equality duty, amenity impacts and design are considered to be addressed in the officer’s report.
- The comment in relation to the relative sizes of the Frampton Park Community Hall and Elsdale Hall can be clarified as follows:
  - Frampton Park Community Hall:
    - Total internal area 450.9sqm

- Ground Floor - 247.2sqm
- Ground Floor Hall space - approximately 150sqm
- First Floor - 203.7sqm
- First Floor Hall Space - 150.9sqm

Elsdale Hall:

- Existing Total Internal Area: 130.7sqm
  - Proposed Total Internal Area: 151.1sqm
  - Existing Total Garden Area: 339.2sqm
  - Proposed Total Garden Area: 525.4sqm
  - Existing Hall Internal Area: 40.7sqm
  - Proposed Hall Internal Area: 64.3sqm
- The contribution currently proposed is considered sufficient to provide an improved and extended space at Elsdale Hall which would allow the existing activities held at Frampton Park Community Hall to be accommodated in an improved facility.

Cllr Wrouth

*Frampton Park is Victoria Ward's largest estate and has seen a lot of housing expansion, with a new building under construction somewhere on the estate pretty much constantly over the last decade. Residents are tired of developments on their doorstep, but also recognise that improvements come at the cost of some disruption. The problem, as many see it, is that these changes are approved on a piecemeal basis. Sadly, that piecemeal approach continues with this application in its current form.*

*These plans include some good ideas, like fresh outdoor recreational space and more social housing. But what Frampton Park needs is an over-arching improvement plan, providing a complete vision for the Estate. This application goes part way towards that, with some public realm improvements, but it fails in the provision of adequate indoor community space, which is necessary for the long-term well-being of a thriving community.*

*I have been impressed by how the architects for this scheme, East, have taken residents' views on board, adjusting and evolving plans to address their concerns within the project's geographical and financial constraints. However, as it stands, the one significant failing is the provision of an adequate Community Hall.*

*As both the applicant, the landlord and the assessor for this application it is important that Hackney Council is seen to adhere to the highest standards in reaching a decision. Anything less would leave the Council open to allegations of sharp practice, so I urge the committee to consider very carefully whether the application truly meets the standards required by Local Plan policy LP8 and London Plan policy S1F, regarding community facility replacement. I challenge claims made in the Community Uses Report, and I believe the justifications for the loss of the Community Hall made on page 5, and also in section 6 of the Officer's Report, are incorrect.*

*The report takes current usage as its benchmark, failing to acknowledge that all 3 community halls on the estate have been historically underused, since in different ways, each is not fit for purpose. The large Community Hall, set for demolition under this proposal, has an inaccessible main space with no lift. The Elsdale Hall is cramped, run down and damp. Pitcairn is dark and sited in the basement of a large block where noise and safety issues restrict its use.*

*So, to rely on figures showing how these halls have been used in recent times is misleading in terms of community need. Furthermore, for some time pre-pandemic, bookings were restricted for the main Community Hall so gauging actual demand is not possible and the usage benchmark is therefore misleading.*

*The Community Uses Report also falsely claims that Hackney Quest's youth provision for the estate's youngsters has remained the same since it was removed from the Community Hall in 2018. In fact, the Frampton Park kids had to squeeze into Hackney Quest's existing Poole Road club, when their own youth club closed. Youth activity on the estate has reduced from every weekday night, to just Friday nights at the Baptist Church.*

*The report also completely ignores day-time activities, like popular lunch clubs for the elderly, which Hackney Quest ran when it occupied the ground floor of the large hall. Along with the Tenants and Residents Association (4.4.3 in the officer's report), I find the Community Uses Report disingenuous.*

*The Officers Report also fails to point out that the construction of 69 extra flats would result in significant population growth on the estate, with a consequent increased demand for community space. We have to remember that the main reason the Local Plan and the London Plan protect Community Spaces is because they are seen as a necessary foundation for a cohesive community.*

*Following pressure from councillors and residents, Hackney Council – the developer here – has found £250,000 within the overall budget to commit as a Unilateral Undertaking towards the renovation, extension or reprovision of the Elsdale Hall (6.1.9 in the Officer's Report). Working to the £250,000 budget, the architects, East, have done scoping work for Elsdale Hall, but their plans would still leave Frampton Park with just one functional community space, significantly smaller than the one to be demolished.*

*This by no means compensates for the loss of the much larger hall, let alone providing for the needs of an expanding community. Indeed, the Elsdale Hall is in such poor shape it could be putting good money after bad. A flexible, modern, eco-friendly space, like the Morningside Hall (pictured below), which can accommodate more than one activity at a time is what's needed to harness community building on Frampton Park.*

*I have worked with the Council to look at options, and the quantity surveyor has priced a new building at between £450,000 and £1.3m depending on size (OFFICER NOTE: document summarised below). The Council also did preliminary research on alternative funding sources for community hall provision. This would be most successful if conducted with the TRA, perhaps using Council money as match-funding.*

*I believe that to approve this application the Planning Committee must consider imposing a much more stringent Unilateral Undertaking condition, designed to ensure the Council commits to working with the TRA, to raise the necessary funds to provide an indoor community space on an appropriate scale. An additional advisory, committing the Council to collaborate with residents on an estate-wide Neighbourhood Plan for a coherent vision for Frampton Park's future, would also be welcome.*

*Hackney Council must recognise that when building more homes it has to safeguard communities for the longer-term. Committing to a fit-for-purpose community facility would demonstrate that here.*

The details of the scoping document referred to in the above representation can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed works at Elsdale Hall are summarised, as set out in the officer report.
- Two options to provide a sub divided space in the main hall at Elsdale Hall are discussed. It is noted that such works are not yet costed and may not prove to be the optimum layout of the hall given the nature of the intended use.

- The demolition of the existing Elsdale Hall and erection a replacement facility at the site has been costed on a high level basis. It is estimated that the cost of constructing a hall with floorspace the equivalent of Frampton Park Community Hall would be approx. £1.3m. The cost of constructing a hall with floorspace the equivalent of the existing Elsdale Community Hall would be approx. £450k. This compares with the estimated cost of extending and improving Elsdale Hall in line with the description in the officer's report which is £250k.
- Potential sources of additional funding for works to Elsdale Hall are discussed. It is suggested that options for obtaining additional funding for works to the hall are limited and would in no way be guaranteed. Potential funding sources for outdoor works are less limited and may be open to groups such as the TRA.

#### OFFICER COMMENT:

- In response to the comment relating to an overarching plan for the estate, the planning authority must consider the proposal put before it in the application which in this case relates to the proposal sites only and not the wider estate.
- Officers are satisfied that the evidence submitted demonstrates that there is spare capacity at Frampton Park Community Hall, Elsdale Hall and Pitcairn Hall. The comment in relation to the quality of these halls is noted however the contribution towards works at Elsdale Hall will improve the quality of this space while facilitating the activities currently undertaken at Frampton Park Community Hall.
- The comment in relation to Hackney Quest is considered to be covered in the officer's report.
- The extent of population increase on the estate that would arise from an additional 69 units is not such that this would require the provision of additional community hall space beyond that proposed at Elsdale Hall as part of the proposal.
- The commentary in relation to the likely cost of providing a replacement facility at Elsdale Hall is noted. However, the proposed £250k contribution is considered by officers to be sufficient to provide an improved and extended space at Elsdale Hall which would allow the existing activities held at Frampton Park Community Hall to be accommodated in an improved facility. It is noted that the proposed costs for the re-provision of the hall are unverified at this stage and that the availability of funding to undertake such works also appears uncertain. The £250k contribution proposed by the applicant would be secured by legal agreement and payment would be required prior to the implementation of the development.
- The £250k contribution that would be secured, along with the evidence submitted in relation to the current use of the hall, are considered sufficient to justify the loss of Frampton Park Community Hall, alongside the wider public benefits that the scheme would deliver. The contribution is specific to the impacts of the current proposal and officers believe the indicative works at Elsdale Hall are deliverable with the proposed contribution. It is therefore recommended that the contribution not be limited in its use such that it may only be spent as part of a wider proposal of estate improvements or community hall re-provision. The current wording of the relevant head of term is considered sufficiently flexible to allow additional funding obtained towards Elsdale Hall to be put towards improvements without compromising the objectives and legal practicability of the contribution.

#### Land use

The following sentence should be added to paragraph 6.1.8:

- 6.1.8 It is noted that the proposal is part of the wider Housing Supply Programme where an overarching Unilateral Undertaking is in place in relation to the number of units and tenure



mix to be provided across the programme. A table is appended to this report which sets out the targets included in the Unilateral Undertaking, the number and tenure of units that have secured planning permission to date and the forecasted housing numbers and tenure of schemes with planning applications submitted or at pre-application stage. This shows that the HSP is currently exceeding its targeted proportions of social rented units and is on course to exceed its social rented unit target and the overall number of units the scheme was targeted to deliver. The table can be found at Appendix 1 of this addendum.

## Conditions

The following conditions should be amended.

### 8.1.17 Restriction of noise from plant and equipment

The rating level of any noise generated by plant & equipment as part of the development shall be at least 5 dB (A) below the pre-existing background level as determined by BS4142 -"Method of rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and industrial areas" within the daytime (between the agreed hours of 07:00 and 23:00) with a lower limit of 30dB at night-time (between the agreed hours of 23:00 and 07:00).

REASON: To safeguard the amenity of nearby premises and the area generally

### 8.1.18 Cycle Parking

Notwithstanding the details shown on the plans and documents hereby approved, prior to the commencement of above ground works, details of secure bicycle storage facilities in respect of 180 cycle parking spaces including 38 visitor spaces, including layout, stand type and spacing, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This should include a provision of accessible cycle parking in line with the minimum policy requirements of policy LP42 and priority shall be given to the provision of single tier spaces. Such details as are approved shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained.

REASON: To ensure that adequate provision for the safe and secure storage of bicycles is made for occupants and visitors.

The following condition should be added:

### 8.1.30 Phasing Plan

The development shall be undertaken strictly in accordance with the approved Phasing Plan A-ALL-PLN-001.

REASON: In order to allow the development to be appropriately phased.

**ITEM 7: Legrave Street, Off Chatsworth Road, Hackney, London, E5 9QX- Application 2021/1747**

1) Paragraph 2.1 incorrectly states that the site is not located within a conservation area. However, the site is located within the Lea Bridge Conservation Area, which was extended on 24th February 2020. The site was previously outside the conservation area at the time of the 2016 consent.

As such, paragraph 2.1 should be amended to read:

2.1 The site is located within the Lea Bridge Conservation Area but does not lie within the setting of a listed building.

An additional paragraph 6.8 should also be inserted to read:

6.8 In all respects, the materials and submitted details are considered to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

2) The balcony details submitted showed glass balustrades to the south western (Chatsworth Road facing) elevation of the proposal, in line with the original consent. Recent changes to the Building Regulations in respect of fire safety and a recurring issue across the Borough with the maintenance of glass balustrades has led to a design change to railings on these balconies. As such:

The documents to be approved have therefore been amended:

SWL234(ADL235)-AD-497 Rev P2 has been replaced by SWL234(ADL235)-AD-497 Rev P3

SWL234(ADL235)-AD-A-260 Rev P has been replaced by SWL234(ADL235)-AD-A-260 Rev P6

IF 14-05-200 Rev C has been replaced by IF 14-05-200 Rev D

IF 14-05-201 Rev C has been replaced by IF 14-05-201 Rev D

IF 14-05-202 Rev C has been replaced by IF 14-05-202 Rev D

Paragraph 6.4 should be amended to read:

6.4 Following amendments to improve the detailing of the balconies during the course of this application, including the substitution of glass balustrades for railings on the south west (Chatsworth Road) elevation, these are considered acceptable.

**Signed**.....

**Date**.....

**ALED RICHARDS**  
**Director, Public Realm**

## Appendix 1

### Housing Supply Programme - Tenure and Housing Mix (as agreed in the Overarching Unilateral Undertaking)

	Social Rented Units				Intermediate Units				Open Market Units				Total
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed +	Total	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed +	Total	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed +	Total	
Units	23	42	37	102	33	52	16	101	47	88	67	202	405
Unit %	23	41	36	100	33	51	16	100	23	44	33	100	N/A
DMLP Target	< 2 bed	> 1 bed	36%	N/A	< 2 bed	> 1 bed	16%	N/A	< 2 bed	> 1 bed	33%	N/A	N/A
Tenure % (units)	25%				25%				50%				100%
Tenure % (habitable rooms)	26%				23%				51%				100%

### Housing Supply Programme - Tenure and Housing Mix (schemes with planning consent\*)

	Social Rented Units				Intermediate Units (Shared Ownership)				Open Market Units				Total
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed +	Total	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed +	Total	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed +	Total	
Units	35	35	32	102	21	28	5	54	26	46	6	78	234
Unit %	34	34	32	100	39	52	9	100	33	59	8	100	N/A
LP33 Target	30%-34%	30%-34%	33%-36%	N/A	< % than 2 bed	> % than 1 bed	15%-25%	N/A	< % than 2 bed	> % than 1 bed	33%	N/A	N/A
Tenure % (units)	44%				23%				33%				100%
Tenure % (habitable rooms)	46%				22%				32%				100%

\*Mandeville Street, Daubeney Road, Pedro Street, Fairbank Estate, Buckland Street and Wimbourne Street

**Housing Supply Programme - Tenure and Housing Mix (current forecast - including schemes with planning consent, submitted applications and proposals at pre-application stage)**

	Social Rented Units				Intermediate Units (Shared Ownership)				Open Market Units				Total
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed +	Total	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed +	Total	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed +	Total	
Units	83	92	71	246	56	60	27	143	119	125	63	307	696
Unit %	34	37	29	100	39	42	19	100	39	41	21	100	N/A
LP33 Target	30%-34%	30%-34%	33%-36%	N/A	< % than 2 bed	> % than 1 bed	15%-25%	N/A	< % than 2 bed	> % than 1 bed	33%	N/A	N/A
Tenure % (units)	35%				21%				44%				100%
Tenure % (habitable rooms)	37%				20%				43%				100%