Notice of Meeting
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD

Monday, 6 February 2017 - 7:00 pm
Council Chamber, Town Hall, Barking

Members:  Cllr Sanchia Alasia (Chair), Cllr Faraaz Shaukat (Deputy Chair), Cllr Abdul Aziz, Cllr Peter Chand, Cllr Faruk Choudhury, Cllr Edna Fergus, Cllr Irma Freeborn, Cllr Cameron Geddes, Cllr Syed Ghani, Cllr Rocky Gill, Cllr Kashif Haroon, Cllr Giasuddin Miah, Cllr Margaret Mullane, Cllr Chris Rice, Cllr Liam Smith, Cllr Bill Turner, Cllr Dominic Twomey and Cllr Jeff Wade

Date of publication: 27 January 2017

Contact Officer: David Symonds
Tel. 020 8227 2638
E-mail: david.symonds@lbbd.gov.uk

Councillors who are not members of the Development Control Board may speak at a meeting with the agreement of the Chair but must sit separately from the Board Members and must declare whether they have had any contact with the applicant / objector / property owner or their agents, and whether they are speaking on behalf of a third party and, if so, who (Councillors’ Code of Conduct for Planning Matters)

AGENDA

Use Classes and Planning Application Procedure

1. Apologies for Absence

2. Declaration of Members' Interests

   In accordance with the Council’s Constitution, Members are asked to declare any interest they may have in any matter which is to be considered at this meeting.

3. Minutes - To confirm as correct the minutes of the meeting held on 16 January 2017 (Pages 7 - 43)

New Planning Applications

4. Boleyn Garage, 87 Movers Lane, Barking-16/01353/FUL (Pages 45 - 68)  Gascoigne
5. Land to the west of the junction of Church Lane and Siviter Way, Dagenham-16/01408/FUL (Pages 69 - 93)

6. Barking Riverside, Renwick Road, Barking-16/00131/OUT (Pages 95 - 99)

Advertisement Applications

7. Town Planning Appeals (Pages 101 - 134)

8. Delegated Decisions (Pages 135 - 159)

9. Any other public items which the Chair decides are urgent

10. To consider whether it would be appropriate to pass a resolution to exclude the public and press from the remainder of the meeting due to the nature of the business to be transacted.

Private Business

The public and press have a legal right to attend Council meetings such as the Development Control Board, except where business is confidential or certain other sensitive information is to be discussed. The list below shows why items are in the private part of the agenda, with reference to the relevant legislation (the relevant paragraph of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended). There are no such items at the time of preparing this agenda.

11. Any confidential or exempt items which the Chair decides are urgent
Our Vision for Barking and Dagenham

One borough; one community; London’s growth opportunity

Our Priorities

Encouraging civic pride

- Build pride, respect and cohesion across our borough
- Promote a welcoming, safe, and resilient community
- Build civic responsibility and help residents shape their quality of life
- Promote and protect our green and public open spaces
- Narrow the gap in attainment and realise high aspirations for every child

Enabling social responsibility

- Support residents to take responsibility for themselves, their homes and their community
- Protect the most vulnerable, keeping adults and children healthy and safe
- Ensure everyone can access good quality healthcare when they need it
- Ensure children and young people are well-educated and realise their potential
- Fully integrate services for vulnerable children, young people and families

Growing the borough

- Build high quality homes and a sustainable community
- Develop a local, skilled workforce and improve employment opportunities
- Support investment in housing, leisure, the creative industries and public spaces to enhance our environment
- Work with London partners to deliver homes and jobs across our growth hubs
- Enhance the borough’s image to attract investment and business growth

Well run organisation

- A digital Council, with appropriate services delivered online
- Promote equalities in the workforce and community
- Implement a smarter working programme, making best use of accommodation and IT
- Allow Members and staff to work flexibly to support the community
- Continue to manage finances efficiently, looking for ways to make savings and generate income
- Be innovative in service delivery
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Class</th>
<th>Use/Description of Development</th>
<th>Permitted Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Shops, retail warehouses, hairdressers, undertakers, travel and ticket agencies, post offices (but not sorting offices), pet shops, sandwich bars, showrooms, domestic hire shops, dry cleaners, funeral directors and internet cafes.</td>
<td>State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. Some temporary uses – see footnote 4. A1 plus two flats above C3 residential use - see footnote 5 Bank, building society, credit union or friendly society (A2) but not for other purposes falling within A2 – see footnote 6 A2 A3 (up to 150 m2) see footnote 9 D2 (up to 200 m2) see footnote 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Financial services such as banks and building societies, professional services (other than health and medical services) including estate and employment agencies.</td>
<td>A1 (where this is a ground floor display window) plus two flats above A2 plus two flats above State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. Some temporary uses – see footnote 4. C3 residential use - see footnote 5 A3 (up to 150 m2) – see footnote 9 D2 (up to 200 m2) see footnote 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>For the sale of food and drink for consumption on the premises - restaurants, snack bars and cafes.</td>
<td>A1 or A2 State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. Some temporary uses – see footnote 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Public houses, wine bars or other drinking establishments (but not night clubs).</td>
<td>A1, A2 or A3 unless listed as an Asset of Community Value State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. Some temporary uses – see footnote 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>For the sale of hot food for consumption off the premises.</td>
<td>A1, A2 or A3 State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. Some temporary uses – see footnote 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>a) Offices, other than a use within Class A2 (Financial Services) b) Research and development of products or processes c) Light industry appropriate in a residential area</td>
<td>B8 (where no more than 500 sqm) B1a - C3 subject to prior approval -see footnote 1. State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. State funded school or registered nursery subject to prior approval - see footnote 3 Some temporary uses – see footnote 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>General industry: use for the carrying out out of an industrial process other than one falling in class B1. (excluding incineration purposes, chemical treatment or landfill or hazardous waste).</td>
<td>B1 or B8 (B8 limited to 500 sqm] State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Storage or distribution centre. This class includes open air storage.</td>
<td>B1 (where no more than 500 sqm) State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. C3 (where no more than 500 sqm) see footnote 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Hotel, boarding house or guesthouse, where no significant element of care is provided. (Excludes hostels).</td>
<td>State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. State funded school or registered nursery subject to prior approval - see footnote 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Hospital, nursing home or residential school, college or training centre where they provide residential accommodation or care to people in need of care (other than those within C3 dwelling houses).</td>
<td>State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. State funded school or registered nursery subject to prior approval - see footnote 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2A</td>
<td>Secure residential accommodation, including use as a prison, young offenders institution, detention centre, secure training centre, custody centre, short term holding centre, secure hospital, secure local authority accommodation or use as a military barracks.</td>
<td>State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. State funded school or registered nursery subject to prior approval - see footnote 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Use as a dwelling house by a single person or by people living together as a family or by not more than 6 residents living together as a single household</td>
<td>Article 4 direction removes permitted development right to convert to C4 House in Multiple Occupation. State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Houses in multiple occupation</td>
<td>Small shared houses occupied by between three and six unrelated individuals, as their only or main residence, who share basic amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom.</td>
<td>C3 (dwelling houses) State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Assembly &amp; Leisure</td>
<td>Cinema, concert hall, bingo hall, dance hall, swimming bath, skating rink, gymnasium, or area for indoor or outdoor sports or recreations, not involving motor vehicles or firearms.</td>
<td>State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. State funded school or registered nursery subject to prior approval - see footnote 3. Some temporary uses – see footnote 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sui – Generis</td>
<td>A use on its own, for which any change of use will require planning permission. Includes, theatres, nightclubs, retail warehouse clubs, amusement arcades, launderettes, petrol filling stations, casinos, taxi businesses, waste management facilities, motor car showrooms, betting offices and pay day loan.</td>
<td>Casino to Class D2 Amusement arcades/centres and casinos to C3 (up to 150 m²) See footnote 8 Betting offices and pay day loan to A1 and A2 plus two flats above See footnote 9. Betting offices, pay day loan and casinos to A3 (up to 150 m²) See footnote 10. Betting offices and pay day loan to D2 (up to 200m²) – see footnote 10. Betting offices and payday loan to C3 residential use - see footnote 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnotes**

1. B1a (Offices) can change use to C3 (Dwelling houses) provided development commenced before 30/06/16. Need to apply to Council for prior approval to confirm no significant transport and highway impacts, contamination risks and flood risks.
2. State funded schools can open without planning permission for a single academic year without planning permission from any existing use within the Use Classes Order. School must be approved by Secretary of State and school must notify Council before they open. Must revert to its previous use at end of year. Does not apply to listed buildings.
3. B1 (business), C1 (hotel), C2 (residential institution), C2A (secured residential institution) and D2 (assembly and leisure) can convert to a state funded school or registered nursery providing early years childcare without planning permission. Need to apply to Council for prior approval to confirm no significant transport and highways impact, noise impacts and contamination risks. D2 uses that have changed use from A1 or A2 using permitted development right (see footnote 10) cannot then change use to state funded school or registered nursery under this permitted development right.
4. A1 (shops), A2 (financial and professional services), A3 (restaurants and cafes), A4 (pubs), A5 (takeaways), B1a (offices), B1b (light industry), B1c (R&D), D1 (non-residential institutions) and D2 (assembly and leisure) can change to A1, A2, A3, B1a,b & c without planning permission. Change of use must be less than or equal to 150 square metres. Applies for single continuous period of two years. Can change to other permitted use within two year period. Must revert to original use at end of two year period and notify Council before use begins.
5. A1 (shops) and A2 (financial and professional services) can change to C3 (residential). Building operations and partial demolition works that are “reasonable necessary” are also permitted. Prior approval required for transport and highways impact, contamination, flooding, the design and external appearance of the building and undesirable impacts on shopping facilities. This right only applies to buildings of 150 square metres or less and does not apply in Conservation Area or to listed buildings.
6. Does apply in Conservation Areas but not to listed buildings.
7. B8 (storage of distribution) to C3 (residential). Prior approval required for transport and highways impact, air quality impacts on intended occupiers, noise impacts of the developments, risks of contamination, flooding and the impact the changer of use would have on existing industrial uses and or storage or distribution uses. Right only applies to buildings in B8 use on or before 19 March 2015 and development must be begun before 15 April 2018. Building must have been in B8 use for four years.
8. Prior approval required for transport and highways impact, flooding, contamination and where building works are to be carried out under the permitted development right, design.
9. A1 (shops), A2 (financial and professional services) and betting offices and pay day loans to A3 (restaurants and cafes). Prior approval required for noise, smell/odours, transport and highways, hours of opening as well as siting and design in relation to extraction, ventilation, waste management, storage and undesirable impacts on shopping facilities.
10. A1 (shops) and A2 (financial and professional services) can change to D2. Applies to premises in A1 or A2 use on 5 December 2013. Prior approval required for transport and highways impact, hours of opening, noise impacts of the development and undesirable impacts on shopping facilities. Does not apply to listed buildings.
Planning Application Procedure

1. The Chair introduces the Planning Officer who will present the item.

2. The Planning Officer presents the report to the Board and advises on any relevant additional information received after the completion of the report. The Planning Officer will also refer to the recommendation (it is assumed that Members will have read the report).

3. If clarification is required, DCB Members may, through the Chair, ask relevant (i.e. planning related) questions regarding an issue within the Planning Officer’s report.

4. Registered objectors may speak for up to three minutes.

5. DCB Members may, through the Chair, seek clarification of any relevant planning issue raised by the objectors.

6. Councillors who are not members of the Development Control Board may address the Board with the Chair’s permission. They are not permitted to take part in the discussions or question objectors, supporters, applicants or applicants’ representatives.

7. DCB Members may, through the Chair, seek clarification of any relevant planning issue raised by the councillors.

8. Registered supporters, applicants or applicants’ representatives for the application may speak for up to three minutes.

9. DCB Members may, through the Chair, seek clarification of any relevant planning issue raised by the supporters, applicants or applicants’ representatives.

10. DCB Members may, through the Chair, seek further clarification from Council officers on any relevant planning issue that may have arisen.

11. The Board shall debate the item. Where the application is considered to be straightforward and there are no speakers present, the Board may make a decision based on the report and without any debate.

12. The Board’s will vote on the matter (including any proposed supplementary conditions or recommendations). In the event that the Board’s decision is to refuse or allow an application contrary to the report’s recommendation, DCB Board Members must give valid reasons for the decision based on relevant planning policies.

13. The Chair shall announce the Board’s final decision.
Notes

- The opportunity to ask questions may not be used to make general or specific comments or observations. General comments can be raised at the discussion point of the proceedings.
- DCB Members must be present during the entire debate on an application in order to be allowed to participate in the deliberations and vote on the matter. Any DCB Member who is not present at the beginning of the consideration of an application, or who leaves the room at any stage during the consideration of the application, shall be excluded from participating and voting on the application.
- If a DCB Member needs to leave during consideration of an application and wishes to take part in the deliberations and vote, they should seek the permission of the Chair for a short adjournment.
- Members should avoid expressing a view about an application until after the applicant has spoken to avoid the impression of bias.
- If there is a substantial point which needs to be clarified before a vote can take place, the Board may agree to defer the application.
- The Chair may ask members of the public and press to leave the room to enable the Board to consider information which is confidential or exempt (in accordance with Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972).
MINUTES OF
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD

Monday, 16 January 2017
(7:00 - 9:00 pm)

Present: Cllr Sanchia Alasia (Chair), Cllr Faraaz Shaukat (Deputy Chair), Cllr Abdul Aziz, Cllr Faruk Choudhury, Cllr Edna Fergus, Cllr Irma Freeborn, Cllr Cameron Geddes, Cllr Syed Ghani, Cllr Rocky Gill, Cllr Kashif Haroon, Cllr Giasuddin Miah, Cllr Chris Rice, Cllr Dominic Twomey and Cllr Jeff Wade

Apologies: Cllr Peter Chand, Cllr Margaret Mullane and Cllr Bill Turner

54. Declaration of Members’ Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

55. Minutes (12 December 2016)

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2016 were confirmed as correct.

56. Vicarage Field Shopping Centre, Station Parade/Ripple Road; 24, 24a, 26 and 28 Station Parade; 30-32 Station Parade; 34 Station Parade; 36-38 Station Parade; 13-15 Ripple Road; 17 Ripple Road; 19 Ripple Road; 21-23 Ripple Road; and PCT Health Clinic, Vicarage Drive, Barking-16/01325/OUT

The Development Management Manager introduced a report on the application relating to Vicarage Field Shopping Centre, Station Parade/Ripple Road; 24, 24a, 26 and 28 Station Parade; 30-32 Station Parade; 34 Station Parade; 36-38 Station Parade; 13-15 Ripple Road; 17 Ripple Road; 19 Ripple Road; 21-23 Ripple Road; and PCT Health Clinic, Vicarage Drive, Barking.

The proposed development was a significant mixed-use regeneration proposal for Barking Town Centre which would provide new and enhanced retail and leisure facilities, affordable workspace, a hotel, a 3-form entry primary school and enhanced replacement healthcare facilities, along with a substantial number of new residential units. It had the potential to be truly transformative to the image and function of the town centre and could provide a catalyst for other developments to come forward. The Design Code to be approved would ensure that the detailed design would be of an exemplar quality to justify the location, heights and density of the proposed development.

The proposed development would contribute towards the Council’s vision for growth and positive change in line with the Growth Commission’s recommendation that Barking Town Centre should continue its direction towards becoming a more urban centre, with an active, interesting street life, a broad range of retail and restaurants and places of employment.

The proposal was considered to be acceptable having regard to the relevant
policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, the London Plan, the Local Plan and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The Development Management Manager added that there had been a wide consultation conducted on the proposed development and four letters of objection had been received and five were in support of the application. Historic England (HE) did have some concerns about the development although they recognised that majority of the site was outside the conservation area. They consider that the development presents an opportunity to activate this part of the town centre by creating new streets but were concerned at the loss of some buildings and the overall scale of the proposal. Officers, however, consider that that the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the conservation area and other heritage assets and that this harm would be outweighed by the very considerable public benefits of the scheme.

The development aligns with strategic policies to optimise the use of brownfield sites in areas of high public transport accessibility and officers therefore support the principle of this mixed-use scheme.

The Development Management Manager went on to explain that the developer had suggested that the scheme would probably be built out in a single phase although the construction of the new development would take the best part of five years to complete. It was accepted that there would be short term disruption in the locality and it was important to ensure that local businesses were relocated as sensitively as possible.

Moving on to the type of housing contained in the application, these would largely be 1 and 2 bedroom units and at least five per cent would be three bedroom units. At least 10% would be classed as Studio accommodation. The development would be of a high-density nature and slightly above the London Plan density range. A minimum of 10% of the residential properties would be of intermediate tenure although this may rise as the applicant would need to carry out a viability review before occupation of the units.

The buildings would be of a high level of design quality and usage of lesser quality materials would fail to maximise the potential to regenerate the town centre. The illustrative scheme shows the highest buildings would be around 26 and 36 storeys but planning policy states that the site is suitable for tall buildings provided they are of exemplary design.

The layout would be largely retail based on the ground floor with spiral staircases, lifts and escalators leading to the first floor which would have more restaurants and provide access to the leisure uses. The area in Vicarage Drive would offer affordable workspace, a cycle hub and the siting of a new Primary School. The streets in the new development would be pedestrianised and their appearance would be in line with the Design Code. In addition, new bridges would provide a link at second floor level across ‘The Field’ which would be a substantial communal open space for the new residents.

The development included four hundred car parking spaces where there were currently 480. The development also included 40 spaces for disabled blue badge holders.
The Chair invited Paul Scott, an objector to the application, to address the Board. Mr Scott considered that the building of high rise housing would not improve the way of life for residents although he accepted that there was an appetite for high quality shops in the locality. He also felt that there would be a substantial increase in congestion and reduction in public spaces. He considered that the development would not guarantee that some retailers would come back to the locality. He added that the development would in his view lead to a ‘clone’ town and that the area needed independent shops. He felt that the development was in no way a guarantee of improving the area and whilst it was the best of intentions, it would not make it a more desirable area to live or work.

The Chair invited Reena Kanda, representing Thames Pharmacy, to address the Board. Ms Khanda stated that she was the owner of 17-19 Ripple Road, which included Thames Pharmacy. She had worked very hard to build the practice and the development, if approved, would ruin her business and would be the imposition of big business into the community. She hoped that the Council would seek to protect local businesses. Ms Khanda considered that there was a great sense of community in the area and this development would have a detrimental effect on the local community, in particular as it would not include enough amenity spaces. She highlighted that the locality had suffered owing to the development of the Lemonade building and Travelodge nearby. The sheer scale of the proposed development was very concerning. She also felt that the application also had failed to honour the 50% target for affordable homes. If the development were approved, then she feared that the Pharmacy would be subject to a Compulsory Purchase Order and considered that the language used by the applicant towards her business was inappropriate. She asked the Board to reject the application and support local businesses.

The Chair invited Peter Cornforth, representing the applicant, to address the Board. Mr Cornforth considered that the development provided a great opportunity for the Borough and was in line with the Council’s Growth Commission and Ambition 2020 reports. He stated that a very comprehensive consultation exercise had been conducted within the locality and there was a great deal of desire shown towards improving employment prospects and housing in the area. He stated that if there was no change in the current Vicarage Field existing development from the 1980’s, he felt that a large proportion of young people would leave the borough. (which had the highest proportion of under 16s in the country). He highlighted conversations he had conducted with young people which showed their enthusiasm for the application and the proposed development. The application would provide great opportunities and potential for the future livelihood of the borough for everyone and in particular young people. This would in turn help to make the borough stronger and more prosperous.

Members expressed concern about the lack of affordable housing contained in the application and also were concerned about the height of the buildings. They also considered that the applicant should do more to ensure that the Mayor’s 50% target of affordable housing was met and wanted an assurance that local businesses should be protected where possible. In response, the Development Management Manager understood the concerns and confirmed that the tallest tower would be taller than the Pioneer Tower in Ilford. With reference to small
businesses, this was addressed at condition 61 (Development Implementation Strategy) which required the developer to submit a scheme to mitigate the impact of the development on the vitality and viability of the town centre. In terms of any Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO), if this was necessary, this would be subject to approval by Cabinet. Re affordable housing, the ten per cent was offered at this stage and there would be viability reviews on occupation to determine if there was any extra profit on the scheme, which would allow the Council to provide affordable housing off site in other borough locations.

Members asked about the values of the properties in the proposed development. The Acting Head of Regeneration & Planning (Planning) advised that the developers referred to a figure of £547 per square feet for current values with a forecast that this would rise to £798 per square foot. In the last few years there had been double digit growth in residential values in the town centre and this would need to be maintained to reach £798 per square foot. Using this benchmark, this would mean properties would be sold for around £450,000. Peter Cornforth added that this would be for a large flat and generally homes would be more affordable than that.

Members asked about the London Plane Tree, which was currently subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and as part of the development would need to be removed and the Council would receive a £200k sum for replacement tree planting/environmental improvements. They also asked whether the scheme would link into the proposed District Heating Network. The Development Management Manager responded that £200k was based on a formula provided by the Council’s Arborist. With reference to district heating, the developer was minded to link into the network although this would need to be considered further closer to the time of commencement of the development.

Members asked about the usage of the Health Centre in Ripple Road, particularly as it provided a valuable resource for blood tests etc. and asked where it might be relocated if the development were approved. The Development Management Manager advised that as part of the condition there would need to be liaison with the NHS Trust to assess the need for any replacement facilities. The applicant stated that the current facility was not fit for purpose and the Acting Head of Planning and Regeneration (Planning) added that the NHS Family Centre in Axe Street was underused and the NHS would look at this building first.

Members generally supported the application. They felt it was in line with the Growth Commission report as it was not just about “bricks and mortar” but also about the potential social benefits for people, for example supporting the night-time economy. The application was also about showing potential for the future and revitalising the retail economy in the locality.

Members were concerned to ensure that local businesses were protected as far as possible. They were also concerned about an issue raised by one of the objectors that implied the applicant was using threatening language in stating that “you will have to have a CPO” and “we don’t care about your pharmacy”. Peter Cornforth responded that he had never written this letter to the pharmacy and comments may have been misinterpreted and apologised that the language used was inappropriate. He added that the issue of CPO was for the
Council and not for the applicant.

(Councillor Gill requested that his name was included as voting against this application)

The Board granted planning permission subject to:

1. No Direction from the Mayor of London;

2. A Section 106 legal agreement to secure the matters set out in section 5.23 of this report; and

3. The following conditions (with any amendments that might be necessary up to the issue of the decision, including any other conditions that may be required as a result of referral to the Mayor of London):

Conditions:

Definition of Development Plot

1. “Development Plot” means the Development Plots identified on drawing reference ‘0247_SEW_VF_P_6000 Rev 00’. The Development Plots identified on this drawing are:

   Development Plot A (podium); Development Plot A1; Development Plot A2; Development Plot A3; Development Plot B (podium); Development Plot B1; Development Plot B2; Development Plot B3; Development Plot B4; Development Plot C (podium); Development Plot C1; Development Plot C2; Development Plot C3; Development Plot C4; and Development Plot D.

Time Limits and Submission of Reserved Matters

2. Approval of the details of the appearance, scale and landscaping of the proposed development (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the details so approved.

   Reason: The application is in outline only, and these details remain to be submitted and approved.

3. The first reserved matters application shall be made to the Local Planning Authority for approval before the expiration of three years from the date of this outline permission. All remaining reserved matters applications, with the exception of the primary school site, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval before the expiration of six years from the date of this outline permission. The reserved matters application for the primary school site shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval before the expiration of ten years from the date of this outline permission.

   Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).
4. The development permitted shall be begun before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, excluding the reserved matters in respect of the primary school site.

Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

**Approved Plans and Documents**

5. The Outline Planning Permission hereby permitted shall be completed in accordance with the following submitted Parameter Plans and Development Specification and schedules therein:

Parameter Plans prepared by Studio Egret West:

- 0247_SEW_VF_P_6000 Rev 00
- 0247_SEW_VF_P_6001 Rev 01
- 0247_SEW_VF_P_6002 Rev 01
- 0247_SEW_VF_P_6003 Rev 01
- 0247_SEW_VF_P_6004 Rev 01
- 0247_SEW_VF_P_6005 Rev 01
- 0247_SEW_VF_P_6006 Rev 01
- 0247_SEW_VF_P_6007 Rev 00
- 0247_SEW_VF_P_6008 Rev 01
- 0247_SEW_VF_P_6009 Rev 02

Development Specification with the following schedules:

- Table 1 - Total Floorspace by Use Class
- Table 2 - Proposed Unit Mix
- Table 3 - Car Parking Use Mix
- Table 4 - Parameter Plan List and Description

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

**Phased Development**

6. No development shall take place (excluding demolition, the laying of any estate roads, site clearance and preparation works) until a phasing plan showing how the development will be implemented in a comprehensive manner has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be implemented only in accordance with the approved phasing plan.

Reason: The phasing plan is required prior to commencement of development to allow the community infrastructure levy (CIL) liability to be calculated for each phase and for any reliefs to be determined.

In accordance with the Design and Access Statement, Design Code and Development Specification

7. All reserved matters applications shall include a statement to demonstrate compliance with the Design Code and principles of the Design and Access
Statement, both prepared by Studio Egret West and the Development Specification prepared by DP9.

Reason: To ensure that the scheme is implemented in accordance with the principles and parameters established by this permission, in order to secure an exemplar development and in accordance with policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, policy CP3 of the Core Strategy and policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

**Construction Management**

8. Demolition and construction work and associated activities, other than internal works not audible outside the site boundary, are only to be carried out between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 and 13:00 Saturday, with no work on Sundays or public holidays without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority. Driven piling or ground improvement work which will generate perceptible off-site ground borne vibration is only to be carried out between the hours of 08.00 and 18.00 Monday to Friday only.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed demolition and construction work does not cause nuisance and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

9. No development shall commence, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These plans shall incorporate details of:

   a) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
   b) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
   c) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
   d) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding(s) including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
   e) wheel washing facilities;
   f) measures to control the emission of dust, dirt and emissions to air during construction; such measures to accord with the guidance provided in the document “The Control of Dust and Emissions during construction and demolition”, Mayor of London, July 2014; including but not confined to, non road mobile machinery (NRMM) requirements;
   g) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
   h) the use of efficient construction materials;
   i) methods to minimise waste, to encourage re-use, recovery and recycling, and sourcing of materials; and
   j) a nominated Developer/Resident Liaison Representative with an address and contact telephone number to be circulated to those residents consulted on the application by the developer’s representatives. This person will act as first point of contact for residents who have any problems or questions related to the ongoing development.
Demolition and construction work and associated activities are to be carried out in accordance with the recommendations contained within British Standard 5228:2009, “Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites”, Parts 1 and 2.

The approved CEMP and SWMP shall be implemented for the entire period of the construction works at the site, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The CEMP and SWMP are required prior to commencement of development in order to reduce the environmental impact of the construction phase and the impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents, and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

10. No development shall commence, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Logistics Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall be designed to minimise deliveries of materials and export of any waste materials within the times of peak traffic congestion on the local road network. The Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained.

Reason: The Construction Logistics Plan is required prior to commencement of development in order to minimise the impact of construction on the free flow of traffic on the local highway network and in the interests of highway safety, and in accordance with policy BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 6.3 of the London Plan.

Land Contamination

11. No development shall commence, including any works of demolition, until an investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, has been completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

(i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
(ii) an assessment of the potential risks to human health; property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes; adjoining land; groundwaters and surface waters; ecological systems; archaeological sites and ancient monuments; and
(iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency’s ‘Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11’. 
12. No development shall commence, including any works of demolition, until a detailed remediation scheme, to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment, has been prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

13. The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development, other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

14. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of Condition 11, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of Condition 12, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for Conditions 11 to 14: Contamination must be identified prior to commencement of development, excluding demolition of above ground structures, to ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors in accordance with policy BR5 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 5.21 of the London Plan.

**Archaeology**

15. A) No demolition or development shall commence until a stage 1 archaeological written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition or development shall commence other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, the programme and methodology of site evaluation and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works.
B) If heritage assets of archaeological interest are identified in the stage 1 WSI then those parts of the site which have archaeological interest shall be subject to a stage 2 WSI which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For land that is included within the stage 2 WSI, no demolition or development shall commence other than in accordance with the agreed stage 2 WSI which shall include:

i) The statement of significance and research objectives, the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works; and

ii) The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication and dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the stage 2 WSI.

Reason: Heritage assets of archaeological interest may survive on the site. The Local Planning Authority wishes to secure appropriate archaeological investigation prior to development, followed by the publication of results, in accordance with policies BP2 and BP3 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

**London City Airport**

16. Prior to the erection of any crane on the site details of the construction methodology and the use of the crane(s) shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing in consultation with London City Airport. The details shall include the proposed location(s) and maximum operating height(s) of the crane(s) and the start/finish dates for use of the crane(s).

Reason: To ensure that construction activities will not adversely affect the operation of London City Airport.

17. The tallest building within the development must be lit with steady red medium intensity obstacle lighting which is visible from all angles. This should be maintained for so long as the development shall exist.

Reason: To ensure that the completed development will not adversely affect the operation of London City Airport.

**Building Regulations M4 (2) and M4 (3)**

18. Ninety percent (90%) of the residential units hereby permitted shall meet Building Regulations Approved Document M Volume 1 (2015 Edition) M4 (2) ‘accessible and adaptable dwellings’. Evidence of compliance shall be notified to the building control body appointed for the development in the appropriate Full Plans Application, or Building Notice, or Initial Notice to enable the building control body to check compliance.
Reason: To ensure that accessible housing is provided in accordance policy BC2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 3.8 of the London Plan.

19. Ten percent (10%) of the residential units hereby permitted shall meet Building Regulations Approved Document M Volume 1 (2015 Edition) M4 (3) ‘wheelchair adaptable dwellings’. Evidence of compliance shall be notified to the building control body appointed for the development in the appropriate Full Plans Application, or Building Notice, or Initial Notice to enable the building control body to check compliance. Wheelchair units shall not be located in Development Plots that do not have direct lift access to the car park.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient accessible housing is provided in accordance with policy BC2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD and policy 3.8 of the London Plan.

Security Management Scheme

20. A Development Plot shall not be occupied until a security management scheme for that Development Plot including, for example, details of CCTV, concierge services, door entry systems, secure access to the residential entrance points from the car park and car park security, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall demonstrate how the development meets Secured by Design standards. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to occupation of the Development Plan and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In order to provide a safe and secure development, in accordance with policy CP3 of the Core Strategy and policies BC7 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

External Lighting

21. A Development Plot shall not be occupied until an external lighting scheme for that Development Plot, including any lighting of the building(s) in that Development Plot, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The external lighting shall be designed, installed and maintained so as to fully comply with The Association of Chief Police Officers Secured by Design publication “Lighting Against Crime – A Guide for Crime Reduction Professionals”, ACPO SPD, January 2011. The design shall satisfy criteria to limit obtrusive light presented in Table 1, p25 of the guide, relating to Environmental Zone E3 – medium district brightness areas. The scheme should seek to minimise upwards light and obtrusive light and avoid light spill onto trees, hedges, bird and bat boxes and green roofs. Lighting should be designed in accordance with the Bat Conservation Trust’s guidance ‘Bats and Lighting in the UK’ or their latest advice. Any lighting, either temporary or permanent, along the site boundaries should be kept to a minimum and directed away from the boundary features to ensure there is no increase in light levels. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to occupation of the Development Plot and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of security and safety, to avoid light pollution and safeguard neighbouring amenity and in accordance with policies BC7 and

*Communal Television and Satellite System*

22. No satellite dishes may be installed on the exterior of any of the Development Plots, with the exception of one roof mounted dish per Development Plot providing a communal system available to each resident of the Development Plot.

Reason: To safeguard the external appearance of the buildings in accordance with policy CP3 of the Core Strategy and policies BP2 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

*Boundary Treatment*

23. Prior to occupation of a Development Plot, details of all boundary fences, walls, railings, gates and other boundary treatment for that Development Plot shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be implemented prior to occupation of the Development Plot and thereafter permanently retained unless the Local Planning Authority gives prior written approval to their removal.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory means of enclosure for the proposed development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area and to accord with Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy and Policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

*Trees and Biodiversity*

24. All retained trees (including any trees adjacent to the site or affected by highways works or transportation of material but outside the development boundary) must be protected in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012, 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction'.

Reason: In order to ensure the safety and well-being of nearby trees and trees on the site that are to remain after building works are completed, and in accordance with policies BR3 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

25. There shall be no vegetation clearance, tree works or works to existing building roof tops during the bird breeding season (February to September). If this is not possible a check for the presence of active nests and nesting birds shall be undertaken immediately prior to the commencement of the relevant works by a suitably qualified ecologist. If nests/nesting birds are present, the relevant works must be delayed until the nesting season is over and the fledglings have left the surrounding area.

Reason: To protect the ecology of the area in accordance with policy CR2 of the Core Strategy.

26. No above ground new development shall commence in a Development Plot until details of bird nesting and bat roosting bricks/boxes to be
incorporated into the structure of the new building(s) or roof space in that Development Plot have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall accord with the advice set out in 'Biodiversity for Low and Zero Carbon Buildings: A Technical Guide for New Build' (Published by RIBA, March 2010). Bird nest boxes/bricks should be provided for swifts, starlings and house sparrows. Additional bird and bat boxes should be identified on suitable trees. The roof of one of the tall buildings should be designed to incorporate at least one nest site designed for peregrine falcons. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to occupation of the Development Plot and permanently retained thereafter.


27. A Development Plot shall not be occupied until a detailed scheme for the provision and maintenance of any green roofs to be provided in that Development Plot has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority prior to occupation of the Development Plot. Green roofs shall comprise a minimum substrate depth of 125mm and only native plants of local provenance shall be used. The design should include appropriate substrates, bare patches and log piles.

Reason: To protect and enhance the biodiversity of the site and contribute towards sustainable drainage in accordance policy BR3 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

28. A Development Plot shall not be occupied until a landscape management plan, including long-term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas in that Development Plot, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved.


Transport

29. The basement parking level shall not be occupied until details of petrol and oil interceptors for all car parking, servicing and loading areas at the basement parking level have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the development.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with policy BR4 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

30. The basement parking level shall not be occupied until details of the car
parking layout, allocation, management and charging arrangements, electric vehicle charging points and passive provision for electric vehicles have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall ensure that at least 20% of all residential parking spaces are for electric vehicles with an additional 20% passive provision and at least 20% of all public and non-residential parking spaces are for electric vehicles with an additional 20% passive provision. Accessible car parking spaces for residents, the quantum being equivalent to 5% of the proposed number of residential units, shall be provided and clearly marked with a British Standard disabled symbol. The approved details shall be implemented prior to occupation of the development and shall be permanently retained thereafter and used for no other purpose.

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, in order to encourage the use of electric cars as a sustainable mode of transport and to ensure and promote easier access for disabled persons, in accordance with policy 6.13 of the London Plan and policies BC2, BR9 and BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

No above ground new development shall commence in a Development Plot until details of cycle parking for that Development Plot, including its appearance, location and the means of secure storage proposed, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the Development Plot and shall be permanently retained thereafter and used for no other purpose.

Reason: In the interests of promoting cycling as a safe, efficient and non-polluting mode of transport and in accordance with policy BR11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 6.9 of the London Plan.

32. Prior to the occupation of the development a Delivery and Servicing Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in conjunction with Transport for London. The Plan shall identify efficiencies and sustainability measures to be undertaken once the development is operational, and should incorporate details of deliveries to the site and servicing arrangements, including the size of vehicles, routing and tracking of vehicles and times of deliveries and servicing. The approved Plan shall be implemented and adhered to thereafter.

Reason: In order to minimise the impact of the development on the local highway network and traffic congestion and in accordance with policy BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 6.3 of the London Plan.

Surface Water Drainage

33. No development shall commence until a Surface Water Drainage Scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the
hydrological and hydro geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

Reason: The Drainage Scheme is required prior to commencement of development in order to reduce the risk of flooding and in accordance with policy BR4 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 5.13 of the London Plan.

**Piling**

34. No piling shall take place until a piling method statement, detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to, and have the potential to impact on, local underground sewerage utility infrastructure.

35. If piling or other ground improvement work is undertaken pursuant to this permission then the 95% level of vibration attributable to these activities shall not exceed a peak particle velocity of 1.5mm/sec when measured at the point of entry to any adjoining residential development. In the event of reasonable complaint of vibration nuisance and at the request of the Local Planning Authority monitoring to evaluate compliance with this condition is to be carried out and the results submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to reduce the impact of construction on the amenities of neighbouring residents, and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

**Noise and Vibration**

36. A venue operation and noise mitigation strategy for all entertainment uses shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing prior to the occupation of these uses. The strategy shall include, but is not limited to, demonstrating the design and operation mitigation methods required to create an adequately quiet noise environment for all ‘noise-sensitive uses’. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed residential units and surrounding residential properties are adequately protected from noise and in accordance with policy BR13 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 7.15 of the London Plan.

37. The combined rating level of the noise from any plant installed pursuant to this permission (other than plant which is only to be operated in emergency circumstances) shall not exceed the existing background noise level outside
the window to any noise-sensitive room. Any assessment of compliance with this condition shall be made according to the methodology and procedures presented in BS4142:2014.

Reason: To ensure that noise-sensitive rooms within the proposed development and neighbouring developments are adequately protected from noise and in accordance with policy BR13 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 7.15 of the London Plan.

38. The combined rating level of the noise from any plant installed pursuant to this permission which is only to be operated in emergency circumstances shall not exceed the existing background noise level outside the window to any noise-sensitive room by more than 10 dB. Any assessment of compliance with this condition shall be made according to the methodology and procedures presented in BS4142:2014.

Reason: To ensure that noise-sensitive rooms within the proposed development and neighbouring developments are adequately protected from noise and in accordance with policy BR13 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 7.15 of the London Plan.

39. No above ground new development shall commence in a Development Plot until full details of a scheme of acoustic protection of habitable rooms in that Development Plot against external noise has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme of acoustic protection shall be sufficient to secure internal noise levels no greater than 35 dB LAeq in living rooms and bedrooms (07:00 hrs to 23:00 hrs) with windows closed; and 30 dB LAeq in bedrooms (23:00 hrs to 07:00 hrs) with windows closed. Additionally, where the internal noise levels will exceed 40dB LAeq in living rooms and bedrooms (07:00 hrs to 23:00 hrs) or 35dB LAeq in bedrooms (23:00 hrs to 07:00 hrs) with windows open the scheme of acoustic protection shall incorporate a ventilator system. The approved scheme shall be fully implemented before the first occupation of the residential unit to which it relates and shall be maintained at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed residential units are adequately protected from noise and in accordance with policy BR13 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 7.15 of the London Plan.

40. No development shall commence in a Development Plot until details of a scheme of vibration mitigation to be incorporated into the foundations of the building(s) in the Development Plot have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be designed to ensure that:

a) re-radiated noise does not exceed 35 dB LAFmax in any habitable room; and
b) the vibration value in any habitable room does not exceed 0.2ms⁻¹.⁷５ day (07:00 hrs to 19:00 hrs) or 0.1 ms⁻¹.⁷５ night (23:00 hrs to 07:00 hrs).

The approved scheme shall be fully implemented before the first residential
occupation of the building to which it relates.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed residential units are adequately protected from noise and vibration and in accordance with policy BR13 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 7.15 of the London Plan.

41. Any commercial kitchen extract ventilation system shall be designed to ensure that structure borne (re-radiated) noise emissions from the system do not exceed 35 LAeq dB (5 min) when measured in any habitable room in adjoining residential premises.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed residential units are adequately protected from noise and in accordance with policy BR13 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 7.15 of the London Plan.

42. The delivery/collection of goods associated with the commercial uses is only permitted to take place between the hours of 07:00 hrs and 23:00 hrs on any day.

Reason: To prevent any undue disturbance to residential occupiers of the proposed development and neighbouring properties at unreasonable hours and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

43. The handling of bottles and/or the movement of bins and rubbish is not permitted take place outside the premises between the hours of 23:00 hrs on one day and 07:00 hrs the following day.

Reason: To prevent any undue disturbance to residential occupiers of the proposed development and neighbouring properties at unreasonable hours and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

**Bat Survey**

44. Prior to demolition of the existing buildings a dusk emergence and dawn re-entry transect survey shall be undertaken in order to locate any potential roost sites and record bat activity levels within, and adjacent to, the site. These surveys should be undertaken between May and August within the bats active period.

Reason: To protect the ecology of the area in accordance with policy CR2 of the Core Strategy.

**Kitchen Extract Ventilation**

45. Prior to the occupation of any A3 or A5 uses, details of the appearance of any kitchen extract ventilation system and associated equipment (which shall include measures to alleviate fumes and odour and (incorporating electrostatic precipitators and activated carbon filters where necessary) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved
details shall be fully implemented before the first use of the relevant commercial unit and shall thereafter be permanently retained in an efficient manner.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the premises and minimise the impact of cooking smells and odours in accordance with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

**Energy and Sustainability**

46. The development shall incorporate and maintain energy efficiency and renewable energy measures in line with the energy strategy set out in the Framework Energy Statement prepared by Scotch Partners LLP. An Energy Statement demonstrating compliance with the Framework Energy Statement shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing for each reserved matters application. The Energy Statement shall also include details of any energy centre, the location and quantum of any photovoltaic panels and provisions to be made for interconnecting pipework to link into the District Heating Network.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the environment and providing sustainable development in accordance with policies BR1 and BR2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policies 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6 and 5.7 of the London Plan.

47. No above ground new development shall commence until details of any Combined Heat and Power Plant (CHP) to be installed at the premises have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall be sufficient to:

a) demonstrate that products of combustion emitted from the plant will not be prejudicial to health or a nuisance having regard to:

- the position and height of the discharge flue of the chimney;
- the position and descriptions of buildings near it;
- the levels of the neighbouring ground; and
- any other matters requiring consideration in the circumstances, including but not limited to, the concentration of oxides of nitrogen in the flue gas and the flue discharge velocity.

b) demonstrate that the emission standards for CHP plant for Band A locations set out in Appendix 7 of Mayor of London’s ‘Sustainable Design and Construction’ Supplementary Planning Guidance will be satisfied.

Reason: To protect the amenity of residential occupiers of the proposed development and neighbouring properties in accordance with policies BR14 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

48. The non-residential elements of the development hereby permitted, excluding the primary school, shall achieve a BREEAM ‘Excellent’ rating.
Reason: To ensure that the proposed development is constructed in an environmentally sustainable manner and in accordance with policy CR1 of the Core Strategy and policy BR1 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

*HighSpeed 1*

49. The developer shall enter into discussions with HighSpeed1 (HS1) and their engineer, Network Rail (High Speed), as soon as practicable to assist in identifying the likely effect of the development on HS1 or HS1 Property.

Reason: The nature of the proposed development is such that detailed discussion is required concerning the design, construction, future maintenance and demolition of the development to ensure that it does not compromise the integrity, safety, security, operation, maintenance and liabilities of HS1.

50. Prior to the start of construction, details of the design of the foundations and other works proposed below existing ground level shall be submitted in writing and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with HS1. Construction activity shall then be carried out in compliance with the approved details unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with HS1.

Reason: To ensure that loads on, and settlement of, HS1 tunnels, structures, track and other infrastructure do not prejudice the safety or operation of HS1.

51. Prior to the start of site investigations involving a borehole or trial pit deeper than one metre, details of the location and depth of site investigations including a method statement shall be submitted in writing and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with HS1. This activity shall then be carried out only in compliance with the approved details unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with HS1.

Reason: No such information has been provided and is required in order that the borehole or trial pit is at an acceptable vertical and horizontal distance from the tunnel such that it does not compromise the integrity, safety or operation of HS1.

52. No demolition activity shall take place until the proposed methodology has been submitted in writing to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with HS1. Demolition activity shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless the Local Planning Authority in consultation with HS1 has previously agreed in writing to any change.

Reason: No such information has been provided and demolition activity could pose a risk to the safety, security and operation of HS1.

53. Prior to the start of construction activity engineering details of the size, depth and proximity to HighSpeed1 of any excavations shall be submitted in writing to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with HS1. Excavations shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless the Local Planning Authority in consultation with HS1 has
previously agreed in writing to any change.

Reason: No such details have been provided. To ensure that the stability HS1 tunnels, structures, track and other infrastructure is not prejudiced.

54. Prior to the start of construction, details of the size, loading and proximity to HighSpeed1 of additional ground loads such as stockpiles shall be submitted in writing and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with HS1. Works shall be carried out in conformity with the approved details unless the Local Planning Authority in consultation with HS1 has previously agreed in writing to any change.

Reason: To ensure that the stability of HS1 tunnels, structures, track and other infrastructure is not prejudiced.

**School**

55. Prior to occupation of the school hereby permitted a noise management plan relating to the mitigation of noise emissions from the premises shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include, but not be limited to, the mitigation of noise from the use of the rooftop play/sports space. The approved scheme shall be implemented at all times thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of residential occupiers of the proposed development and neighbouring properties and to accord with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

56. Prior to occupation of the school hereby permitted a School Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall be designed to manage and spread arrivals and departures of staff and pupils, minimise deliveries within the times of peak traffic congestion on the local road network and shall include, where relevant, community use management. The Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained.

Reason: In order to minimise the impact of the development on the free flow of traffic on the local highway network during peak periods and in the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policy BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

57. Prior to occupation of the school hereby permitted a Travel Plan for the school, which shall include proposals for minimising car-borne travel and encouraging walking, cycling and the use of public transport, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall include details of funding, implementation, monitoring and review. The approved Travel Plan shall be implemented and monitored in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In order to encourage the use of sustainable transport and in accordance with policy 6.1 of the London Plan and policy BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.
Temporary Access Strategy

58. No development shall commence until a temporary access strategy detailing temporary routes for pedestrians and cyclists through the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Provisions for pedestrians shall be fully accessible to all, including people with disabilities. Details of any temporary boundary treatment should also be provided. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved strategy and shall be maintained thereafter until completion of the development.

Reason: The temporary access strategy is required prior to commencement of the development to ensure an inclusive environment is maintained at all times in accordance with policy CP3 of the Core Strategy and policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

Directional Signage

59. Prior to occupation of the development details of all proposed directional signage within the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved signage shall be implemented prior to occupation of the development and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring a legible and accessible environment and in the interests of the appearance of the development in accordance with policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, policy CP3 of the Core Strategy and policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

Site Levels

60. No above ground new development shall commence in a Development Plot until existing and proposed site levels for that Development Plot have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of external appearance and in accordance with policy CP3 of the Core Strategy and policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

Development Implementation Strategy

61. No development shall commence until a development implementation strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall include, but not be limited to, details of any phasing, measures to mitigate the impact of the development on the vitality and viability of Barking Town Centre during the demolition and construction phase including meanwhile uses, an arts strategy for the construction hoardings and details of consultation undertaken with the local Commissioner for NHS Community Pharmacy Services to confirm any reasonable mitigation measures required to ensure adequate provision of local pharmacy services during construction. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: The development implementation strategy is required prior to commencement of the development to ensure that existing businesses are supported in their desire to relocate and to ensure a similar level of function, vitality and viability of the town centre as is currently experienced throughout the construction period of the development having regard to the nature and scale of the development, and in accordance with policy CE1 of the Core Strategy and policy BE2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

**Long-Term Maintenance of Buildings and Public Realm**

62. Prior to occupation of the development a scheme for the long-term maintenance of the buildings and public realm within the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The buildings and public realm shall be maintained in accordance with the approved scheme thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the long-term maintenance of the buildings and public realm and to protect the character and amenity of the area in accordance with policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, policy CP3 of the Core Strategy and policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

*(At the conclusion of this item, the Board adjourned from 8.33-8.41 pm)*

57. **Kingsley Hall, Parsloes Avenue, Dagenham-16/01518/OUT**

The Development Management Manager introduced a report on the application relating to Kingsley Hall, Parsloes Avenue, Dagenham. The proposal was to comprehensively redevelop the Kingsley Hall community centre site, but retaining the existing historic Sunshine building for continued use as a nursery, providing a replacement multi-use community centre and sports hall, 6 key worker flats, and 32 one and two-bedroom flats.

The accommodation would be provided in three and four storey blocks located on the perimeters of the site, with internal courtyards providing amenity space and car parking.

The application was a hybrid with Phase 1 of the scheme fully detailed and Phase 2 submitted in outline.

The design was considered to be high quality and will activate and animate the street frontages, and ‘announce’ the purpose of the building as a focal point for the local community. This was in contrast to the existing site which is poorly designed with some lacklustre buildings that are set back from the road and somewhat hidden from public view.

Kingsley Hall was well known and respected in the area for its community services and support to local residents and as a venue for local events since 1929.

The proposed development would enable the charity to continue this work and
improve its services within attractively designed and user friendly buildings, whilst also making the most of the potential of the site to provide additional housing that will contribute to housing need.

In respect of the proposed 32 flats within Phase 2 a viability appraisal would be required to be submitted at the reserved matters stage that will be tested by the Council. This was to ensure that sub-market (affordable) housing was maximised on the site subject to viability in accordance with London Plan policy.

There had been no objections to the application and six letters of support had been submitted from local residents and existing users of Kingsley Hall. The proposed development would result in significant benefits to the local community, and significantly enhance the appearance of the site and the surrounding street scene.

The scheme was in accordance with the relevant development plan policies and would contribute to the Council’s corporate priorities of encouraging civic pride; enabling social responsibility; and growing the Borough.

Councillor Elizabeth Kangethe, Parsloes Ward Councillor, was invited to address the Board. She fully supported the application as a local resident and considered that it would enhance the local community and it was a much needed resource.

Members asked about the key worker housing in phase 1. These two properties were for community workers.

Members also asked about the proposed ownership of the thirty two flats. Chris Kapnisis, Director of Kingsley Hall stated that these would be targeted towards those in social need, particularly people with disabilities, and they were working closely with Livability and Habitat for Humanity, well known national charities, on this scheme.

The Board **granted** planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. The development of Phase 1 of the permitted scheme (as shown on drawing No. A1013/2.1/PL 1000 Rev. C) shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

   Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development of Phase 1 (as shown on drawing No. A1013/2.1/PL 1000 Rev. C) hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

   A1013 2.1-PL1000 Rev. C
   A1013 2.1-PL1001 Rev. C
   A1013 2.1-PL1002 Rev. C
   A1013 2.1-PL1003 Rev. C
   A1013 2.1-PL1004 Rev. B
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.3. No above ground level development within Phase 1 (as shown on drawing No. A1013/2.1/PL 1000 Rev. C) shall take place until details/samples of all materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of Phase 1 of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development of Phase 1 shall be carried out in accordance with the approved materials.

Reason: To protect or enhance the character and amenity of the area in accordance with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

3. No above ground level development within Phase 1 (as shown on drawing No. A1013/2.1/PL 1000 Rev. C) shall take place until details/samples of all materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of Phase 1 of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development of Phase 1 shall be carried out in accordance with the approved materials.

Reason: To protect or enhance the character and amenity of the area in accordance with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

4. No above ground level development within Phase 1 (as shown on drawing No. A1013/2.1/PL 1000 Rev. C) shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping for Phase 1 of the site which shall include indications of all existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows on the site and details of those to be retained.

Reason: To safeguard and improve the appearance of the area in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

5. The Phase 1 landscaping scheme as approved in accordance with condition No. 4 shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation or completion of Phase 1 of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To secure the provision and retention of the landscaping in the interests of the visual amenity of the area and in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
6. No above ground level development within Phase 1 (as shown on drawing No. A1013/2.1/PL 1000 Rev. C) shall take place until a scheme showing those areas of Phase 1 to be hard landscaped and the details of that hard landscaping have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme as approved shall be carried out prior to the occupation of Phase 1 of the development and thereafter permanently retained.

Reason: To safeguard and improve the appearance of the area in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

7. The Phase 1 car parking spaces indicated on Drawing No. A1013 2.1-PL1001 Rev. C shall be constructed and marked out prior to the occupation of Phase 1 of the development, including the accessible parking bays (that shall be clearly marked with a British Standard disabled symbol), and details shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority of the number and location of Electric Vehicle Charging Point bays (to be installed with active charging points) and the parking spaces and charging points shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of Phase 1 and retained permanently for the use of occupiers and visitors to the premises and not used for any other purposes (excluding any temporary arrangements in relation to the construction of Phase 2) and the accessible parking bays shall be permanently retained for the use of disabled persons and their vehicles and for no other purpose.

Reason: To ensure and promote easier access for disabled persons, to ensure sufficient off-street parking, and to encourage the use of electric cars in order to reduce carbon emissions, and in accordance with policies BC2, BR9 and BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 6.13 of the London Plan.

8. Cycle parking for Phase 1 of the development (as shown on drawing No. A1013 2.1-PL1001 Rev. C) shall be provided in accordance with the details shown on drawing No. A1013 2.1-PL1001 Rev. C prior to the occupation of Phase 1 of the development and thereafter maintained for the use of residents and visitors to the site, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of promoting cycling as a safe, efficient and non-polluting mode of transport in accordance with policy BR11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

9. The Phase 1 refuse enclosures indicated on drawing No. A1013 2.1-PL1001 Rev. C shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of Phase 1 of the development hereby approved and thereafter permanently retained for the use of the occupiers of the premises, with the exception of the temporary refuse enclosures indicated.

Reason: To provide satisfactory refuse storage provision in the interests of the appearance of the site and locality in accordance with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.
10. Phase 1 of development shall be implemented in a manner that does not materially depart from the submitted ‘Built Physics Limited’ BREEAM Pre-Assessment report (September 2016) and shall achieve a minimum BREEAM rating of ‘Very Good’.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development is constructed in an environmentally sustainable manner and in accordance with policy BR1 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 5.3 of the London Plan.

11. Phase 1 of the development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted ‘Built Physics Limited’ Energy Statement (September 2016) unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the energy strategy shall result in a minimum reduction in carbon emissions of 35% in comparison with the minimum requirements of Part L of the 2013 Building Regulations.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the environment, to ensure that the development provides renewable energy in accordance with policy BR2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 5.2 of the London Plan.

12. The Phase 1 temporary car park shall be installed and thereafter maintained for the use of residents and visitors to the site in accordance with the details shown on drawing No. A1013/2.1/PL 1000 Rev. C until the commencement of Phase 2 of the development.

Reason: In order to ensure the provision of adequate on site car parking during the construction of Phase 1 in view of the loss of the existing Phase 1 car parking spaces that will occur after commencement of the development in the interest of residential amenity and highway safety and in accordance with policies BP8 and BR9 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

13. No development above ground level within either Phase (as shown on drawing Nos. A1013/2.1/PL 1000 Rev. C and A1013/2.1/PL 2001 Rev. B) shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the position, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected for that Phase. No part of the development shall be occupied until the approved boundary treatment for that part has been provided. The approved boundary treatment shall be retained unless the Local Planning Authority gives prior written approval for its removal.

Reason: To ensure the boundary treatment protects or enhances the character and amenity of the area in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

14. No development above ground level within either Phase (as shown on drawing Nos. A1013/2.1/PL 1000 Rev. C and A1013/2.1/PL 2001 Rev. B) shall take place until a scheme showing the provisions to be made for CCTV coverage, access control, and any other measures to reduce the risk of crime, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the approved scheme has been implemented. Thereafter the approved measures shall be permanently retained unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to provide a good standard of security to future occupants and visitors to the site and to reduce the risk of crime in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

15. Any kitchen extract system installed pursuant to this permission is to include measures for the removal and treatment of cooking odours. The measures shall have regard to and be commensurate with guidance and recommendations in publication 'Guidance on the Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems'. DEFRA, 2005. In the event that an external flue is required it shall be installed in accordance with details that shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect the health and residential amenities of future occupiers and in accordance with policies BR14 and BC10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

16. The community centre buildings and workshops hereby permitted shall not be open to visiting members of the public between the hours of 07:00 and 23:00 on any day except Christmas Eve, Easter Friday and the Easter Bank holiday, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to prevent noise nuisance and disturbance to future occupiers of the development and in accordance with policies BR13 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

17. Noise from any entertainment, including live and amplified music taking place within the community centre buildings hereby approved shall be controlled so as to be inaudible inside adjoining and other noise-sensitive premises in the vicinity. The initial test for compliance with the ‘inaudibility’ criterion will be that noise should be no more than barely audible outside those noise sensitive premises. In the event there is disagreement as to whether entertainment noise is or is not audible the following numerical limits shall be used to determine compliance with this condition:

- the LAeq (EN) shall not exceed LA90 (WEN) and;
- the L10 (EN) shall not exceed L90 (WEN) in any 1/3 octave band between 40Hz and 160Hz.

EN = Entertainment noise level, WEN = Representative background noise level without the entertainment noise, both measured 1m from the façade of the noise-sensitive premise.

Reason: In order to prevent noise nuisance to future residential occupiers of the development and in accordance with policies BR13 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

18. Prior to first residential occupation within either Phase (as shown on
drawing Nos. A1013/2.1/PL 1000 Rev. C and A1013/2.1/PL 2001 Rev. B) a scheme of noise mitigation (window insulation/acoustic ventilation of habitable rooms/acoustic screens to balconies and restriction on plant noise emission) in line with the specifications provided in the noise assessment report, reference AC101951r2, is to be fully implemented. The noise mitigation measures are to be maintained at all times thereafter.

Reason: In order to protect future occupiers from noise nuisance and in accordance with policies BR13 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

19. The external lighting of the development hereby permitted, is to be designed, installed and maintained so as to fully comply with The Association of Chief Police Officers - Secured by Design publication “Lighting Against Crime – A Guide for Crime Reduction Professionals”, ACPO SPD, January 2011. The design shall satisfy criteria to limit obtrusive light presented in Table 1, p25 of the guide, relating to Environmental Zone E3 – Medium district brightness areas - small town centre or urban locations and shall be designed to minimise upwards light and shall also be designed in accordance with Bats and Lighting in the UK http://www.bats.org.uk/pages/bats_and_lighting.html or the latest advice from the Bat Conservation Trust.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities and security of future occupiers and to protect wildlife habitat in accordance with policies BR3, BC7 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

20. Construction work and associated activities are only to be carried out between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00-13:00 Saturday with no work on Sundays or public holidays, and shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations contained within British Standard 5228:2009, “Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites”. Parts 1 and 2. Any works which are associated with the generation of ground borne vibration are only to be carried out between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed construction work does not cause undue nuisance and disturbance to neighbouring properties at unreasonable hours and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

21. Measures to control the emission of dust, dirt and emissions to air are to accord with the guidance provided in the document “The Control of Dust and Emissions during construction and demolition”, Mayor of London, July 2014; including but not confined to, non road mobile machinery (NRMM) requirements are to be implemented at all times during demolition and construction works associated with the development.

Reason: In order to prevent nuisance to neighbouring occupiers and to minimise air pollution in accordance with policy 7.14 of the London Plan.

22. An investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site,
whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

(i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;

(ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:

- human health,
- property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,
- adjoining land,
- groundwaters and surface waters,
- ecological systems,
- archaeological sites and ancient monuments;

(iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency’s ‘Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11’.

23. A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

24. The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

25. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of condition 22, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of condition 23, which is
subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with condition 24.

Reason for Conditions 22 to 25: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors in accordance with Policy BR5 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

26. No vegetation, scrub, tree clearance, or tree works may take place between 15 February and 30 September unless approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, whereby in accordance with a bird nesting survey strategy approved by the Local Planning Authority a survey shall be carried out no more than 2 days prior to the clearance work, and if any nesting birds are found, the works will be delayed until the nests are no longer being used and the fledglings have left the area.

Reason: In order to prevent harm to wildlife habitats and in accordance with Policy BR3 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

27. No phase of the development shall be occupied until bird nesting and bat roosting boxes for that Phase have been installed on the buildings or in any trees within that Phase of the site in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall accord with the advice set out in "Biodiversity for Low and Zero Carbon Buildings: A Technical Guide for New Build" (Published by RIBA, March 2010) or similar advice from the RSPB and the Bat Conservation Trust, and where possible the boxes shall be incorporated within the structure of the buildings or roof spaces.

Reason: In order to preserve and enhance the Borough’s natural environment and to comply with policy CR2 of the Core Strategy, policy BR3 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 7.19 of the London Plan.

28. No above ground development within either Phase (as shown on drawing Nos. A1013/2.1/PL 1000 Rev. C and A1013/2.1/PL 2001 Rev. B) shall commence until details of the proposed living roofs for that Phase including their type, location and specific purpose together with a maintenance schedule has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The living roofs shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved maintenance schedule.

Reason: In the interests of reducing the impact of the development on the mains drainage system, enhancing the insulation of the building and contributing to biodiversity and in accordance with policy CR1 of the Core Strategy and policies BR3, BR4 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development
29. Prior to the commencement of the demolition of any existing building a bat inspection of the internal roof spaces of that building shall be carried out by a qualified ecologist. The results shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. If there is evidence of bat roost(s) within the building its demolition shall not commence until the submission to and approval by the Local Planning Authority of a bat habitat mitigation strategy. (Where the inspection result is negative demolition shall take place within 12 months of the inspection, and if this period is exceeded a further inspection shall be carried out in accordance with the above prior to demolition). The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved strategy.

Reason: In order to prevent harm to wildlife habitats and in accordance with Policy BR3 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

30. Prior to commencement of either Phase (as shown on drawing Nos. A1013/2.1/PL 1000 Rev. C and A1013/2.1/PL 2001 Rev. B), a scheme for the provision of sustainable surface water drainage management for that Phase shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. If submitted on a Phased basis the scheme shall take account of any impact on land within the adjacent Phase of the development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

The scheme shall clearly demonstrate how it is designed to minimise surface water run-off from the site water by providing information on:

- Potential to incorporate sustainable urban drainage (SuDs) in accordance with the hierarchy set out in Policy 5.15 of the London Plan.
- Calculations showing storm period and intensity and volume of storage required to control surface water and size of features to control that volume to Greenfield run off rates at a variety of return periods including 1 in 1 year, 1 in 30, 1 in 100, and 1 in 100 plus climate change
- Flood Risk Assessment

Reason: The drainage scheme is required prior to commencement of development in order to reduce the risk of flooding and in accordance with policy BR4 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 5.13 of the London Plan.

31. No above ground works within either Phase (as shown on drawing Nos. A1013/2.1/PL 1000 Rev. C and A1013/2.1/PL 2001 Rev. B) shall commence until the completion of a highways agreement for that Phase that secures the provision of the new vehicular accesses and the re-instatement of the existing dropped kerbs that will become redundant, and subject to feasibility makes provision for the planting of street trees within the pavement of Parsloes Avenue in front of the site, as shown on drawing No. A1013/2.1/PL 2000 Rev. B, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved vehicular access and planting arrangements for each Phase shall be completed prior to the occupation of that Phase.

Reason: To ensure the provision of a satisfactory access to the development in
the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policy BR10 of the

32. No development shall commence within either Phase (as shown on
including any works of demolition, until an Employment and Skills Strategy
applicable to the construction of that Phase has been submitted to the Local
Planning Authority for approval in writing. The Strategy shall promote
employment opportunities for, and encourage job applications from, local
people and businesses related to the construction. In particular, work
experience opportunities for young people 18-24 years should be included in
the Strategy. Any skills training opportunities should also be considered and
incorporated if possible. The approved Strategy shall be implemented for each
Phase in partnership with the Council’s Employment and Skills Team.

Reason: Details are required prior to commencement in order to encompass
the full range of site work to be carried out including demolition, and the
strategy is required in order to contribute to the local economy and local
residents in need of employment and in accordance with the principles within
policy CC3 of the Core Strategy.

33. Approval of details of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale (The
‘Reserved Matters’) of Phase 2 of the proposed development (as shown on
A1013/2.1/PL 2001 Rev. B) shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority
in writing before the development of Phase 2 is commenced.

Reason: The application is in outline only, and these details remain to be
submitted and approved, and are required prior to commencement.

34. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local
Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this
outline permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act
1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase
Act 2004).

35. Phase 2 of the development hereby permitted (as shown on drawing No.
A1013/2.1/PL 2001 Rev. B) shall be begun before the expiration of two years
from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved for
Phase 2.

Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act
1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase
Act 2004).

36. The siting, scale and massing of the buildings within Phase 2 (as shown on
drawing No. A1013/2.1/PL 2001 Rev. B) shall not materially depart from the
indicative drawings submitted for Phase 2 listed below; including that the
maximum height of buildings fronting Cornwallis and Hobart Roads shall be 3
storeys (excepting access doors to the roof, and a four storey element at the
corner of Parsloes Avenue and Cornwallis Road as shown on drawing No.
A1013/2.2/PL2004 Rev. B) and 4 storeys fronting Parsloes Avenue, and the
minimum set back of the building frontage from the site boundaries shall not materially depart from that shown on drawing No. A1013/2.1/PL 2000 Rev. B.

Drawing Nos:
A1013/2.2/PL2001 Rev. B
A1013/2.2/PL2002 Rev. B
A1013/2.2/PL2003 Rev. B
A1013/2.2/PL2004 Rev. B
A1013/2.2/PL2005 Rev. B
A1013/2.2/PL2006 Rev. B
A1013/2.2/PL2007 Rev. B
A1013/2.2/PL2012

Reason: In order to ensure that the scale of the development does not detract from the character of the area and to protect the amenities of neighbouring residents and in accordance with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

37. The reserved matters application in respect of Phase 2 of the development shall be accompanied by the submission of a development viability assessment that shall demonstrate the optimisation of the provision of sub-market (affordable) housing within this Phase, which may also have regard to the impact on the viability of the overall scheme caused by the delivery of Phase 1 community centre.

Reason: Insufficient detail has been provided with the outline application, and in order to allow an up to date assessment of market conditions at the time of the reserved matters application, and in accordance with policy BC1 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 3.12 of the London Plan.

38. All residential units within Phase 2 shall be designed to achieve the minimum internal and external space standards set out within policy 3.5 of the London Plan and the ‘nationally described space standard’ and the London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG).

Reason: In order to ensure a good standard of accommodation for future residents and in accordance with policy 3.5 of the London Plan and the Housing SPG.

Reason: In order to contribute to housing need and to contribute to the creation of a mixed and balanced community and in accordance with policy 3.8 of the London Plan.

39. Prior to any above ground development within Phase 2 of the development (as shown on drawing No. A1013/2.1/PL 2001 Rev. B) details shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority of the location and unit type of a minimum of 3 residential units within the Phase to be constructed to achieve Building Regulation M4 (3) ‘Wheelchair user dwellings’ standards. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that accessible housing is provided in accordance policy BC2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document
and policy 3.8 of the London Plan. Minor variations may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

40. Aside from the ‘Wheelchair user dwellings’ the subject of condition 40, all remaining Phase 2 residential units hereby permitted shall be constructed to achieve Building Regulation M4 (2) ‘Accessible and adaptable dwellings’ standards.

Reason: To ensure that accessible housing is provided in accordance policy BC2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 3.8 of the London Plan. Minor variations may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

41. Prior to any above ground development of Phase 2 of the hereby permitted development (as shown on drawing No. A1013/2.1/PL 2001 Rev. B) details shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority of the layout and allocation of the Phase 2 car parking spaces, designed to provide a minimum of 23 off street car parking spaces, including a minimum of 3 accessible parking spaces, and bays served by electric vehicle charging points in accordance with London Plan standards. The approved parking arrangement shall be constructed, marked out, and thereafter permanently maintained for the purpose of general parking, accessible parking, and electric vehicle parking for the use of residents and visitors to the site prior to occupation of Phase 2.

Reason: To ensure and promote easier access for disabled persons, to ensure sufficient off-street parking, and to encourage the use of electric cars in order to reduce carbon emissions, and in accordance with policies BC2, BR9 and BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 6.13 of the London Plan.

42. No above ground development shall take place within Phase 2 of the development (as shown on drawing No. A1013/2.1/PL 2001 Rev. B) until the submission to and approval by the Local Planning Authority of details of the proposed cycle parking. The approved cycle parking shall be installed prior to occupation of the Phase and thereafter maintained.

Reason: In the interests of promoting cycling as a sustainable and non-polluting mode of transport and in accordance with policy BR11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

43. No above ground development shall take place within Phase 2 of the development (as shown on drawing No. A1013/2.1/PL 2001 Rev. B) until the submission to and approval by the Local Planning Authority of details of the proposed refuse storage enclosures. The approved refuse storage shall be installed prior to occupation of the Phase and thereafter maintained.

Reason: To provide satisfactory refuse storage provision in the interests of the appearance of the site and locality in accordance with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

44. The workshop/life skills training centre hereby approved shall be utilised only in an ancillary capacity to the Kingsley Hall community centre, and any employment skills training undertaken shall be restricted to activities that would
otherwise fall within Use Class B1 of the Use Classes Order, i.e. uses which can be carried out in any residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area by reason of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust or grit.

Reason: In order to prevent any nuisance to existing neighbouring occupiers and future occupiers of the residential development and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

45. No above ground development shall take place within Phase 2 of the development (as shown on drawing No. A1013/2.1/PL 2001 Rev. B) until the submission to and approval by the Local Planning Authority of an energy strategy that is designed to achieve a minimum 35% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions over Part L of the Building Regulations (2013). The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure compliance with the proposed energy strategy in accordance with Policy 5.2 of the London Plan and Policy BR2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

58. 759 Becontree Avenue, Dagenham- 16/00633/FUL

The Development Management Manager introduced a report on the application relating to 759 Becontree Avenue, Dagenham. The application site was a mid-terrace property located on the northern side of Becontree Avenue, Dagenham. The ground floor unit is occupied by a newsagent/convenience store, the first floor and roof space above comprises of a 2-bedroom flat split over 2 levels. The application sought permission for the erection of a ground floor extension at the rear of the shop and extensions to the upper floor levels in order to convert the 2-bedroom flat into two separate 1 bedroom flats. An external staircase located in the rear service yard was proposed to provide separate access to the flats above.

The proposed development also included alterations to the external rear façade. The premises formed one of a tight cluster of buildings characterised by disjointed rear elevations with little design merit. As such the proposal would have little impact on the character and appearance of the area.

Each of the flats accords with the Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standards (March 2015) as reflected in the Housing Standards of the London Plan March 2016.

The application did not make any provision for access to amenity space, however, it was common for flats above shops not to benefit from such amenity space and in these circumstances the lack of such provision was considered to be acceptable. The existing 2 bedroom flat did not benefit from any outdoor space.

There was no existing or proposed off-street parking provision for this development. This was not, per se, contrary to policy, and given the moderate public transport accessibility level (PTAL) rating for the site and the minor
nature of the proposal which is unlikely to generate much, if any, parking demand the absence of off-street parking is considered to be acceptable.

The Board granted planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1) The development permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
   
   Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by S.51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004)

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: F7-01, F7-02, F7-03, F7-04, F7-05, F7-06, F7-07, F6-08, F7-12
   
   Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.

3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.
   
   Reason: To ensure the development respects the appearance of the existing property and to maintain the amenity of the area in accordance with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

59. Town Planning Appeals

The Board noted details of the following appeals:

Appeals Lodged

The following appeals have been lodged:

None.

Appeals Determined

The following appeals have been determined by the Planning Inspectorate:

   a) Enforcement appeal – Unauthorised construction of rear extension – 143 New Road, Dagenham (River Ward)

   Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 21 December 2016 (see attached).

   b) Enforcement appeal – Unauthorised change of use of single family dwellinghouse to a house in multiple occupation – 10 Wilthorne Gardens, Dagenham (Village Ward)

   Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 19 December
2016.

c) Use of single dwelling as house in multiple occupation - 10 Wilthorne Gardens, Dagenham (Ref: 15/01444/FUL – Village Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 27 January 2016 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would result in the loss of a 5 bedroom family house to the detriment of the stock of family housing in the borough, contrary to policy BC4 of the Borough wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

2. The proposed development, by virtue of the intensification of the existing single dwellinghouse use, would lead to a material increase in levels of noise and disturbance to the detriment of the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to policy BP8 of the Borough wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

3. The proposed development would exacerbate existing car parking pressure in Wilthorne Gardens, which is a narrow cul-de-sac, contrary to policies BR9 and BR10 of the Borough wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).


60. Delegated Decisions

The Board noted details of delegated decisions for the period 17 October-25 November 2016.

Minutes agreed as a true record.

Chair: ..............................................

Date: ..............................................
This page is intentionally left blank
Location of Site

Boleyn Garage, 87 Movers Lane, Barking
This page is intentionally left blank
Application No: 16/01353/FUL
Ward: Gascoigne

Reason for Referral to DCB as set out in Part 2, Chapter 9 of the Council Constitution:
The application is recommended for approval with five or more objections from local residents.

Address: Boleyn Garage, 87 Movers Lane, Barking

Development: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 3 storey building to provide 8 two bedroom flats together with associated cycle and refuse stores

Applicant: Plaistow Broadway Filling Stations

Contact Officer: Simon Bullock
Title: Principal Development Management Officer
Contact Details: Tel: 020 8227 3803
E-mail: simon.bullock@lbbd.gov.uk

Summary:
The proposed development involves the demolition of the existing motor repair garage and its replacement with a three storey L shape block of eight 2 bedroom flats.

The development would result in the loss of a small employment site but one that is poorly located in relation to its potential to impact adversely upon the amenities of immediately adjacent residents, and therefore the change in the use of the site is considered desirable and in accordance with the exceptions set out within policy CE3 of the Core Strategy.

The proposed flats would provide a good standard of accommodation with internal and external space that is in accordance with the requirements of the relevant planning policies.

The architecture and urban design is considered to be of good quality providing visual interest and responding well to the context of the surrounding street scene.

Recommendation:

That the Development Control Board grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. The development permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 16005 102 Rev. A; 16005 103 Rev. B; 16005 104 Rev. B and RP-PRE-
01. Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. No development above ground level shall take place until details/samples of all materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved materials.

Reason: To protect or enhance the character and amenity of the area in accordance with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

4. No development above ground level shall take place until a scheme of hard and soft landscaping for the site, including details of materials, species and a planting schedule have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The approved hard landscaping shall be carried out prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter permanently retained. The approved soft landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the building or completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the development is satisfactorily landscaped in order to improve the visual appearance of the area and in accordance with policies BR3 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Policies Development Plan Document.

5. No development above ground level shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the position, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The development shall not be occupied until the approved boundary treatment has been provided. The approved boundary treatment shall be retained unless the Local Planning Authority gives prior written approval for its removal.

Reason: To ensure the boundary treatment protects or enhances the character and amenity of the area in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

6. No development above ground level shall take place until a scheme showing the provisions to be made for external lighting, CCTV coverage, access control, and any other measures to reduce the risk of crime, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the approved scheme has been implemented. Thereafter the approved measures shall be permanently retained unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to provide a good standard of security to future occupants and visitors to the site and to reduce the risk of crime in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

7. The refuse and cycle storage enclosures indicated on drawing No. 16005 102 Rev A;
shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved and thereafter permanently retained for the use of the occupiers of the premises.

Reason: To provide satisfactory refuse storage provision in the interests of the appearance of the site and locality and to promote cycling as a sustainable and non-polluting mode of transport in accordance with policies BR11, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

8. Prior to the commencement of the development a scheme of highway works shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority that shall where feasible secure the provision of an additional on-street parking bay within Gordon Road, and that shall secure the vehicular access to the approved parking bays, and the re-instatement of existing obsolete dropped kerbs; the development shall not be occupied until the completion of the approved scheme.

Reason: Details are required prior to the commencement of the development in order to secure any necessary associated works to the highway to enable the provision of the dropped kerb, in the interests of highway and pedestrian safety and convenience and in view of the low level of on-site parking provision and in accordance with policy BR9 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

9. The car parking areas indicated on drawing No. 16005 102 Rev A; shall be constructed and marked out prior to the occupation of the development, and thereafter retained permanently for the accommodation of vehicles of occupiers and visitors to the premises and not used for any other purpose.

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 in accordance with policy BR9 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

10. Prior to the commencement of the development a drainage scheme that seeks to achieve the ‘green field’ rate of run off shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the completion of the approved scheme.

Reason: Details of the drainage scheme are required prior to commencement in order to secure any underground works required to reduce the risk of flooding and in accordance with policy BR4 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 5.13 of the London Plan.

11. An investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

(i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
(ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:

- human health,
- property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,
- adjoining land,
- groundwaters and surface waters,
- ecological systems,
- archaeological sites and ancient monuments;

(iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency’s ‘Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11’.

12. A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

13. The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

14. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of condition 11, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of condition 12, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for Conditions 11 to 14: Details are required prior to the commencement of development in order to ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors in accordance with Policy BR5 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.
15. Before occupation all of the flats shall comply with Building Regulations Optional Requirement Approved Document M4(2) Category 2: Accessible and adaptable dwellings (2015 edition). Evidence of compliance shall be notified to the building control body appointed for the development in the appropriate Full Plans Application, or Building Notice, or Initial Notice to enable the building control body to check compliance.

Reason: To ensure that accessible housing is provided in accordance with policy 3.8 of the London Plan.

1. Introduction and Description of Development

1.1 The site, Boleyn Garage, is a motor repair garage that lies at the junction of Movers Lane and Gordon Road.

1.2 The garage is currently occupied by a tenant of the landlord of the site, but the lease is due to expire shortly. It is understood that the tenant is currently undecided about whether to seek an alternative premises or to wind up the business.

1.3 The existing two storey, and one and a half storey buildings would be replaced by a three storey L shaped building that would front Movers Lane and Gordon Road with a small area of amenity space to the rear, and three undercroft parking spaces accessed from Gordon Road. The building would provide 8 two bedroom flats.

2. Background

2.1 The garage originally included a filling station and planning permission was granted in 1995 for continuation of the use of the filling station forecourt for vehicle sales.

3. Consultations

Adjoining occupiers

3.1 Letters were sent to 52 neighbouring residents, in response a petition in objection to the proposed development was received signed by 8 neighbouring individuals and families, objection on the grounds of loss of privacy, traffic congestion, and lack of parking.

Access Officer

3.2 No objections but recommends changes to the door opening arrangements to improve safety and asks why no lift is provided.

*Officer note: In response the applicant has made amendments to the proposed internal layout, and provided a statement prepared by a local surveyor that states that the provision of a lift is not considered financially viable because it would add a significant cost, and the maintenance cost would need to be passed on to future occupiers. Consequently the service charges for residents, for only 8 flats, would be significantly higher than the average for this area which is considered likely to put off potential buyers.*
Environmental Health

3.3 No comments received.

Historic England – Archaeology

3.4 The development is unlikely to affect heritage assets of archaeological interest and therefore no further assessment or conditions are necessary.

Lead Local Flood Authority

3.5 Concern is expressed that connecting additional dwellings to the existing surface water drains serving this area could exacerbate existing drainage capacity problems which has previously led to the flooding of Greatfields Park.

Officer note: Thames Water is responsible for the drains in question and has been made aware of the above comments. However, the body has not identified any issues with drainage capacity in the area, and has not raised any objection to the application.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

3.6 No objections.

Refuse Services

3.7 No comments.

Transport Development Management

3.8 No comments received.

Thames Water

3.9 In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage.

Officer note: A proposed condition addresses this point.

4. Local Finance Considerations

4.1 The proposed development would be liable for the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) at a rate of £20 per square metre (index linked from 2012) resulting in a charge of £7843.05 and the Borough CIL at a rate of £10 per square index linked from 2015 resulting in a charge of £3429.41.

5. Analysis

Principle of the Development
5.1 The lawful use of the site as a garage is an employment use, although it is not within an area of designated employment land, and policy CE3 of the Core Strategy generally seeks to protect such uses. However, the policy allows for exceptions in circumstances where continued use would cause disturbance to residential neighbours, and where there the site is no longer needed for employment purposes.

5.2 The applicant has submitted a report by a local property consultant in response to this issue, that states there is limited demand for such sites, a vehicle related use is likely to cause residential disturbance, the building cannot easily be converted to an alternative employment use, and refers to the wide availability of other more suitable sites for industrial activities in other parts of the Borough.

5.3 The existing garage, due to its longstanding nature, is not subject to any existing planning conditions in relation to matters as such as noise or hours of operation. It is not known whether the previous occupier did cause disturbance to neighbours but this lack of control over the potential impacts of industrial use of the site could result in harm to amenity by a future occupier.

5.4 Given the above considerations it is considered desirable that the employment use should cease and the proposed residential use is appropriate in this location.

5.5 The residential density of the proposal would be 60 units per hectare (u/ha), and this falls within the density recommended by policy 3.4 of the London Plan of between 45–170 u/ha for a site of this nature.

5.6 The proposed tenure is 100% private because at 8 units the scheme falls below the threshold of 10 units where a proportion of affordable housing is required by London Plan policy.

Design

5.7 The three storey building would generally have flat roofs roughly at the same height as the ridge height of the adjacent two storey terrace houses. The exception is the eastern end of the Gordon Road elevation which would have a pitched roof roughly aligning with that of the adjacent end of terrace house, No. 1 Gordon Road. There would be a gap of 1m between the flank walls of the building and the adjacent terraced houses at No. 89 Movers Lane and No. 1 Gordon Road.

5.8 First and second floor inset balconies at the corner would help add visual prominence to the corner.

5.9 The design would be contemporary with large windows, inset balconies, and roof terraces. The front elevation facing Movers Lane would be visually divided into two bays by the entrance and stair core in the middle of this elevation and the fact that the front elevation being stepped.

5.10 The Gordon Road elevation is also articulated with a series of small steps in its street elevation designed to create a vertical emphasis and rhythm that is reflective of the surrounding two storey terrace houses.
The proposed materials are predominantly brick with elements of corten steel, frameless glass balustrades to balconies, and silver/grey window frames. Corten steel is a group of steel alloys which form a stable rust-like appearance.

The Gordon Road elevation includes an open partially recessed area at ground level providing undercroft parking. Whilst such recesses are not ideal in relation to security and crime prevention the depth of the recess is not excessive given the set back from the main elevation of the first floor of the building at this point. The area would also be relatively easily viewed from Gordon Road thereby providing natural surveillance. It would not be practical to provide gates in front of the parking spaces. Good quality lighting can be provided and on balance it is considered that this aspect of the design is acceptable taking account of the above considerations.

The design is considered to be of good quality and to respond well to the site context. The development would result in a major improvement to the appearance of the street scene when compared with the existing buildings on the site. The existing site is poorly maintained and comprises a two storey flat roofed building set back from the site frontage, with the forecourt dominated by car parking, and a workshop to the rear. The existing buildings are also covered in a proliferation of signage.

The proposed building would be set further forward towards Movers Lane relative to the existing building. The resulting development would follow the established Movers Lane front building line. This siting enables the building to create a focal point at the Movers Lane/Gordon Road junction.

Amenity

Each proposed flat is designed to meet the London Plan standards for internal space, bedroom dimensions and storage space, and each proposed flat has private external amenity space to meet the standards set out within the London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance. Additionally a communal landscaped amenity space would be provided to the rear of the building.

The two ground floor flats would both have a small private terrace at the front of the building facing Movers Lane and Flat 2 would additionally have a private amenity area to the rear, backing onto the communal garden. These spaces are designed to provide a degree of privacy without resulting in a blank frontage onto the main road, in the form of a brick boundary wall at a height of 0.7m with piers up to 1.5m in height, with metal railings between piers and shrub planting adjacent to the wall. Flat 1 would have bedroom windows and kitchen/dining room window facing onto Gordon Road 0.6m from the back edge of the pavement. It is considered that the proposed railing along the boundary line, defensive planting, and use of relatively high window cill heights would serve to provide an acceptable degree of privacy for the future occupiers of this unit.

All flats are designed to meet Building Regulations M4(2) accessibility standards in accordance with London Plan policy and all flats are dual aspect.

In relation to the privacy of neighbouring residents the first and second floor rear windows of the Gordon Road wing of the building would face towards the rear garden of the neighbouring dwelling at No. 89 Movers Lane at its adjoining
neighbours. For the most part these windows serve non habitable rooms (hall and bathroom) though there is one window on each floor that serves a kitchen/dining room. In addition the first floor flat kitchen/dining room opens onto a small balcony at the rear. The distance from this rear elevation to the nearest part of the garden of No. 89 is 7.5m.

5.19 The kitchen/dining room windows referred to above would face towards the rear part of this adjacent garden. The balcony would have a screen to each side that is designed to hinder direct overlooking from the balcony towards the rear windows of No. 89. The garden of this house also has a large tree at the end of the garden with a large canopy that provides a degree of screening. Taking account of the above factors it is considered that the proposed development would not cause an unacceptable loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers.

5.20 In relation to bulk it is considered that the proposed development would have a lesser impact on the neighbour at No. 89 than does the existing development. This is because the existing 2 storey building on the site is sited slightly to the rear of this adjoining end of terrace house, and the existing 1 ½ storey building is positioned on the boundary between the site and the rear garden of the above house. This building extends the whole length of the rear garden.

5.21 By comparison the proposed 3 storey building would follow the rear building line of the existing adjacent terrace within Movers Lane, and there would be no building adjacent to the side garden boundary of No. 89 as at present. This part of the site would be utilised as a communal amenity space.

5.22 As referred to above in relation to privacy, the Gordon Road wing of the building would be 7.5m from the nearest part of the garden of No. 89. This element is also to the north-west of the neighbour and therefore would not have any significant impact on sunlight, and this relationship is considered acceptable.

5.23 The proposed development would extinguish the existing industrial lawful use of the site which has the potential to cause harm to residential amenity by way of noise and fumes.

Transport

5.24 The site has a moderate Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 3. PTAL is measured on a scale of 0 to 6, where 6 is excellent.

5.25 The site is within a controlled parking zone that restricts on street parking to residential permit holders between the hours of 8am to 9pm Monday to Saturday.

5.26 It is proposed that 3 partially undercroft parking spaces would be provided, one of these being an accessible space. These would be accessed from Gordon Road. There would therefore be 5 new flats without any off street parking space.

5.27 A new widened dropped kerb would be installed to serve these parking spaces. In addition some existing dropped kerbs on other parts of the site would be re-instated with a raised kerb. It appears that the net effect would be to create space for one additional car to park on the street without blocking any access. However, that
potential parking space would be on a single yellow line and therefore only usable outside the hours of the CPZ restriction set out above, so may be of limited benefit.

5.28 It may be possible that an additional formal on street parking bay could be created in this location in place of the current single yellow line. This requires further investigation as part of a highway scheme that will need to be submitted pursuant to a condition.

5.29 It is considered likely that the expiry of the existing use would have some impact on reducing parking demand on street resulting from customers of the garage, given the tightly constrained nature of the site with limited on-site car parking.

5.30 There is limited on street parking availability within Movers Lane, though there are some designated pavement parking bays, although not immediately adjacent to the site. Within Gordon Road there are designated on street parking spaces on both sides of the road, and the parking demand does not appear to be excessive, this may be partly explained by the fact that on the north side of the road it is mainly rear gardens that adjoin the road.

5.31 The applicant has also submitted a ‘parking stress’ survey, that is a night time survey on two occasions of the number of cars parked on the surrounding streets on a weekday during term time, in order to assess the maximum on street parking demand. The outcome showed that within this CPZ zone up to 70% of available on street parking spaces were in use leaving a total of 66 on street car parking spaces which were available.

5.32 Having regard to the above considerations it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause parking congestion that would be harmful to highway safety or the amenities of neighbours, and the proposed parking provision would be in accordance with London Plan policy which sets a maximum parking ratio for developments of this type of 1 for 1 parking.

5.33 Covered cycle parking would be provided sized to accommodate two cycles per flat in accordance with London Plan standards.

Environmental Sustainability

5.34 The use of the site as a garage results in the need for land remediation in order to ensure that there are no harmful contaminants within the development site that could affect future residents. A planning condition is imposed in order to secure this in accordance with the Environmental Health Officer’s advice.

5.35 A flood risk assessment has been submitted including details of a proposed sustainable drainage scheme incorporating underground water storage tanks, and it is stated that the scheme is designed to ensure that the rate of surface water run off does not exceed that of the existing use. However, the London Plan policy requirement is that the drainage scheme should be designed to achieve the ‘green field’ rate of surface water run off or where this is not possible to at least achieve a reduction in the rate of run off. It is therefore proposed that a condition be imposed to secure the implementation of a revised drainage scheme that is in accordance with this policy.
5.36 The proposed layout of the development allows for some areas of soft landscaping where there are none at present. This has the potential to contribute to a reduction in the rate of surface water run-off and to enhance biodiversity. However, in order to properly test this a detailed assessment will be required as set out above.

5.37 With reference to energy, as a minor application, there is no planning policy requirement in relation to the building’s energy performance. However, the applicant has voluntarily submitted an energy statement indicating the proposal to install an array of 16 solar panels on the roof of the building, that together with improved building fabric, would result in a carbon emissions reduction (relative to the minimum requirements of the Building Regulations) of 19.6%.

Background Papers

- Planning Application File: [http://paplan.lbbd.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=OCJ0TTBLHQ500](http://paplan.lbbd.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=OCJ0TTBLHQ500)

- Local Plan Policy

  - Policy CM1  General Principles for Development
  - Policy CE3  Safeguarding and Release of Employment Land
  - Policy CR4  Flood Management
  - Policy BR3  Greening the Urban Environment
  - Policy BR4  Water Resource Management
  - Policy BR5  Contaminated Land
  - Policy BR9  Parking
  - Policy BR10 Sustainable Transport
  - Policy BR11  Walking and Cycling
  - Policy BC7  Crime Prevention
  - Policy BP3  Archaeology
  - Policy BP8  Protecting Residential Amenity
  - Policy BP10  Housing Density
  - Policy BP11  Urban Design

- London Plan Policy

  - Policy 3.4  Optimising housing potential
  - Policy 3.5  Quality and design of housing developments
  - Policy 3.8  Housing choice
  - Policy 5.12  Flood risk management
  - Policy 5.13  Sustainable drainage
  - Policy 6.13  Parking

- National Policy

  National Planning Policy Framework
  National Planning Practice Guidance
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AGENDA ITEM 5

Land to the West of the Junction of Church Lane and Siviter Way.
Application No: 16/01408/FUL  Ward: Village Ward

Reason for Referral to DCB as set out in Part 2, Chapter 9 of the Council Constitution:
The proposed development is an application which has been requested by Ward Members to be determined by the Development Control Board.

Address:
Land to the west of the junction of Church Lane and Siviter Way, Dagenham.

Development:
Erection of two terraces of 2 storey houses with roof accommodation to provide 9 three and four bedroom houses.

Applicant:
Secureland Developments Plc

Contact Officer:
Nelupa Malik  Title: Principal Development Management Officer  Contact Details:
Tel: 020 8227 3888  E-mail: nelupa.malik@lbbd.gov.uk

Summary:
The application site comprises a 0.16 hectare area of informal open space located on the northern side of Siviter Way, Dagenham. The land is located between the junctions of Siviter Way with St Giles Avenue and Church Lane, Dagenham.

The land is currently owned by the Council which has entered into an agreement to sell to the applicant subject to planning permission.

The site is adjacent to, but not within, the Dagenham Village Conservation Area and is not designated as protected open space. Therefore the proposed residential development of the site is policy compliant and acceptable in principle.

The development relates to the erection of 4 x three bedroom houses and 5 x four bedroom houses. The proposal will comprise two separate terraces fronting St Giles Avenue and Church Lane respectively.

The proposed design and layout is considered to be of a satisfactory quality and responsive to neighbouring buildings and adjoining residential occupiers.

The scale, form and massing of the development would be acceptable and would not detract from the character of the street scene and surrounding area or impact on neighbouring residential amenities.

All the dwellings meet the London Plan space standards in terms of gross internal floor area, bedroom size and in-built storage provision. Each dwelling will also meet the Council’s policy with regards to minimum private amenity space.
One objection has been received as a result of the public consultation exercise raising concerns with regards to the loss of the amenity green and overdevelopment of the area generally. However, it is considered that the loss of this informal space, would not undermine local plan policies. Similarly the existence of other housing developments in the vicinity eg the redevelopment of the former Butterkist factory and the Telephone Cables sports ground, does not preclude the redevelopment of this site.

The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 2 which is low. The proposal would provide each dwelling with an off-street car parking space, of which two spaces would comprise private motor garages accessed from Siviter Way. This is an acceptable level of off-street parking provision. The development would require new vehicular access points from St Giles Avenue, Siviter Way and Church Lane. All new access points have been considered to be acceptable by the Transport Development Management Team.

The applicant has agreed to a contribution of £5,000 for the implementation of double yellow lines along one side of Siviter Way together with the costs of the associated Traffic Management Order. This will ensure that the development does not result in any material increase in on-street parking pressures within the locality which could adversely affect highway safety.

**Recommendation:**

That the Development Control Board grant planning permission subject to the conclusion of a Section 106 agreement securing the payment to the Council of £5,000 for the cost of making an appropriate Traffic Management Order to allow the implementation of double yellow lines in the vicinity and the following conditions:

1. The development permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
   
   Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans; 467/16-01 Rev A, 467/16-02, 467/16-03 Rev B, 467/16-04 Rev B, 467/16-05 Rev B, 467/16-06 Rev A.

   Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. No above ground development shall take place until details/samples of all materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved materials.

   Reason: To protect or enhance the character and amenity of the area in accordance with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

4. Before occupation, the dwellings shall comply with Building Regulations Optional Requirement Approved Document M4(2) Category 2: Accessible and adaptable dwellings (2015 edition). Evidence of compliance shall be notified to the building control body appointed for the development in the appropriate Full Plans
Application, or Building Notice, or Initial Notice to enable the building control body to check compliance.

Reason: To ensure that accessible housing is provided in accordance with policy 3.8 of the Housing Standards to the London Plan March 2016.

5. No development above ground level shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping for the site, which shall include indications of all existing trees and shrubs on the site and details of those to be retained.

Reason: To safeguard and improve the appearance of the area in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

6. The landscaping scheme as approved in accordance with condition No. 5; shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of any of the buildings or completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To secure the provision and retention of the landscaping in the interests of the visual amenity of the area and in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

7. No development above ground level shall take place until a scheme showing those areas to be hard landscaped and the details of that hard landscaping have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme as approved shall be carried out prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter permanently retained.

Reason: To safeguard and improve the appearance of the area in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

8. The car parking areas indicated on drawing No. 467/16-03 Rev B; shall be constructed and marked out prior to the occupation of the development, and thereafter retained permanently for the accommodation of vehicles of occupiers and visitors to the premises and not used for any other purpose.

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 in accordance with policy BR9 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

9. No development above ground level shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the position, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. No part of the development shall be occupied until the approved boundary treatment for that
part has been provided. The approved boundary treatment shall be retained unless the Local Planning Authority gives prior written approval for its removal.

Reason: To ensure the boundary treatment protects or enhances the character and amenity of the area in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

10. An investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

a. a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;

b. an assessment of the potential risks to:
   i. human health,
   ii. property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,
   iii. adjoining land,
   iv. groundwaters and surface waters,
   v. ecological systems,
   vi. archaeological sites and ancient monuments;

c. an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

d. This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency’s ‘Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11’.

11. A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

12. The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

13. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.
14. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of condition 10 and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of condition 11 which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

15. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for Conditions 10-15: Contamination must be identified prior to commencement of development to ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors in accordance with policy BR5 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 5.21 of the London Plan.

16. Demolition and construction work and associated activities are only to be carried out between the hours of 0800 to 1800 on Monday to Friday and 0800 to 1300 on Saturday and not at all on Sundays, Public or Bank Holidays without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority. Any works which are associated with the generation of ground borne vibration are only to be carried out between the hours of 0800 and 1800 Monday to Friday unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed construction work does not cause undue nuisance and disturbance to neighbouring properties at unreasonable hours and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

17. Construction work and associated activities are to be carried out in accordance with the recommendations contained within British Standard 5228:2009 ‘Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites’ (Parts 1 and 2).

Reason: To reduce the environmental impact of the construction and to ensure that the proposed construction work does not cause undue nuisance and disturbance to neighbouring properties and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

18. No development shall commence, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These plans shall incorporate details of:

a. construction traffic management;
b. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
c. loading and unloading of plant and materials;
d. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;

e. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding(s) including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;

f. wheel washing facilities;

g. measures to control the emission of dust, dirt and emissions to air during construction; such measures to accord with the guidance provided in the document “The Control of Dust and Emissions during construction and demolition”, Mayor of London, July 2014; including but not confined to, non road mobile machinery (NRMM) requirements.

h. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;

i. the use of efficient construction materials;

j. methods to minimise waste, to encourage re-use, recovery and recycling, and sourcing of materials; and a nominated Developer/Resident Liaison Representative with an address and contact telephone number to be circulated to those residents consulted on the application by the developer’s representatives. This person will act as first point of contact for residents who have any problems or questions related to the ongoing development.

Reason: The construction environmental management plan and site waste management plan are required prior to commencement of development in order to reduce the environmental impact of the construction and the impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents, and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

19. No development shall take place until details of existing and finished site levels, finished floor and ridge levels of the buildings to be erected, and finished external surface levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The proposed levels of the development are required prior to commencement in order to ensure that any works in connection with the development hereby permitted respect the height of adjacent properties and in accordance with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

1. Introduction and Description of Development

1.1 The site is a 0.163 hectare area of grassland/amenity green located on the northern side of Siviter Way, Dagenham.

1.2 Whilst not within, the north-west tip of the site in Church Lane is adjacent to the Dagenham Village Conservation Area. The surrounding area is predominately residential and the land is located between St Giles Avenue to the west and Church Lane to the east, both are residential roads of two storey houses. The southern boundaries of numbers 20 St Giles Avenue and 18 Church Lane bound the northern boundary of the site.

1.3 This application relates to the erection of two terraces of two storey houses with roof accommodation to provide 4 x three bedroom houses and 5 x four bedroom
houses. The three bedroom dwellings will front St Giles Avenue (facing west) and the four bedroom dwellings Church Lane (facing east).

1.4 The development will comprise two dwelling typologies with the dwellings fronting St Giles Avenue comprising a kitchen, WC, and living/dining room at ground floor level, two bedrooms and a bathroom at first floor level and a master bedroom with an en suite in the roofspace. The dwellings fronting Church Lane will comprise a kitchen, WC, and living/dining room at ground floor level, three bedrooms at first floor level and a master bedroom with an en suite in the roofspace.

2. Background

2.1 The site has no planning history.

3. Consultations

3.1 Adjoining occupiers

52 neighbouring occupiers were notified about the application during the public consultation exercise and site notices were displayed within the vicinity of the site. One response has been received raising the following objections and concerns;

- The area has already been over developed over the years eg the redevelopment of the former Butterkist factory in Blackborne Road and the Telephone Cables sports ground in Exeter Road.
- The site and the adjacent green land are the last greenery in an area of urban over development.
- During the redevelopment of the Dagenham Village area in the 1970’s, the works resulted in destruction leaving only three of the original village buildings untouched.
- The continuation of this kind of development has carried on unabated.

Officer Note: The existence of other housing developments within the area does not preclude new developments from occurring, provided that they are in accordance with local plan policies. Matters relating to the loss of the green space are considered in the main body of this report.

3.2 Transport Development Management

The current Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating has been determined at a level 2, on a scale of 1 to 6 where 6 is excellent.

We are satisfied with the layout shown is acceptable to us in terms of access and parking arrangement, with a 1:1 provision ratio. However, we have the following additional observations;

The junctions of Siviter Way with St Giles Avenue and Church Lane will require the implementation of double yellow line restrictions to protect against illegal/inconsiderate parking causing obstruction. This measure is also to be applied at the vehicular crossovers in Siviter Way in order to protect clear visibility splays without obstruction. This could be by way of a S106 contribution.
Any part of adopted highway which requires to be stopped by an order will need to be arranged for by the applicant.

Pedestrian crossing points which may need relocation/alteration will require our approval as to their new location.

*Officer Note: Transport matters are considered in the main report.*

3.3 Access Team

We are generally happy with the proposals but have a couple of issues that we would like addressed.

Provide outward opening bathroom doors.

A minimum of 850mm clear stair width must be provided to allow for future lift provision.

*Officer Note: The submitted plans have been revised addressing comments made by the Access Team.*

3.4 Environmental Protection Team

A comprehensive report has been provided covering potential land contamination and construction phase impacts – noise and dust and other emissions to air. The Environmental Health Officer has no objections to the proposal based on the following summarised comments;

A review of historical maps indicates this is a Greenfield site. The geological maps indicate the superficial deposits to be sand and gravel and solid geology London Clay. By reference to BS 8576:2013, “Guidance on investigations for ground gas – Permanent gases and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)”, the potential for gas generation is very low (natural soil strata with a low degradable organic content) and so the advice in the standard is that soil gas monitoring may not be needed.

There is no evidence to suggest a likelihood of historical chemical contamination and a very low risk of a ground gas generation.

However, the development includes dwellings with private gardens which raises the potential for the growing and consumption of home grown produce. This represents a highly sensitive land use.

In view of the above, and after careful consideration, it is considered necessary to attach the standard land contamination planning conditions to any consent that might be granted.

There is potential for significant adverse impact from demolition/construction phase noise, dust and other emissions to air and so it is recommend that any approval that might be granted be subject to conditions limiting the hours of construction work and requiring the mitigation of dust and emissions in accordance guidance provided in the document “The Control of Dust and Emissions during construction and demolition”, Mayor of London, July 2014.
3.5 **Historic England**

The proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of archaeological interest.

3.6 **London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority**

The Brigade is satisfied with the proposals.

4. **Local Finance Considerations**

4.1 The proposed development would be liable for the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) at a rate of £20 per square metre (index linked from 2012) and the Borough CIL at a rate of £10 per square metre (index linked from 2015). This would result in a total Mayoral contribution of £26,753.18 and a total Borough contribution of £11,697.96.

5. **Analysis**

5.1 **Principle of the development**

5.1.1 The site is not situated within the Green Belt and it is not designated as Protected Open Space.

5.1.3 The site provides a pleasant open outlook for its residential neighbours to the north and south which would be compromised as a result of this development. However, protecting views is not a relevant planning consideration.

5.1.4 The site is grassed and has very little in the way of trees and planting and is essentially an informal public amenity space. The space may have been used informally by local residents in the past, however, the proposal to redevelop the site would not be contrary to the Local Plan as this particular amenity area is afforded no specific protection under the Local Plan. A residential development would be the preferred use for a site of this nature, that is not located within a town centre and is not in an area of high public transport accessibility.

5.1.5 As the scheme comprises 9 units it is below the threshold of 10 above which London Plan policy 3.13 seeks the provision of affordable housing where viable. It is considered that the scheme maximises the use of the site and therefore it is in accordance with this policy.

5.2 **Layout and Design**

5.2.1 The layout of the development will comprise two short terraces fronting St Giles Avenue and Church Lane. The terrace fronting St Giles Avenue will continue the front building line of the adjacent terrace comprising numbers 10-20 St Giles Avenue. The terrace fronting Church Lane will be set back 3.2 metres from the front building line of the adjacent terrace comprising numbers 8-18 Church Lane. However, the existing terraces in both these streets have varied building lines.
5.2.2 The two terraces will create a ‘back to back’ relationship as per the existing residential dwellings in St Giles Avenue and Church Lane. Along this stretch of Siviter Way, there are no residential dwellings fronting the main road. Directly to the south and on the opposite side of Siviter Way, are the rear elevations of residential dwellings located in Wilthorne Gardens, Beech Gardens, and Boleyn Gardens. There are concrete boundary walls/timber fencing bounding the rear gardens of these properties visible along Siviter Way. Similarly, directly to the north west of the site, the rear elevations of two storey dwellings in St Giles Close face Siviter Way. These dwellings are however set behind a smaller piece of public grassland.

5.2.3 The site is in a visually prominent location and as such it is recognised that the location of dwellings fronting Siviter Way would have introduced active frontages to that street. However, to develop the site in this way would have resulted in dwellings with inadequate garden sizes and may have raised issues of overlooking and loss of privacy to existing residential occupiers.

5.2.4 The development would incorporate two domestic garages fronting Siviter Way which will break up the boundary walling along the southern boundary. The application of good quality boundary treatment would also help to maintain an attractive frontage onto Siviter Way. In this regard, Officers consider that the boundary treatment fronting Siviter Way should be in brickwork and pay acknowledgement to and be in keeping with boundary treatment of Dagenham Parish Church, immediately to the east of the site, which comprises a rustic brick wall of a dark yellow variety. If Members are minded to approve this application, this matter can be addressed via the imposition of a condition. Given the constraints of the site, the layout of the development is acceptable.

5.2.5 The scale, form and massing of the development is considered to be acceptable and will not impact on neighbouring amenities in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy or detract from the character of the area. The dwellings in St Giles Avenue will measure approximately 4.6 metres wide, 10.6 metres deep and 9.8 metres in overall height. The dwellings in Church Lane will measure approximately 5 metres wide, 10.4 metres deep and 9.8 metres in overall height. Both terraces would be an estimated 2 metres higher than the adjacent terraces.

5.2.6 The rear building line of the terrace in St Giles Avenue will be set behind a 45-degree angle from the nearest corner of number 20 St Giles Avenue (the test set out in the Council’s Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)). Although the proposed development does not relate to a residential extension, it is considered that the above guidance is of relevance to assessing the relationship of the proposed development with its neighbouring residential dwellings. Therefore, in this instance it is not considered to have any adverse impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of this dwelling.

5.2.7 With regards to the relationship between the terrace in Church Lane and number 18 Church Lane, the rear building line of the proposed terrace will project approximately 1.6 metres beyond a 45-degree angle from the nearest corner of the neighbouring property at ground floor level (which in this instance is a single storey rear extension).
However, the orientation of the proposed terrace with number 18 Church Lane will leave a physical separation of between approximately 1.2 – 1.4 metres between buildings which mitigates much of the impact.

In terms of the impact at first floor level, whilst the proposed terrace would project approximately 6 metres deeper than number 18 Church Lane, the nearest window closest to the boundary with the proposed development is a small and narrow window and does not appear to serve a habitable room. There is also a larger, presumably bedroom, window however this window is sited closer to the boundary with number 16 Church Lane. The gap between the proposed terrace and number 18 also mitigates any harm. On balance, it is therefore considered that the proposed relationship is acceptable and would not materially harm the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

In terms of the appearance of the buildings, the houses would generally have pitched roofs with gable ends. Windows at first floor level will measure 2 metres in height thus articulating a vertical emphasis to the dwellings. The variety of window shapes adds further interest. The materials proposed are in most part brick for the walls, slate grey coloured tiled roofs and grey UPVC window surrounds. The brick material will comprise TBS Rustington Antique, a good quality dark yellow textured brick with a darker brick for banding detail. It is also proposed to use the same brick for the boundary wall fronting Siviter Way. The full details of the materials would be the subject of a condition with details to be subsequently approved however broadly speaking the palette of materials proposed is considered to be acceptable.

Overall the development would be well proportioned, attractively laid out and would provide interest to the immediate locality and therefore accords with policies CP3 of the Core Strategy and policies BP11 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) which relate to urban design and seek to protect residential amenities.

Policy BP5 of the Borough Wide Development Policies seeks to ensure that appropriate external private amenity space to meet the needs generated by the development is provided. In this regard the development is required to provide a minimum of 60m² of private amenity space for the three bedroom dwellings and 75m² for the four bedroom dwellings.

Each dwelling will have its own private rear garden and the development has a whole will provide garden areas measuring between 77m² and 110m². The proposal therefore accords with the Council’s policies in respect of garden space.

In relation to internal space standards, the 3 bedroom 5 person dwellings will have a Gross Internal Area (GIA) of 108m² (99m² required) and have adequate sized bedrooms and storage space. The 4 bedroom 6 person dwellings will have a GIA of 123m² (112m² required) and have adequately sized and storage areas.

All the dwellings would therefore meet the standards set out within the Government’s ‘nationally described space standard’ and the London Plan (2016).
5.4.1 The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 2 which is low on a scale of 0 – 6b where 6b is excellent.

5.4.2 The proposed development would provide each dwelling with an off-street car parking space. All the dwellings, except for the end dwellings in each terrace closest to the junctions of St Giles Avenue and Church Lane with Siviter Way, would have a front garden parking space. The two end dwellings would have a garage each which would be accessed directly from Siviter Way.

5.4.3 The proposed off-street car parking provision is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the London Plan.

5.4.4 The Transport Development Management Team have considered the proposal and are satisfied that the layout, access and parking arrangements would be acceptable. Members are advised that a very small part of the site is adopted highway land and the proposal would require the stopping of this land in order to facilitate the development.

5.4.5 The applicant has also agreed to provide a contribution of £5,000 to implement double yellow lines on Siviter Way where there are currently no restrictions for on street car parking. The implementation of double yellow lines would improve highway safety, particularly as there is a bus stop on the opposite side of Siviter Way and it is important to keep the carriageway clear from parked vehicles.

6. Conclusion

6.1 The proposed development would result in well designed buildings of appropriate scale and relationship with neighbouring buildings, which would make good use of the site.

6.2 The scheme would protect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and provide a good standard of residential amenity for future occupiers.

6.3 The development will provide each dwelling with an off-street parking space and the applicant has agreed to make a contribution of £5,000 towards the implementation of a scheme to provide double yellow lines on Siviter Way.

Background Papers

- Planning Application File: http://paplan.lbbd.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=OD35RFBLJN200

- Local Plan Policy

  Policy CM1 General Principles for Development
  Policy CP3 High Quality Built Environment
  Policy BR9 Parking
  Policy BR10 Sustainable Transport
  Policy BC7 Crime Prevention
  Policy BP3 Archaeology
Policy BP5  External Amenity Space
Policy BP8  Protecting Residential Amenity
Policy BP11 Urban Design

- **London Plan Policy**

  Policy 3.4  Optimising Housing Potential
  Policy 3.5  Quality and Design of Housing Developments
  Policy 3.8  Housing Choice
  Policy 6.13 Parking

- **National Policy**

  National Planning Policy Framework
  National Planning Practice Guidance
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Land To The West Of The Junction Of Church Lane And Siviter Way
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SECTIONAL ELEVATION TO SIVITER WAY

FRONT ELEVATION TO CHURCH LANE TERRACE

REAR ELEVATION TO CHURCH LANE TERRACE

FRONT ELEVATION TO ST GILES AVENUE TERRACE.

REAR ELEVATION TO ST GILES AVENUE TERRACE.

New tiles from Harvest Herringbone roof tiles in Slate Grey.
All units have TMD finish at front entrance to all buildngs, with decorative Brindle door for street entrance.
All windows are black beams from grey Killarney brick.
Front doors have black, grey painted finish.
All stonework done from random stones located at chippings, protection areas from slate base pavers to flush thresholds.
### Barking and Dagenham Council Development Control Board

**Date:** 6 February 2017  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Application No.</strong></th>
<th>16/00131/OUT</th>
<th><strong>Ward:</strong> Thames</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for Referral to DCB as set out in Part 2, Chapter 9 of the Council Constitution</strong></td>
<td>The application is a strategic development which is of a scale and importance that should be determined at DCB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address:</strong></td>
<td>Barking Riverside, Renwick Road, Barking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development:</strong></td>
<td>Application for variation of all conditions following grant of planning permission 08/00887/FUL for the redevelopment of the site known as Barking Riverside.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>Barking Riverside Ltd (BRL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

This report asks members to agree two revisions to the outline permission they granted for Barking Riverside (ref 16/00131/OUT) on 27 July 2016.

The first is to amend the draft Section 106 Heads of Terms to introduce more flexibility to the delivery of the A13 (Renwick Road) scheme in the light of current progress with the replacement of the Lodge Avenue flyover and the A13 Riverside Tunnel and in the interests of ensuring an optimal scheme is delivered which meets the Council’s objectives.

The second is to allow for the revised Outline Planning Permission to be issued subject to the completion of the new Section 106 agreement and for the Deed of Variation to updated thereafter.

This is because the existing Section 106 legal agreement contains many obligations which apply to Stage 1 only but it also contains obligations which have been updated in the new Section 106 legal agreement and therefore it is necessary to remove these to avoid duplication. This is not a straightforward task and is likely to take several months.

This would enable work on the revised Outline Planning Permission to proceed (e.g. this will allow Barking Riverside Limited to submit the District Centre sub framework plan and the Site Wide Infrastructure Plan in March 2017 to the Council) whilst the Deed of Variation is worked on in parallel.

### Recommendation

That the Development Control Board agree to change the permission it granted for 16/00131/OUT as follows:

- Update the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms as set out in Appendix 1 to the report to 27 July 2016 Development Control Board to introduce more flexibility to the delivery of the A13 (Renwick Road) Scheme as follows:

  No more than 2500 homes to be occupied before payment of the A13
scheme contribution and 4000 before scheme open to the public. If at 2500 homes TfL confirm it cannot fund and undertake the works so that the scheme is open to the public by 4000 homes than in accordance with the evidence submitted by TfL a new limit of occupations will be agreed along with any necessary interim measures to enable the continued occupation of homes in accordance with the submitted phasing scheme and land disposal programme.

- Remove the requirement to grant permission for subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation to the existing legal agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Title: Acting Head of Regeneration and Planning (Planning)</th>
<th>Contact Details:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Pope</td>
<td>Tel: 020 82273929</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:daniel.pope@lbbd.gov.uk">daniel.pope@lbbd.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Introduction**

1.1 Planning permission was granted in August 2007 for outline planning permission for Barking Riverside (ref 08/00887/FUL). On 27 July 2016 Development Control Board (DCB) agreed changes to this outline permission (16/00131/OUT). This was necessary to take account of the fact that the original scheme was designed around the DLR extension not the London Overground extension. A new Section 106 agreement is being prepared to secure the Heads of Terms set out in Appendix 1 to the DCB report which was agreed on 27 July. It is expected this will be complete in February 2017.

1.2 This report updates the committee on two issues which have arisen since 27 July and which require changes to the decision that was made by DCB.

- Update the Heads of Terms set out in Appendix 1 to the report to 27 July Development Control Board to introduce more flexibility to the delivery of the A13 Renwick Road Scheme
- Remove the requirement to grant permission subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation to the existing legal agreement

2. **The A13 (Renwick Road) scheme**

2.1 The draft Section 106 Heads of Terms in the report to 27 July DCB included the obligation that no more than 2500 homes to be occupied before payment of A13 (Renwick Road) scheme contribution and 4000 before scheme open to the public. It also set out that the A13 (Renwick Road) scheme must:

- Be compatible with removal of the Renwick Road flyover
- Not prejudice the Riverside Tunnel
- Provide sufficient capacity to deal with the traffic generated by 10,800 homes but achieve the mode share set out in the Transport Strategy and S106
• Provide a north south link across the A13 to allow the proposed EL4 bus route and pedestrians and cyclists to get across the A13 and connect Barking Riverside with the rest of the Borough north of the A13

2.2 The delivery of the A13 (Renwick Road) scheme is complex. Improvements to the Renwick Road/A13 junction are necessary before 4000 homes are built to provide sufficient capacity to deal with the extra demand from these new homes. They are also necessary to provide a north south bus link across the A13 as set out in the Barking Riverside Bus Strategy.

2.3 However, DCB also agreed that the design of the A13 (Renwick Road) scheme must be compatible with the removal of the Renwick Road flyover and the potential A13 Riverside Tunnel.

2.4 The Council has been working in partnership with Transport for London on plans for the A13 Riverside Tunnel. This culminated in Transport for London submitting an outline business plan to the Treasury in February 2016.

2.5 In response to the Treasury’s positive feedback Transport for London has done more work on the detailed business case for the tunnel and the Council has been working to secure developer interest in this project.

2.6 The A13 is managed by Transport for London through a Design Build Finance Operate contract. This runs to 2030 and has delivered a number of improvements to the A13 since its inception including the Movers Lane underpass and the elevated A13 east of the Goresbrook Junction. The last improvement to be made under this contract is the like for like replacement of the Lodge Avenue flyover which RMS is contractually obliged to deliver by 2025.

2.7 The Council is concerned that the like for like replacement of the Lodge Avenue flyover is not compatible with the A13 Riverside Tunnel and also not the best solution for addressing this pinch point and improving traffic flow in this location particularly out of London. Therefore, the Council’s preferred option is for the flyover to be removed not replaced.

2.8 Since the decision on the flyover is inextricably linked with the Riverside Tunnel, Transport for London has agreed with RMS to delay the decision on the future of the Renwick Road flyover until summer 2017 by which time the deliverability of the tunnel will be clearer.

2.9 Until the future of the Renwick Road flyover and the A13 tunnel is clear it is not possible for Transport for London to settle on a preferred option for the A13 (Renwick Road) scheme. Therefore, Transport for London at this moment in time cannot provide sufficient confidence to BRL and the Council that the scheme will be open to the public before 4000 homes are occupied.

2.10 In response to this uncertainty officers recommend that some flexibility is built in to the S106 so it does not act as a brake on the delivery of new homes at Barking Riverside and gives Transport for London sufficient time to implement an optimal scheme which meets the objectives agreed by DCB on 27 July. Therefore, officers recommended a revised Heads of Terms for the A13 scheme as follows:
Existing wording agreed by 27 July DCB

- BRL to pay £5.4m contribution to A13 scheme, balance to be funded by TfL; and
  TfL to commit to its delivery
-
- No more than 2500 homes to be occupied before payment of the A13 scheme
  contribution and 4000 before scheme open to the public.

Recommended revised wording

- BRL to pay £5.4m contribution to A13 scheme, balance to be funded by TfL; and
  TfL to commit to its delivery
-
- No more than 2500 homes to be occupied before payment of the A13 scheme
  contribution and 4000 before scheme open to the public. If at 2500 homes TfL
  confirm it cannot fund and undertake the works so that the scheme is open to the
  public by 4000 homes than in accordance with the evidence submitted by TfL a
  new limit of occupations will be agreed along with any necessary interim
  measures to enable the continued occupation of homes in accordance with the
  submitted phasing scheme and land disposal programme.

2.15 The deed of variation to the existing Barking Riverside outline planning permission

2.16 The decision of 27 July 2016 DCB to grant permission was subject to:

- No direction from the Mayor of London
- The completion of a Deed of Variation to the existing legal agreement
- A new Section 106 legal agreement to secure the heads of terms outlined in the
  report
- Payment of the Local Planning Authority’s professional and legal fees associated
  with completion of the Deed of Variation and new Legal S106 agreement; and
- And the conditions set out in the report with any amendments that might be
  necessary up to the issue of the decision notice

2.17 No direction was received from the Mayor of London and as already outlined good
  progress has been made on the Section 106 which, subject to DCB agreeing the
  recommendation to revise the A13 (Renwick Road) obligation, should be complete in
  February. This means that the only impediment to issuing the decision for Barking
  Riverside will be the completion of a Deed of Variation to the existing Section 106
  legal agreement for the existing outline planning permission.

2.18 There is therefore a need to separate the resolution of 27 July 2016 to allow for the
  revised Outline Planning Permission to be issued subject to the completion of the
  new legal Section 106 agreement and for the Deed of Variation to updated thereafter.

2.19 This is because the existing Section 106 legal agreement contains many obligations
  which apply to Stage 1 only but it also contains obligations which have been updated
  in the new Section 106 legal agreement and therefore it is necessary to remove
these to avoid duplication. This is not a straightforward task and is likely to take several months.

2.20 In addition, there is merit in "de-coupling" the existing Section 106 legal agreement from the new Section 106 legal agreement as the existing Section 106 legal agreement will be varied by a deed of variation that will only relate to what has been built already and the new Section 106 legal agreement will apply to the rest of the land. The work on the revised Outline Planning Permission can therefore proceed (e.g. this will allow Barking Riverside Limited to submit the District Centre sub framework plan and the Site Wide Infrastructure Plan in March 2017 to the Council) whilst the Deed of Variation is worked on in parallel.

2.21 Therefore, to avoid delay in issuing the decision for the revised Outline Planning Permission officers recommend that permission is not subject to a Deed of Variation to the existing legal agreement but rather that this is completed separately.
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Summary:

This report advises Members of recent appeals that have been lodged and the outcomes of decisions made.

Recommendation(s)

The Development Control Board is asked to note this report.

1. Appeals Lodged

The following appeals have been lodged:

a) Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres) – 70 Hurstbourne Gardens, Barking (Ref: 16/00916/PRIOR6)

Application refused under delegated powers 21 July 2016 (Longbridge Ward).

b) Erection of two bedroom bungalow in garden – 44 Rugby Gardens, Dagenham (Ref: 16/00727/FUL)

Application refused under delegated powers 19 August 2016 (Mayesbrook Ward).

c) Erection of first floor side and rear extension and single storey front extension - 85 Lodge Avenue, Dagenham (Ref: 16/01084/FUL)

Application refused under delegated powers 13 October 2016 (Mayesbrook Ward).

d) Erection of bungalow – Land to rear of 225 Rush Green Road, Romford (Ref: 16/00653/FUL)
Application refused under delegated powers 8 July 2016 (Eastbrook Ward).

e) Demolition of single storey building and erection of three storey building comprising 10 dwellings – Land between 487 - 535A Rainham Road South, Dagenham (Ref: 16/00938/FUL)

Application refused under delegated powers 27 September 2016 (Eastbrook Ward).

2. Appeals Determined

2.1.1 The following appeals have been determined by the Planning Inspectorate:

a) Subdivision of house into 1 two bedroom and 1 three bedroom houses - 2 St Erkenwald Road, Barking (Ref: 16/00431/FUL – Abbey Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 17 May 2016 for the following reason:

1. The proposed external amenity space for both houses fails to meet the requirements of policy BP5 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and would be detrimental to the living standards and amenities enjoyed by future occupiers.

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 9 December 2016 (see attached)

b) Conversion of house into 2 two bedroom flats – 16 Gordon Road, Chadwell Heath (Ref: 16/00858/FUL – Whalebone Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 1 August 2016 for the following reasons:

1. The development has resulted in the loss of a family dwelling, further reducing the Borough’s existing stock of family housing contrary to Policy BC4 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

2. The development cannot provide sufficient off-street parking spaces and as such has resulted in an increase in existing parking pressures harmful to highway safety and contrary to Policies BR9 and BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and Policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2015.

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 18 January 2017 (see attached)

c) Erection of two storey side extension to provide new dwelling – 18 Martin Road, Dagenham (Ref: 16/00389/FUL – Mayesbrook Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 25 May 2016 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would cause harm to the appearance of the street scene by virtue of its scale, design and prominent siting on this corner plot contrary to Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development

2. The proposed development does not comply with policy 3.5 of the Minor Alterations to the London Plan (March 2016) and the Technical Housing Standards - nationally described space standards (March 2015) in that the potential second bedroom is too small and as such the house would fail to meet the space standards required for the potential number of occupants.

3. The proposed development fails to provide adequate amenity space for the proposed dwelling to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers contrary to Policy BP5 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

4. The proposed development would result in increased on-street parking demand within an area of poor public transport accessibility to the detriment of highway safety and the amenity of local residents contrary to Policies BR9 and BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 18 January 2017 (see attached)

d) Conversion of existing dwelling into 2 self-contained flats – 24 Salisbury Avenue, Barking (Ref: 16/00074/FUL – Abbey Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 4 April 2016 for the following reasons:

1. The conversion of the existing house to flats would result in the loss of a three bedroom family dwelling to the detriment of the stock of family housing in the borough and contrary to policy BC4 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

2. The development does not comply with policy 3.5 of the Minor Alterations to the London Plan (March 2016) and the Technical Housing Standards - nationally described space standards (March 2015) and as such the proposed flats would provide insufficient space for daily living detrimental to the living standards and amenities enjoyed by future occupiers.

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 16 January 2017 (see attached)

e) Erection of annexe in rear garden to provide independent living accommodation for disabled daughter - 25 Charlotte Road, Dagenham (Ref: 16/00550/FUL – Village Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 21 June 2016 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, due to its size and siting to the south of the neighbouring garden at 27 Charlotte Road, would appear overbearing and result in a loss of sunlight to the adjoining garden area to the detriment of the amenities of
neighbouring occupiers and contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

2. The proposed development, by reason of its siting and design would constitute an unacceptable form of backland development that would be harmful to the character of the area and out of keeping with the prevailing built form, contrary to Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy (July 2010), Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 20 December 2016 (see attached)

f) Erection of two storey two bedroom house – Land adjacent to 33 Braintree Road, Dagenham (Ref: 16/00751/FUL – Heath Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 27 July 2016 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by virtue of its scale, siting and location would represent inappropriate development of a residential garden and significantly close the gap between numbers 31 and 33 Braintree Road and as such would materially reduce the open and spacious character of the side garden of the application property and of the area, contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

2. The proposed new dwelling will be finished with a hipped roof which does not reflect the roof design of and would be out of character with the host dwelling and terrace and as such contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

3. The development cannot provide any off-street parking spaces and as such would result in an increase in existing on-street parking pressures harmful to highway safety and contrary to Policies BR9 and BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and Policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2015.

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 18 January 2017 (see attached)

g) Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof and rear dormer window – 42 Beccles Drive, Barking (Ref: 16/00760/FUL – Longbridge Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 19 July 2016 for the following reason:

1. The proposed hip to gable roof alteration would, by reason of its design, bulk and appearance, be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and disrupt the prevailing pattern of development in the street scene, contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011) and the Supplementary Planning Document for Residential Extensions and Alterations (February 2012).

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 20 December 2016 (see attached)
h) **Erection of single storey front and two storey side extension – 51 Melford Avenue, Barking (Ref: 16/00711/FUL – Longbridge Ward)**

Application refused under delegated powers 7 July 2016 for the following reason:

1. The proposed two storey side extension, by virtue of its gabled roof design and set back, would be incongruous and out of keeping with the street scene and original design of the host property and terrace and would partly close off an important gap within the street scene which provides relief from the built up nature of the street and would therefore fail to maintain the character of the area and be harmful to the street scene. The proposed development is contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011) and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012).

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 20 December 2016 (see attached)

i) **Construction of front dormer window - 78 Keir Hardie Way, Barking (Ref: 16/00880/FUL – Eastbury Ward)**

Application refused under delegated powers 8 August 2016 for the following reason:

1. The proposed front dormer window would look conspicuous and out of keeping in the streetscene, disrupting the rhythm and balance of the roofscape and would fail to protect the character of the area contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Local Plan (March 2011) and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (February 2012).

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 19 January 2017 (see attached)

j) **Conversion of single dwelling into 6 bedroom house in multiple occupation (retrospective) - 259 Valence Wood Road, Dagenham (Ref: 16/00028/FUL – Heath Ward)**

Application refused under delegated powers 29 March 2016 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would result in the loss of a family dwelling house to the detriment of the stock of family housing in the borough, contrary to Policy BC4 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

2. The proposed development, by virtue of the intensification of the existing residential dwelling, would lead to an unacceptable material increase in levels of noise and disturbance to the detriment of the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers, contrary to Policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

3. The non-provision of external amenity space for the proposed dwelling unit would result in a cramped and substandard unit of residential accommodation, detrimental to the amenities of the future inhabitants of the unit. The proposal is therefore
contrary to policy 3.5 of the London Plan, the DCLG Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard March 2015 and policy BP5 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD 2011.

4. In the absence of off-street parking provision, the proposed development would result in increased parking demand within an area of poor public transport accessibility to the detriment of highway safety and the amenity of local residents contrary to Policies BR9, BR10 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 24 January 2017 (see attached)
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2016

by David Hogger  BA MSc MRTPi MCIHT
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 09th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/16/3158216
2 St Erkenwald Road, Barking IG11 7XA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 16/00431/FUL, dated 21 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2016.
- The development proposed is to divide the existing dwelling by separating the existing annex to form an independent dwelling house.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the provision of amenity space for the two dwellings.

Reasons

3. There is no objection to the principle of the development or to the design and layout of the proposed internal sub-division of the property. However, according to the Council the proposed three bedroom house would have only approximately 25 sqm of private amenity space and the two bedroom dwelling would have about 8 sqm. Policy BP5 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD states that, as a minimum, a three bedroom house should have 60 sqm of amenity space and a 2 bedroom house should have 50 sqm. The appellant refers to ‘a front balcony’ but this is currently enclosed and could not reasonably be classified as making a significant contribution towards the provision of amenity space. Similarly there is space to the side of the property but this is not identified as contributing to the amenity space.

4. I have attached weight to the fact that the property is located in a relatively sustainable position, close to Barking town centre. However, although the appellant refers, for example, to the Barking Abbey open space and Greatfields Park, they are some distance away and therefore I only attach little weight to the contribution that they could make in terms of providing ‘alternatives’ to on-site amenity space provision.

5. I saw on my visit that there is a window in the ground floor dining area of the proposed 2 bedroom dwelling immediately adjacent to the proposed private amenity space of the 3 bedroom property. Although obscure glass in this
window could be retained by the imposition of an appropriate condition, there is the risk of noise and nuisance emanating from the larger area of amenity space which could be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of the two bedroom dwelling. This is not a matter on which my decision has turned but it adds weight to my overall conclusion.

6. A number of examples were cited of development that has been undertaken nearby, where no (or very little) amenity space has been provided. However, I do not have the details of all those developments and in any event I am required to determine this appeal on its own merits.

7. The National Planning Policy Framework confirms that great importance should be attached to achieving high quality design, including in relation to private spaces (paragraph 57). This approach is reflected in policy BP5 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (2011) which requires a minimum standard of external amenity space to be provided in relation to new dwellings. This proposal falls significantly short of what is expected and does not meet the aforementioned requirements. I have taken into account the circumstances of the current occupiers of the property but they do not over-ride the need to provide suitable amenity space.

8. For the above reasons the appeal should be dismissed.

David Hogger
Inspector
Appeal Decision
Site visit made on 10 January 2016

by G J Fort  BA PGDip LLM MCD MRTPId an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/16/3157907
16 Gordon Road, Chadwell Heath RM6 6DD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Sunil Kumar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 16/00858/FUL, dated 5 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2016.
- The development is described as “existing 6 bedroom bungalow converting into 2 dwellings”.

Decision
1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter
2. The application form indicated that conversion of the appeal property into two separate dwellings had already been completed. I saw at my site visit that this is the case, and that the separate parts of the dwelling appeared to be occupied by discrete households. However, the proposed parking arrangement had not been implemented. I have thus treated the appeal as retrospective in terms of the conversion works and related change of use of the appeal dwelling, but not in terms of the proposed parking arrangement.

Main Issues
3. The main issues in this appeal are firstly, the effect of the appeal scheme on the Borough’s housing mix; and secondly, whether the appeal scheme would make adequate arrangements for parking.

Reasons
Housing Mix
4. The appeal property is a single-storey dwelling with accommodation in the roof space, in a broadly residential area. I saw at my site visit that the appeal property has already been sub-divided to provide two dwellings as per the submitted plans, both with two bedrooms.

5. Policy BC4 of the Barking and Dagenham Boroughwide Development Policies Development Plan Document (the DPD) sets out the Council’s approach to residential conversions. In order to ensure an adequate supply of family housing within the Borough, the policy is restrictive of conversions that would
result in the loss of dwellings with three bedrooms or more. The policy’s reasoned justification explains that due to the need to protect and increase the supply of family housing that there is a strict approach to preserving family housing of four bedrooms or more. I have been supplied with no substantive evidence to suggest that the evidence base that supports Policy BC4 is out of date. Furthermore, this policy is consistent with paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states, amongst other things, that “local planning authorities should plan for a mix of housing based on... the needs of different groups in the community”, including but not limited to, families with children.

6. The appeal scheme has removed a family dwelling of considerable size from the local housing supply. The resultant units are both considerably smaller, and whilst they meet the relevant space standards for two-bedroom dwellings, do not offset the loss of family housing that the DPD seeks to safeguard. Consequently, the appeal scheme clearly conflicts with the DPD in this regard.

7. Whilst I note that the details of this scheme have been amended following the refusal of a previous planning application, and that there has been a reduction in the number of bedrooms from that previous scheme from three to two bedrooms for one of the units, these matters do not address the appeal scheme’s clear conflict with the relevant development plan policy. Similarly, the modest increase in the amount of housing in the borough created by the appeal scheme is a limited benefit that is clearly outweighed by its reduction of the availability of larger family housing.

8. Accordingly, as the appeal scheme removes a family-sized dwelling from the local supply it has a harmful effect on the Borough’s housing mix, and conflicts with Policy BC4 of the DPD in this regard.

Parking

9. The submitted drawings of the existing layout of the appeal property indicate that two parking spaces are available, and the proposed layout shows that this would be increased to three spaces. However, I saw at my visit that the limited depth of the appeal property’s front garden would mean that any additional parking would not be practicable, with vehicles overhanging the pavement to a considerable degree, which would be likely to cause conflict with the users of the pavement and thus not result in a safe or convenient parking arrangement.

10. However, I am mindful of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. The appeal scheme has replaced a large family dwelling with two smaller units. The very limited, if any, increase in residential occupancy and consequent number of private vehicles at the site would be unlikely to be of a scale that would cause a significant increase in parking demand.

11. I noted at my morning site visit that parking spaces close to the appeal property were available. Whilst, given the area’s relatively low Public Transport Accessibility Level rating, demand for parking spaces may increase at different times of the day, I consider that the appeal scheme would not increase the demand for on-street parking spaces to a degree that would have severe effects to the operation of the highway, or its safety in its immediate environs.
12. Consequently, whilst the proposed off-street parking arrangements would clearly be at variance to Policies BR9 and BR10 of the DPD; and Policy 6.13 of The London Plan: The Spatial Development Strategy for London-Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011 insofar as those policies seek to ensure that parking arrangements are safe and convenient, I consider that the appeal scheme would not create a level of parking demand that would make the additional off-street parking space necessary. Consequently, I consider that the adequacy of the proposed parking arrangements in this regard would not constitute a reason to dismiss the appeal.

Other Matter

13. I note the appellant’s comment that they would welcome the opportunity to amend and improve the design. However, this decision has focused on the plans and details as submitted as part of the planning application that led to the appeal, and I am mindful of the guidance in the Planning Inspectorate’s Procedural Guide: Planning Appeals- England, in this regard, which states that: “If an applicant thinks that amending their application proposals will overcome the local planning authority’s reasons for refusal they should normally make a fresh planning application”; and “If an appeal is made the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority, and on which interested people’s views were sought.” Consequently, any amendments to the details of the scheme are outside the scope of this appeal.

Conclusion

14. I have found that the appeal scheme would not lead to a material increase in the demand for parking, and thus that the inadequacy of the proposed off-street parking arrangements would not constitute a reason to refuse the appeal. However, in removing a family-sized dwelling from the Borough’s supply, and its replacement with smaller units the appeal scheme would fail to supply a housing mix in line with Policy BC4 of the DPD. The appeal scheme’s conflict with the development plan in this regard demonstrably outweighs the lack of harm I have found in regards to the adequacy of its parking arrangements.

15. Accordingly, as no material considerations outweigh the conflict with the development plan, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G J Fort

INSPECTOR
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Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2017

by G J Fort BA PGDip LLM MCD MRTPi
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/16/3158217
18 Martin Road, Dagenham, Barking and Dagenham RM8 2XH

• The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
• The appeal is made by Mr Mehmet Osman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
• The application Ref 16/00389/FUL, dated 15 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2016.
• The development proposed is erection of double storey side extension to create a one bed room house.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues in this appeal to be firstly, the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; secondly, whether the proposed amenity space would meet the day-to-day needs of its occupiers; thirdly, whether the proposed development would make adequate provision of internal space; and fourthly, whether the proposed development would provide adequate arrangements for car parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Situated in a prominent corner location, the appeal site comprises land to the side of 18 Martin Road, including elements of garden and a parking space accessed from Bowes Road. The area is principally residential, with two-storey dwellings in short terraces, set back from the road and within reasonably generous plots establishing the predominant development grain. The flank walls of the Martin Road dwellings at the corner with Bowes Road are set away considerably from the highway emphasising the spaciousness of the streetscene.

4. The appeal scheme seeks to develop a two-storey side extension to No 18 providing a separate dwelling. It would feature a hipped roof and its pattern of openings would more or less mirror that of No 18. The proposed development’s flank wall would be close to the appeal site’s boundary, and amenity space would be provided to its front and rear.
5. The proposed development, due to its scale and site coverage, and its tight relationship with the appeal site’s side boundary, would erode the spaciousness of the plotting close to this prominent corner and impart a cramped, shoehorned appearance to the plot at variance with the surrounding development grain. Moreover, the proposed development’s flank wall would be on a line considerably proud of the building line of Bowes Road, and this combined with its adjacency to the nearest Bowes Road property, would exacerbate its discordant relationship with the surrounding streetscene. Furthermore, the constrained size of the proposed amenity space would vary considerably from the generally more generous plot ratios achieved in the appeal site’s surroundings, particularly on corner plots, and would be an incongruous element when viewed together with the more spacious plot across Bowes Road. As a result of this incongruity, the proposed development would be of considerable harm to the character and appearance of the area.

6. Due to the harm that the proposed development would cause to the character and appearance of the area, it would conflict with Policy CP3 of the Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy (adopted July 2010) (the Core Strategy); Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (adopted March 2011) (The DPD); and the Residential Extension and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (adopted February 2012). Taken together, and amongst other matters, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that development proposals achieve high quality standards in relation to design and layout respecting and strengthening local character and providing a sense of place.

Amenity Space

7. Policy BP5 of the DPD sets local requirements for the provision of external amenity space for dwellings. Whilst I am aware that the description of development indicates that the proposed dwelling would be a one bedroom property, I am mindful of the Council’s case that the room annotated as a “Study Room/Library” could be used as a bedroom, and thus for the purposes of this policy the relevant amenity space requirement is that for a 2 bedroom house. The minimum standard set by the DPD in this regard is 50 SqM, with a depth of rear garden of a minimum of 12 SqM. The proposed development would undershoot this requirement to a considerable degree, both in terms of the overall space provided of around 30 SqM and in terms of the limited depth of the rear garden of around 5m. Moreover, the space available in the rear garden would be constrained further by the proposals to place cycle and wheelie bin storage within it. Consequently, I consider that the proposed development would not provide adequate provision of external amenity space that would meet the day-to-day needs of its occupants.

8. I note that Parsloes Park is within walking distance of the site, however, I saw that this is situated across a dual carriageway, which was busy at the time of my site visit. Consequently, I consider that the presence of Parsloes Park in the wider area would not meet the exception given within Policy BP5 in relation to sites that adjoin extensive parkland where there may be scope for a reduction in the provision of amenity space. The proposed development would thus conflict with Policy BP5 insofar as it seeks to ensure that appropriate external private amenity space is provided to meet the needs generated by a development.
Internal Space

9. The proposed development would provide around 72 SqM of internal space which would meet the minimum space requirement for a development of this type given in the Government’s *Technical housing standards-nationally described space standard* (the Space Standard). However, the second bedroom, annotated as a “Study Room/Library” would not supply the minimum space required for a bedroom given in the Space Standard. However, the under-provision of space within the second bedroom would only be to a very modest degree, and I am mindful that an internal wall could be repositioned to ensure that the bedroom met with the relevant requirement.

10. Consequently, whilst I note the variance from the Space Standard and thus Policy 3.5 of *The London Plan: The Spatial Development Strategy for London-Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011* (Adopted March 2016) in this regard, I consider that minor revisions to the internal layout could meet the relevant standards, and thus this variance would not constitute a reason to withhold permission in this case, or indicate that the proposed development would fail to meet the day-to-day needs of its future occupants in terms of the provision of internal space.

Parking

11. No off-street parking spaces are proposed. At my site visit, during a weekday morning, and admittedly only a snapshot in time, I saw that some parking spaces were available both on Martin Road and Bowes Road, though I am mindful that additional parking demand may occur at night. I note that the appeal site is within an area with a relatively low Public Transport Accessibility Level and that consequently the proposed development’s residents could be more reliant on private transport. However, the increase in residential occupancy as a result of the proposed development would only be modest, and consequently, the likely increase in demand for parking would be similarly limited. Moreover, the double-yellow lines adjacent to the street corners would tend to deter any unsafe parking and related manoeuvring at the junction. Consequently, I consider that no cumulatively or severely harmful effects to highway safety or residential amenity would arise from the proposed development in this regard.

12. The proposed development would remove the off-street parking space currently available to No 18. However, given the limited capacity for parking on this space, I consider that its removal would not cause a significant increase in demand for on-street parking spaces, and would thus avoid severe harm to either highway safety or residential amenity.

13. As a result, I consider that the proposed parking arrangements would not be inadequate. Accordingly, I can discern no conflict with Policies BR9 and BR10 of the DPD insofar as they seek to ensure that developments make adequate arrangements for parking that avoid harmful impacts to highway safety and residential amenity.

Conclusion

14. I have found that the development would cause no severe impacts to highway safety, or residential amenity as a result of its proposed parking arrangements. I have also found that the slight variance from the Space Standard would not,
of itself, constitute a reason to refuse the appeal. However, these matters are demonstrably outweighed in the overall planning balance by the considerable harm that the proposed development would cause to the character and appearance of its surroundings, and in its failure to provide adequate amenity space to meet the day-to-day needs of its residents.

15. I note that the delivery of an additional house on the site could contribute to development plan and national objectives in terms of boosting the supply of housing, although only to a limited degree. Like any development proposal this would have some economic and social benefits, although due to the modest scale of development these would not weigh heavily in favour of the scheme. Furthermore, the environmental harm that the proposed development would cause to the character and appearance of its surroundings would subsist long after the economic benefits of the proposed development had faded away. Moreover, the proposed development’s social benefits would be tempered to a considerable degree by a failure to provide an adequate amount of external space to meet the day-to-day needs of its future occupants. Thus the proposed development’s harmful effects demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme. Accordingly, for these reasons, the proposed development would not comprise sustainable development for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework.

16. The proposed development would also conflict with the policies of the development plan insofar as they are relevant and have been brought to my attention. No material considerations have been advanced that would outweigh this conflict. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

\textit{G J Fort}

INSPECTOR
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2016

by Jonathon Parsons  MSc BSc(Hons) DipTP Cert(Urb)  MRTP
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 16 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/16/3155685
24 Salisbury Avenue, Barking, Barking and Dagenham IG11 9XW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr S Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 16/00074/FUL, dated 18 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2016.
- The development proposed is changing the existing dwelling property from a single dwelling house into 2 number 2 bed maisonettes.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the description of the development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans that the development is for one 2 bedroom and one 1 bedroom flat. In the interests of certainty, I have considered the proposal on this basis given the greater detail provided in the plans.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on (a) the supply of family sized dwellings and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of the flats, having regard to internal space.

Reasons

Supply of family sized dwellings

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey terraced house and the submitted plans show four bedrooms, including one within the roofspace. The Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) policy BC4 2011 states that the Council is seeking to preserve and increase the stock of family housing in the Borough. The policy further indicates that the Council will resist proposals which involve the loss of housing with three bedrooms or more.

5. The proposal would result in the subdivision of the existing dwelling to form one 2 bedroom flat and one 1 bedroom flat and therefore, there would be a loss of a house with three bedrooms or more. Within the existing dwelling, one of the four bedrooms is smaller than the requirements of the Technical Housing Standards-nationally described space standards (March 2015). However, even
discounting this smaller bedroom, the existing dwelling comprises three bedrooms and therefore, the proposal would still conflict with DPD policy BC4.

Living conditions

6. Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (LP) 2016 states that 3 person 2 bedroom one storey dwellings require a minimum gross internal floorspace area of 61m² whilst 3 person 2 bedroom two storey dwellings require a minimum gross internal floor area of 70m². For 2 person 1 bedroom one storey dwellings and 2 person 1 bedroom two storey dwellings, the minimum floorspace area would be 50m² and 58m² respectively. Both flats would comply with the LP requirements for either one or two storey dwellings.

7. The Technical Housing Standards - nationally described space standards also require that a dwelling with two or more beds has at least one double (or twin) bedroom and that such a room should have a floor area of at least 11.5m². The bedrooms in the ground floor flat are smaller than this requirement but this is a matter to be considered under Building Regulations.

Other matters

8. It has been indicated that the housing stock in the area is similar, with many properties converted into maisonettes, and that the conversion would not affect the character of the area. However there is a shortage of family dwellings in the Borough as highlighted in the Barking and Dagenham Housing Strategy 2007-2010 which DPD policy BC4 is seeking to address. For this reason, the development plan policy conflict would not be outweighed by these considerations.

9. Even though the property is being separated into 2 properties, it is to be kept within the same family as both tenants are brothers. However, the effect of the proposed development would remain the same namely the loss of a three bedroom dwelling and in any case, there is no guarantee that these personal circumstances would not change in the future.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would provide adequate internal space for the occupiers of the proposed flats in compliance with LP policy 3.5 based on the evidence before me. However, there would be a loss of a family sized dwelling in conflict with DPD policy BC4. There are no material considerations to outweigh this conflict with the development plan.

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2016

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPi
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/16/3158515
25 Charlotte Road, Dagenham RM10 8TD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Donny Hoey against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
- The application Ref 16/00550/FUL, dated 11 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2016.
- The development proposed is described as a detached outbuilding/annexe to provide independent living accommodation for a disabled daughter.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effects of the proposal on:

   (i) the living conditions of the occupiers of 27 Charlotte Road, with particular regard to outlook and natural light; and

   (ii) the character and appearance of area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey end of terrace house. It is located in a residential area and occupies a corner plot to the rear of which there are bungalows. The proposal would comprise the erection of a single-storey building containing 2 bedrooms, a bathroom and a kitchen/living area. It is intended that the building would provide living accommodation for the appellant’s disabled daughter who has epilepsy.

   Living conditions

4. The long northern elevation of the proposal would abut a significant proportion of the boundary shared with the rear garden of 27 Charlotte Road. Due to its height, length and close vicinity to the boundary it would severely enclose the rear part of this neighbouring garden resulting in a significant loss of outlook from the garden and a high degree of overshadowing.

5. For these reasons the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 27 Charlotte Road. It therefore fails to comply
with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Planning Document (2011) (BWDP) which, amongst other matters, state that new development should not lead to significant overshadowing and should maintain residential amenity.

**Character and appearance**

6. Whilst the area surrounding the appeal site is varied, development in rear gardens is limited to ancillary buildings that are subordinate in scale to the host properties. By contrast the proposal would occupy almost the full-width of the rear part of the garden and would have a footprint similar to that of the host property. This would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development. In addition the upper part of the proposal would be conspicuous from Richardson Gardens.

7. Due to its siting and size I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. It therefore fails to comply with BWDP Policies BP8 and BP11 which, amongst other matters, state that new development should have regard to and protect local character. It is also contrary to the aims of Policy CP3 of the Council’s Core Strategy (2010).

**Other Matters**

8. I appreciate the appellant’s daughter’s desire to live independently, but with support from her parents, and need for quiet personal space away from the family house. However I do not find that this provides sufficient justification for a permanent building of the size proposed. I therefore conclude that the appellant’s personal circumstances are not sufficient to outweigh the clear conflicts with development plan policy identified above.

**Conclusion**

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

_S Poole_

INSPECTOR
 Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2017

by G J Fort  BA PGDip LLM MCD MRTP
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/16/3157721
Land beside 33 Braintree Road, Dagenham RM10 7NA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Ms Hanife against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 16/00751/FUL, dated 18 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2016.
- The development proposed is erection of a C3 dwelling house.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues in this appeal to be firstly, the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the streetscene; and secondly, whether the proposed development makes adequate arrangements for car parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises the side garden and a portion of land to the front of 33 Braintree Road. Located in a predominantly residential area, with properties of different scales, but all with generous setbacks from the road, the appeal site is at the side of one of a number of short two-storey terraces. These terraces are brick-faced with gable roofs. Although architectural detailing of the front facades is restrained their pattern of structural openings has a strong symmetry, emphasised by the gable springers at either end of the blocks. The plot sizes for the terraces are reasonably generous and there is a pleasant sense of spaciousness between residential buildings in the appeal site’s surroundings. This openness is further emphasised by areas of informal public amenity space including that to the front of the appeal site and its adjacent terraced block, which add to the verdant character of the area.

4. The appeal scheme would secure the development of a two-storey house on the appeal site which would be attached to the flank wall of No 33 and include a hipped roof. The flank wall of the proposed development would be developed up to the boundary of the site.
5. Due to the proposed development’s siting and site coverage, it would erode the visual gap between its host terrace and that of the adjacent dwellings to a considerable degree. As a result the proposed development would substantially diminish the open plotting of the area and thus cause harm to the character of its surroundings. Furthermore, the proposed plot size would be considerably tighter than that of its adjacent properties which would impart a cramped and shoehorned character to the appeal scheme, strongly at variance with the wider development grain.

6. The proposed development’s incongruity in this regard would be exacerbated by its hipped roof which would impart an unbalanced appearance to its host terrace, undermining its strongly symmetrical character. The hipped roof would also be a visually jarring contrast to the gable roofs present in the immediately inter-visible terraced blocks. Consequently, the proposed development would read as an insensitive and discordant feature in the streetscene causing harm to its character and appearance. The use of matching materials would do little to soften the proposed development’s harmful effects in these regards.

7. I note that the roof style has been chosen in order to minimize potential effects on the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent properties. However, this consideration does not weigh heavily in favour of the proposed development, when balanced against the considerable harm it would cause to the character and appearance of its surroundings. I am aware also that the proposed development is not within a conservation area, and nor is it a listed building, however, these considerations do not alter my view regarding the harm it would cause.

8. Whilst design judgements are to some degree subjective, I am mindful of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in this regard, which states that development should "respond to local character... and reflect the identity of local surroundings". For the reasons given above, the proposed development clearly would not meet this aspect of the Framework, and due to the considerable harm caused to the character and appearance of the streetscene would conflict with Policies BP8 and BP11 of Barking and Dagenham Boroughwide Development Policies Development Plan Document (the DPD) (adopted March 2011). Taken together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that developments have regard to the local character of the area and help to create a sense of local identity, distinctiveness and place.

Parking

9. The proposed development would include no off-street parking. The appeal site is within an area with a relatively low Public Transport Accessibility Level rating, and consequently the occupants of the proposed development would be likely to be reliant to some degree on access to a private car. However, I saw during my morning site visit that a reasonable amount of on-street parking space was available close to the appeal site. Whilst I am aware that demand for parking may change over the course of the day, I consider that the limited additional residential space proposed would not exacerbate the demand for additional parking to any significant degree.

10. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would not cause significant harm to either highway safety or residential amenity in these regards, and thus
its arrangements for parking would be adequate. As a result, the proposed
development would not conflict with Policies BR9 and BR10 of the DPD; or
Policy 6.13 of The London Plan: The Spatial Development Strategy for London:
Consolidated with Alterations since 2011 (adopted March 2016). Taken
together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that new
development avoids detrimental impacts to safety and street activity as a result
of on-street parking.

**Other Matters**

11. The proposed development could help to meet the Borough’s housing
requirements. This would be a benefit of the appeal scheme, but due to the
proposal’s modest scale only carries limited weight in the overall planning
balance. I note that the proposed amenity space could meet the day-to-day
needs of its future occupants. However, this would not weigh in the proposed
development’s favour to any substantial degree.

12. I am aware that the size of No 33’s garden is large and that the appellant
considers it to be a burden. This may be the case; however, this is not a
matter that weighs heavily in the proposed development’s favour in planning
terms.

13. The proposed development could avoid harmful effects to the residential
amenity of the occupiers of adjacent properties. I am also aware of no reasons
why residential development of the site would be resisted in principle.
However, these matters are merely indicative of a lack of conflict with relevant
planning policies in these regards, and consequently I attach only neutral
weight to them.

14. Consequently, none of these other matters, individually or taken together
demonstrably outweighs the considerable harm the proposed development
would cause to the character and appearance of the streetscene in the overall
planning balance.

**Conclusion**

15. I have found that the proposed development’s lack of off-street parking would
not cause significant harm to highway safety or residential amenity. However,
the lack of harm in that regard is demonstrably outweighed by the considerable
harm that the proposed development would cause to the character and
appearance of its surroundings.

16. In this latter respect the development proposal would conflict with the policies
of the development plan insofar as they are relevant and have been drawn to
my attention. Accordingly, as no material considerations indicate that a
departure from the development plan would be justified in this instance, I
conclude, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters
raised, that the appeal should be dismissed.

*G J Fort*

INSPECTOR
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Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2016

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPi

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/16/3159858
42 Beccles Drive, Barking IG11 9HX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Jaspal Bhogal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
- The application Ref 16/00760/FUL, dated 19 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2016.
- The development proposed is a loft conversion with a rear dormer and hip to gable alterations.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey end of terrace house which, like its unattached neighbour, has been extended to the side. It is located in a residential street comprising short terraces of similar age and design. A key feature of the terraces is their hipped roof forms, which is a matter to which I attach significant weight.

4. The proposal would extend the property’s roof by forming a gable to the side and a dormer to the rear. This would enable the provision of additional living space in the roof. I note that due to the neighbouring property, which steps forward of the appeal property slightly, the gable would be largely hidden in views looking along the street. However the extended roof would be clearly apparent looking front-on from Oulton Crescent, from where the entirety of the terrace and the hipped ends of the terraces to either side can be seen. In this context the roof addition would be a prominent and incongruous element that would be out of keeping with, and detrimental to, the appearance of the terrace and the surrounding area.

5. I conclude therefore that, as a consequence of its siting and size the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It therefore conflicts with Policies BP8 and
BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011) (BWDP) which, amongst other matters, expect development to have regard to the local character of the area and respect local context. It is also contrary to some of the key principles set out in the Council’s Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

Conclusion

6. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised including the appellant’s need for additional accommodation for family members, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR
**Appeal Decision**

Site visit made on 2 December 2016

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPi

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

**Decision date: 20th December 2016**

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/16/3159451**

51 Melford Avenue, Barking IG11 9HS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Harpreet Kaur against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
- The application Ref 16/00711/FUL, dated 4 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2016.
- The development proposed is described as a double storey side extension.

**Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

**Main Issue**

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

**Reasons**

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey end of terrace house with a hipped roof and an attached single garage to the side. It is located in a residential street comprising short terraces of similar age and design. Whilst some end of terrace houses have been extended to the side at first floor level, in general the gaps between terraces remain. This absence of development between terraces at first floor level is a key feature of the street scene and therefore a matter to which I attach significant weight.

4. The proposal would extend the property to the side boundary at first floor level and the hipped roof would be expanded with the formation of a side-facing gable. The important gap between the neighbouring terraces would be significantly reduced and, due to the slight bend in the road, the first floor side addition and gable above would be prominent and incongruous elements in the street scene.

5. I conclude therefore that, as a consequence of its siting, height and size the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. It therefore conflicts with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011) (BWDP) which, amongst other matters, expects development to have regard to the local character of the area and respect local context. It is also contrary to
some of the key principles set out in the Council’s Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

6. I note that planning permission was granted in 2011 for the infilling of the gap between 26 and 28 Melford Avenue. The scheme included the side extension to both properties and the Council’s records indicate that at the time one of the properties benefitted from an extant consent granted before the adoption of the BWDP. The appeal proposal is not directly comparable to the 2011 permission and therefore I attribute limited weight to it.

7. Whilst each application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits, I am conscious that in these particularly circumstances allowing the appeal would lead to further pressure for similar development, which in my judgement would harm to the appearance of the area. I attach significant weight to this.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2017

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/16/3162876
78 Keir Hardie Way, Barking, IG11 9NY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr A Cahani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
- The application Ref 16/00880/FUL, dated 1 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2016.
- The development proposed is the construction of a front dormer window.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a terraced dwelling, which is situated within a residential estate. The dwelling has an asymmetric roof, which results in the property appearing as a bungalow (with low eaves) at the front and as a two storey building at the rear. The terrace, of which it is a part, contains a central section that is two storeys in height. The neighbouring dwellings at numbers 80 and 80a Keir Hardie Way have rooflights on the front-facing roof areas.

4. The proposal is to enlarge the roof space at the front of the property, in order to provide a study. The proposed works would involve the construction of a flat-roofed dormer window. The dormer would be set-in from the side walls of the property and set-back from the eaves.

5. Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Council’s adopted Borough Wide Development Policies Plan seek (amongst other things) to ensure that new development is of high quality design and reflects the local character of the area. In my opinion, these policies are consistent with the provisions of paragraph 17 and 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which has similar requirements. Furthermore, The Council’s Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions and Alterations 2012, states that dormer windows should normally be located at the rear of properties and front dormers will, in most
cases, be out of character. I accept that this does not preclude all proposals for front-facing dormer window extensions and that each case should be considered on its merits.

6. I acknowledge that the proposed dormer window would be relatively small in terms of its overall size. It would also match the existing dwelling in terms of its external materials. However, the roofscape of both the dwelling and the terrace is largely unaltered, apart from the rooflights at numbers 80 and 80a. I consider that the existing roofscape is a distinctive and important characteristic of the streetscene.

7. In my opinion, the appeal proposal would appear as an incongruous and disruptive element because of its prominent position on the front of the dwelling. I consider that it would be at odds with the remainder of the terrace and, as such, it would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the streetscene. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the limited public views of the building due to its oblique visual relationship with the main section of Keir Hardie Way. It would, however, be clearly visible from the neighbouring cemetery to the south of the property. In any event, the fact that a proposal may not be highly visible does not, in my opinion, justify development that would cause harm.

8. My attention has also been drawn to other dormer roof extensions and alterations in the vicinity of the appeal site. I viewed these at my site visit. However, I am not persuaded that these developments make a positive visual contribution to the area and, therefore, they should not act as a precedent for the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the proposal would be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene. It would conflict with the policies of the Development Plan and with the provisions of the Framework, as referred to above. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR
Appeal Decision
Site visit made on 13 December, 2016

by S. J. Buckingham, BA (Hons) DipTP MSc MRTP MRTPI FSA
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24th January, 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/16/3158399
259 Valence Wood Road, Dagenham, Barking and Dagenham, RM8 3AD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr. Richard Schwartz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 16/00028/FUL, dated 7 January, 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 March, 2016.
- The development proposed is conversion of single family dwelling house (C3) into 6 x bedrooms (HMO).

Decision
1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues
2. The main issues are:
   - the effect on housing supply in the Borough;
   - the effect on the living conditions of occupiers of adjoining dwellings with regard to noise and disturbance;
   - whether the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers of the appeal dwelling with respect to external amenity space; and
   - the effect on parking conditions in the locality.

Reasons

The effect on housing supply in the Borough

3. Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Policy BC4 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD 2011 (the DPD) seeks to preserve and increase the stock of family housing in the Borough, by resisting proposals which involve the loss of housing with three bedrooms or more.

4. The appeal building is a modest early twentieth-century structure, originally built as a dwellinghouse. The property is currently arranged as a six-bedroom HMO. Having regard to the size and layout of the rooms, I have no doubt that
if it were used as a house it would be likely to have at least three bedrooms. Consequently I consider that DPD Policy BC4 is applicable. There is dispute between the parties as to whether the change of use of the appeal building from its later use as a doctor’s surgery back to a single family dwellinghouse had occurred before its unauthorised conversion to a house in multiple occupation (HMO). However the application which is the subject of this appeal was for the change of use of a single dwelling house to a 6 bedroom HMO, and I have approached my decision on that basis.

5. No convincing evidence has been put before me to support the appellant’s claim that the use of the dwelling in its current form as a six bedroom house would not be viable or marketable. Furthermore, I see no practical reason to prevent its adaptation to a more conventional format through the use of some of the current bedrooms as living and reception areas.

6. I have considered the appellant’s argument that the HMO use provides affordable accommodation for existing tenants who would be harmed by being made homeless. This does not, however, alter my conclusions on the planning merits of the case.

7. The conversion of the appeal building to a HMO would therefore entail the loss of a three bedroom family house from the housing stock of the Borough and would be contrary to Policy BC4 of the DPD. No material considerations have been put before me which cause me to alter my conclusion on this point.

The effect on the living conditions of occupiers of adjoining dwellings

8. The appeal building sits at the corner of Valence Wood Road and Wood Lane, which is a busy road which includes a small parade of shops and other local facilities a short distance to one side of the appeal site and a large supermarket to the other. It faces a primary school. This part of the area therefore, while residential, is not particularly quiet, and is the scene of traffic and pedestrian activity.

9. The appellant indicates that the appeal building is currently occupied by eleven occupants, including children, and is already therefore in intensive residential use. While the layout of the appeal proposal has created living rooms adjoining the party wall with No 257 Valance Wood Road, this is no different from situations in which former houses have been converted to flats. No convincing evidence has been put before me to suggest that it currently has a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining dwellings, including No 257.

10. I conclude therefore that any additional activity and noise generated by the appeal proposal would not be significant in a busy context, and would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining dwellings. It would not therefore conflict with Policy BP8 of the DPD, which seeks to ensure that existing and proposed occupiers are not exposed to unacceptable levels of noise or general disturbance.
Whether the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers of the appeal dwelling with respect to external amenity space

11. The appeal building benefits from the rear garden space associated with its original use as a dwelling house. Due to its corner location, this space has an irregular tapering shape. While, as a result, it is smaller than the rear gardens of houses along Valence Wood Road, it is of a roughly similar size to those of houses along Wood Lane.

12. I noted while on site that there is communal access to the garden provided by a gate between the appeal building and 361 Wood Lane. While there is access to the garden via a doorway from bedroom 2, this would not therefore be the only access. I noted also that the rear facing windows of bedroom 2 are obscure-glazed to protect the privacy of that room. This is a further indication that the garden is available for use by other tenants.

13. While the Council has set no standards for the outdoor amenity space for HMOs, the garden appears to be reasonably generous, and would meet the space standard for a four+ bedroomed house as set out in Policy BP5 of the DPD. Therefore, it would be capable of providing a reasonable standard of outdoor living space for occupiers of the HMO, to all of whom it would be accessible. I conclude therefore that the proposal would provide adequate external amenity space, and satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers.

14. The effect of the proposal on parking conditions in the locality

14. The appeal site is close to bus stops linking the site to wider transport links by rail or tube, and therefore has some accessibility to public transport.

15. There is no off-street parking provision on the site. Thus, if it were used as a single dwelling, any parking associated with it would take place on the highway. The Council argues that use as a HMO would generate a greater demand for parking. However, there is no evidence in support of this suggestion. It seems reasonable to assume that occupiers of the HMO would have relatively low incomes and would thus be more likely to rely on public transport. Overall, I see no reason to think that the appeal scheme would result in a material increase in parking demand.

16. The Council considers that the proposal would conflict with Policy BR9 of the DPD, which cross-refers to the London Plan. However, the Council has not identified any standards relevant to HMOs either in the DPD or in the London Plan. In any event, the policy sets a maximum standard. Accordingly, I do not consider that the proposal conflicts with Policy BR9.

17. As I have noted, the appeal site is within reasonable walking distance from a range of local facilities, including a supermarket and primary school, and I conclude that it would not therefore conflict with Policy BR10 of the DPD, which seeks to encourage greater use of sustainable transport options, including walking.
Conclusion

18. In conclusion, I have not identified any conflict with DPD Policies BP8, BP5, BR9 or BR10. Nevertheless, I consider that the conflict with Policy BC4 amounts to a fundamental objection the scheme, such that it should be regarded as being in conflict with the development plan as a whole. I have not identified any factors which lead me to think that the appeal should be determined other than accordance with the development plan. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

S J Buckingham

INSPECTOR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01253/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 28 November 2016</td>
<td>Mr Y Garib</td>
<td>Change of use of single dwelling to 5 independent residential units. 10 St Erkenwald Road Barking Essex IG11 7XA</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01533/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 28 November 2016</td>
<td>Mr R Rashkov</td>
<td>Erection of outbuilding in rear garden (retrospective). 97 Gorseway Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0RR</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01539/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 28 November 2016</td>
<td>Mr S N Rashid</td>
<td>Alterations to outbuildings in rear garden including rebuilding of store in connection with use as home gymnasium. 247 Salisbury Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9XT</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01642/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 28 November 2016</td>
<td>Mrs K Yekovie</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.7 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 83 Gainsborough Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2DP</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**29 November 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01524/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 29 November 2016</td>
<td>Mr J Achmedov</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and front rooflights. 129 Lichfield Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2AX</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01644/PRIOR6</td>
<td>PRIOR6</td>
<td>Mr L Gaxha</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 378 Heathway Dagenham Essex RM10 8NS</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01488/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 30 November 2016</td>
<td>Mr N Sharma</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving, construction of gable end and rear dormer window and front rooflights. 2 Harrold Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2ND</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01490/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 30 November 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of single storey front/side extension. 57 Bennetts Castle Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 3YA</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01386/NMA</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 December 2016</td>
<td>Wates Construction Limited</td>
<td>Application for non-material amendment following grant of planning permission (15/00595/FUL) - amendments to elevations and relocation of primary school entrance. Eastbury Community School Rosslyn Road Barking Essex IG11 9UH</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01552/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 1 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr B Singh</td>
<td>Erection of single storey front, side and rear extension and two storey side extension. 57 Bastable Avenue Barking Essex IG11 0NG</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01554/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 30 November 2016</td>
<td>Mr B Singh</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and front rooflights. 57 Bastable Avenue Barking Essex IG11 0NG</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01555/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr H S Hyer</td>
<td>Erection of single storey side/front extension and front porch. 88 Spring Close Dagenham Essex RM8 1SR</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01585/ REG3</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 December 2016</td>
<td>LBD Richard Alibon Primary School</td>
<td>Erection of single storey extension to provide 2 group rooms. Richard Alibon Primary School Alibon Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8DF</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01595/ ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 December 2016</td>
<td>Bow Arts Trust</td>
<td>Installation of 4 internally illuminated signage panels on corners of building. Icehouse Court 56 Abbey Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01627/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 December 2016</td>
<td>NU Living</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 44 (dynamic overheating modelling) in respect of planning permission 15/01252/FUL. Development Site 16 - 48 Cambridge Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01640/</td>
<td>PRIOR6</td>
<td>Mr D Rath</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.7 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 8 Langley Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 6TA</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01658/</td>
<td>PRIOR6</td>
<td>Mr N Patrichi</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.8 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 12 Ellerton Gardens Dagenham Essex RM9 4HT</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00544/</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Trimast Associates Ltd</td>
<td>Erection of two storey terrace with rear facing dormer windows to provide 2 one bedroom flats, 2 two bedroom flats and 5 three bedroom houses together with associated access road and car parking. Land To The Rear Of The Old Vicarage Crown Street Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01124/</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Bricks &amp; Mortar Ltd</td>
<td>Erection of two storey building with roof accommodation to provide two commercial (Class A1/A2) units on ground floor with 2 two bedroom flats above. 757 Becontree Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 3HH</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01344/</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Mr J Beckford</td>
<td>Change of use from dwellinghouse (Class C3) to care home for young people (retrospective). 7 Westrow Drive Barking Essex IG11 9BH</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 December 2016
## LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING AND DAGENHAM REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
### DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD
### Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01492/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 2 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr A Ferizoli</td>
<td>Erection of first floor rear extension. 41 Campden Crescent Dagenham Essex RM8 2RS</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01580/ PRIOFF</td>
<td>Prior approval required on 2 December 2016</td>
<td>Delta Acquisitions Ltd</td>
<td>Application for prior approval: Notification of a proposed change of use of part of ground and first floor and all of the second and third floors from Class B1 offices to C3 residential use (14 one bedroom flats). Bridge House London Road Barking Essex IG11 8DA</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01573/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 2 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr T Mehmood</td>
<td>Erection of single storey front, side and rear extension. 12 Glenmore Way Barking Essex IG11 0LY</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01575/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 2 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr D Franklin</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side extension and part single storey/part two storey rear extension. 242 Hedgemans Road Dagenham Essex RM9 6DH</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01576/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 2 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr K Moran</td>
<td>Erection of single storey side extension. 1 Canberra Close Dagenham Essex RM10 9YJ</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01643/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 2 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr F Knebel</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.8 metres and maximum height: 3.6 metres). 229 Grafton Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1QP</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING AND DAGENHAM
### REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
#### DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD
### Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01659/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>PRIOR6</td>
<td>Mr R Mahmoud</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.95 metres; height to eaves: 2.7 metres and maximum height: 2.9 metres). 60 Temple Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 1LP</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01671/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>PRIOR6</td>
<td>Mr B Brazas</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.8 metres and maximum height: 3.05 metres). 188 Sterry Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8PT</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01737/ PRIOR4</td>
<td>PRIOR4</td>
<td>Dagenham Dock Limited (DDL)</td>
<td>Application for prior notification of proposed demolition of the Boiler House in the centre, the Old Press Shop (including the Wheel Plant and New Tool Room), conveyor lines building, the New Press Building located along the southern boundary, the Production Line building and ancillary offices located in the south-west and north-west corners of the site respectively. Ford Works Site Ford Motor Company Estate Kent Avenue Dagenham Essex RM9 6SA</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5 December 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/00354/ FUL</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Trust Ford</td>
<td>Demolition of existing single storey brick building in association with change of use of stone masons yard to form extended vehicle sales forecourt to Dagenham Motors, installation of ramped access and additional window and door openings to used car sales building. Dagenham Motors Ripple Road Barking Essex IG11 9PG</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01354/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 5 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr P Knight</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of part hip/part gable end roof and front rooflight. 7 Dagmar Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8XP</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01476/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 5 December 2016</td>
<td>LBBD - Housing Department</td>
<td>Erection of single storey side and rear extension and ramped accesses with handrails to front and side. 1 Rockwell Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8JA</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01541/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 5 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr R Hussain</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side and single storey rear extension. 80 Waldegrave Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2QD</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01561/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 5 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr D Rozario</td>
<td>Erection of a single storey side and rear extension 36 Studley Road Dagenham Essex RM9 6BE</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01562/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 5 December 2016</td>
<td>H &amp; N London Ltd</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey rear extension. 36 Campden Crescent Dagenham Essex RM8 2RU</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01569/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 5 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr V Sedys</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and front rooflights. 79 Reede Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8DT</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01577/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 5 December 2016</td>
<td>Ms O Akiniyi</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey side extension. 323 Wood Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 3NP</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01669/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 5 December 2016</td>
<td>Ms A Nyiyah</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.6 metres). 150 Ballards Road Dagenham Essex RM10 9AB</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01682/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 5 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr N Ahmed</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.5 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 86 Gainsborough Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2DU</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01686/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 5 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr P Baloch</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 4.0 metres). 1006 Green Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 1BT</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 December 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01468/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 6 December 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of two storey side extension to form annexe ancillary to main house. 1 Christopher Gardens Dagenham Essex RM9 5YB</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01637/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 6 December 2016</td>
<td>NU Living</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 36D (i-vi) (Highspeed 1) in respect of planning permission 15/01252/FUL. Development Site 16 - 48 Cambridge Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01479/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 December 2016</td>
<td>Miss L Tilena</td>
<td>Erection of outbuilding in rear garden (retrospective but with reduced roof height). 48 Manor Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8AU</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01544/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 December 2016</td>
<td>Berkeley Square Developments Dagenham Limited</td>
<td>Erection of cafe/restaurant drive through with associated car parking and landscaping. Former Sanofi Aventis Rainham Road South Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01583/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 7 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr J Maisuria</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and front rooflights. 56 Sandringham Road Barking Essex IG11 9AJ</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01591/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr C Hoepelman</td>
<td>Erection of single storey front extension. 20 Neasham Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2LT</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 December 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01267/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 8 December 2016</td>
<td>Vecta Environmental Services</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed use: Use of site for separation and bulking of recyclable materials and associated offices and parking. Well Trade Services Limited 40A - 40B River Road Barking Essex IG11 0DW</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01272/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 8 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr J Avers</td>
<td>Erection of one bedroom bungalow. 84C Westminster Gardens Barking Essex IG11 0BL</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01410/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 8 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr A Dourka-Laird</td>
<td>Erection of part single/part two storey rear extension in connection with conversion of house into 3 flats (1 studio, 1 one bedroom flat and 1 three bedroom flat). 7 Elstow Gardens Dagenham Essex RM9 6BA</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01430/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 8 December 2016</td>
<td>Ms H Bassi</td>
<td>Erection of two storey rear/side extension and first floor rear extension. 521 Whalebone Lane North Romford Essex RM6 5QX</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01565/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 8 December 2016</td>
<td>Ms R Begum</td>
<td>Erection of part single, part two-storey side extension and front porch. 139 Upney Lane Barking Essex IG11 9LF</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01589/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 8 December 2016</td>
<td>Ms M Begum</td>
<td>Erection of first floor rear extension. 105 Lodge Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 2JJ</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01596/TPO</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 8 December 2016</td>
<td>Barking College</td>
<td>Application for tree works subject to a tree preservation order: Various works including lifting canopies, crown lifting, cutting back, removal of deadwood and felling. Barking And Dagenham College Of Technology Dagenham Road Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0XU</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01600/TPO</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 8 December 2016</td>
<td>Chaseview Care Home</td>
<td>Application for tree works subject to a tree preservation order: Reduce canopies of 3 Acer platanoides by 30% in height and reduce overall canopy spread by 20%, crown lift 3 Prunus avium to 3 metres from ground level, remove 1 Buddleia to ground level and drill/eco plug to prevent regrowth. Chaseview Care Centre 2 Camomile Road Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0WW</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01667/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 8 December 2016</td>
<td>Dagenham BV</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 2 (external materials) in respect of planning permission 16/00809/REM. Former Sanofi Aventis Rainham Road South Dagenham Essex RM10 7FN</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01690/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 8 December 2016</td>
<td>Ms J O Nelson-Twakor</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.6 metres). Amended plans for a depth of 6.0 metres. 13 Groveway Dagenham Essex RM8 3XB</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
#### Regeneration and Economic Development
#### Development Control Board
#### Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01692/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 8 December 2016</td>
<td>T Skamarocivs &amp; I Puodziukaityte</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 49 Harris Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5DT</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01700/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 8 December 2016</td>
<td>Mrs V B Ahilan</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 51 Harrow Road Barking Essex IG11 7QZ</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01719/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 8 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr S Miah</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 4.0 metres). 30 Coombewood Drive Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6AB</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01752/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 8 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr P Bhuiyan</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 24 Bastable Avenue Barking Essex IG11 0LF</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01519/ NMA</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 9 December 2016</td>
<td>Berkeley Square Developments Dagenham Ltd</td>
<td>Application for non-material amendment following grant of planning permission 15/00810/REM (alterations to car parking and landscaping layout). Former Sanofi Aventis Yewtree Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 7TA</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01582/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 9 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr T Emmanuel</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and front rooflights and erection of single storey side extension. 14 Edgehill Gardens Dagenham Essex RM10 7LB</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01603/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 9 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr M Hussain</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed use: Use as MOT/vehicle repair centre. Unit 7 Balmoral Trading Estate 115 River Road IG11 0EG</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01691/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 9 December 2016</td>
<td>K Miah</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.5 metres and maximum height: 3.4 metres). 191 Cavendish Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9DZ</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01494/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 12 December 2016</td>
<td>B Yavuz</td>
<td>Installation of dormer windows to front and rear elevations and alterations to appearance of front elevation involving installation of new windows and removal of front bays and canopy. 69 Aldborough Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8AT</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01610/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 12 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr I Malik</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 75 Cavendish Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9DU</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01712/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 12 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr J Aziz</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 4.0 metres). 10 Cavendish Gardens Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6SA</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01729/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 12 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr A Umarjee</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres reducing to 3.65 metres; height to eaves: 2.8 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 113 Fourth Avenue Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0UH</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01751/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required on 12 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr B Ullah</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.8 metres and maximum height: 2.9 metres). 97 Sandringham Road Barking Essex IG11 9AF</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01328/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate refused on 13 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr G Tanner</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey rear extension. 34 Bluebell Close Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0XN</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01567/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 December 2016</td>
<td>Lidl UK</td>
<td>External alterations to all elevations including new wall cladding, shop front, external doors, and single storey extension. Lidl Unit A 258 - 262 Heathway Dagenham Essex RM10 8QS</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01570/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 13 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr V Sedys</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side extension. 79 Reede Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8DT</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01584/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 13 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr V Silcott</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and front rooflights. 24 Greenfield Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4RS</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01597/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 13 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr K Zaman</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and front rooflights and demolition of garage and erection of single storey side extension. 33 Melford Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9HS</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01617/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 13 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr H Uddin</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and front rooflights. 29 Hardie Road Dagenham Essex RM10 7BS</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01626/PRIRET</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 13 December 2016</td>
<td>Florey Properties Ltd</td>
<td>Application for prior approval: Notification of a proposed change from Class A1 shop to C3 dwelling house. 244 High Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6AP</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01745/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 13 December 2016</td>
<td>Ms A Bibi</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.5 metres; height to eaves and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 27 Meadow Road Barking Essex IG11 9QT</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01605/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 14 December 2016</td>
<td>LBBD - Southwood Primary School</td>
<td>Erection of two detached buildings and associated decking to be used as classroom and nurture room. Southwood Primary School Keppel Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5LT</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01606/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 14 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr S &amp; T J Denovan</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and front rooflights and erection of single storey rear extension. 48 Winstead Gardens Dagenham Essex RM10 7TL</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/01563/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 15 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr U Ali</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and front rooflights. 38 Mayesbrook Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2EB</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01624/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 15 December 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of single storey side and rear extension. 126 Reede Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8DU</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01628/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 15 December 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of single storey side and rear extension. 19 Sunningdale Avenue Barking Essex IG11 7QF</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01638/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 15 December 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of replacement gas insulated switchgear (GIS) substation and associated 3.4 metre high inner security fence and outer 2.4 metre high weld mesh fence and construction of new internal access road between the new 132 kV substation and the existing 275 kV substation. National Grid Barking 132kV Electricity Sub-Station Renwick Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING AND DAGENHAM
REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD
Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01656/ PRIOR</td>
<td>PRIOR application</td>
<td>National Grid</td>
<td>Application for Prior Approval of the design and external appearance of 132kV Substation. National Grid Barking 132kV Electricity Sub-Station Renwick Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01118/ FUL</td>
<td>Refused on 16 December 2016</td>
<td>ALDI Stores Ltd</td>
<td>Demolition of existing retail unit and erection of new food store. Unit 1 Merrielands Retail Park Merrielands Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 6SJ</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01501/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 16 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr J Miah</td>
<td>Erection of first floor rear extension. 83 Melford Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9HS</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01525/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 16 December 2016</td>
<td>LBBD - Service Development And Improvement</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 31 Benetts Castle Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 3XX</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01535/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 16 December 2016</td>
<td>LBBD - Service Development And Improvement</td>
<td>Erection of single storey side extension. 90 Winding Way Dagenham Essex RM8 2TB</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01631/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 16 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr V Kyyan</td>
<td>Erection of shed in rear garden (retrospective). 47 Chittys Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 1UP</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING AND DAGENHAM
### REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
#### DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD
##### Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01632/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 16 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr S Shah</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and front rooflights. 195 Wood Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 3LH</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01747/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 16 December 2016</td>
<td>Mrs S Kaur</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 39 Lyndhurst Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9YB</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01746/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 16 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr F Flower</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.8 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 54 Canonsleigh Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4DJ</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01750/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 16 December 2016</td>
<td>Janet Colley</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 37 Donne Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2JG</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01754/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 16 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr M Tao</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 44 Hulse Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9UW</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01765/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 16 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr M I Ahmed</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 4.0 metres). 74 Turnage Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1QS</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01767/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 16 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr N Metalia</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.7 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 11 Sterry Gardens Dagenham Essex RM10 8PH</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01764/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 16 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr G A Hussain</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 4.0 metres). 15 Netherfield Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9TL</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01775/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 16 December 2016</td>
<td>Mrs S Kidwai</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.5 metres and maximum height: 2.65 metres). 138 Wilmington Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9TZ</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01783/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 16 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr L Wren</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.85 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 24 Burnham Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4RA</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Application Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 December 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/01012/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 19 December 2016</td>
<td>Estates &amp; Agency Properties Limited</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 26 (archaeology) in respect of planning permission 13/00852/FUL (Parts A and B only). Abbey Retail Park Abbey Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00444/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 19 December 2016</td>
<td>Wates Construction Limited</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions: 6 (hard landscaping), 7 (boundary treatment), 10 (cycle parking), 16 (acoustic protection), 19 (lighting), 25 (highway works), 30 (bird and bat bricks/boxes) and 33 (surface water drainage) in respect of planning permission 15/00595/FUL. Eastbury Community School Rosslyn Road Barking Essex IG11 9UH</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01481/CLU_E</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 19 December 2016</td>
<td>Premier Inn Hotels Ltd</td>
<td>Installation of kitchen extract ducting and bricking up of window. Premier Lodge Whalebone Lane North Romford Essex RM6 6QU</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01629/CLU_E</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 19 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr A Kapur</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for an existing use: Change of use from single dwelling house to 4 one bedroom flats. 1 West Park Close Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6XT</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01633/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 19 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr D Josheph</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and front rooflights. 63 Upney Lane Barking Essex IG11 9LD</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01715/CDN</td>
<td>Permitted on 19 December 2016</td>
<td>LBBD - Children's Services</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 4 (hard landscaping - lighting and management/maintenance) in respect of planning permission 15/00106/FUL. Barking Riverside Area Renwick Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01782/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 19 December 2016</td>
<td>Ms A Baltusiene</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 51 Windsor Road Dagenham Essex RM8 3JX</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01827/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 19 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr M Orton</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 3.4 metres; height to eaves: 2.767 metres and maximum height: 3.876 metres). 28 Sandown Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 8XD</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01227/CDN</td>
<td>Permitted on 20 December 2016</td>
<td>Wates Construction Limited</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions: 8 (travel plan), 9 (Car Parking Management Plan), in respect of planning permission 15/00595/FUL. Eastbury Community School Rosslyn Road Barking Essex IG11 9UH</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01534/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 20 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr C Chiriac</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 3.8 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.7 metres). 18 Eastbury Square Barking Essex IG11 9SN</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01556/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 20 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr S Zuqqlli</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side and first floor rear extension. 71 Fanshawe Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 5EL</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01593/FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 20 December 2016</td>
<td>Travis Perkins</td>
<td>Installation of storage racking 85 Freshwater Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1RX</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01648/PRIOR</td>
<td>Prior approval required on 20 December 2016</td>
<td>Marash &amp; Kids Ltd</td>
<td>Notification for prior approval for change of use from Class A1 shop to Class A3 restaurant/cafe. 436 Lodge Avenue Dagenham Essex RM9 4QS</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01645/ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 20 December 2016</td>
<td>McDonald's Restaurants Ltd</td>
<td>Installation of replacement 12 metre high internally illuminated totem pole sign. MacDonalds Drive In Eldonwall Trading Estate Whalebone Lane South Dagenham Essex RM8 1AT</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01805/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>Mr G Neagu</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres beyond original rear wall; height to eaves: 2.7 metres and maximum height: 2.8 metres). 62 Valence Circus Dagenham Essex RM8 3LX</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01841/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>Mr S Johm</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.75 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 4 Thicket Grove Dagenham Essex RM9 4NR</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/01003/FUL</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Great Commission Ministries</td>
<td>Application for removal of condition following grant of planning permission: Removal of condition 4 of 13/00298/FUL (no electronic amplification or loud speaker system to be used during acts of worship). 102 Longbridge Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01661/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued</td>
<td>Mr S Islam</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and front rooflights. 2 Buttfield Close Dagenham Essex RM10 8TJ</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01662/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 21 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr S Islam</td>
<td>Erection of first floor rear extension. 2 Buttfield Close Dagenham Essex RM10 8TJ</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01676/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 21 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr Naheem</td>
<td>Erection of first floor rear extension. 39 Greatfields Road Barking Essex IG11 7UA</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01831/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 21 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr A Iqbal</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.5 metres; height to eaves: 2.7 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 146 Morley Road Barking Essex IG11 7DH</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01835/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 21 December 2016</td>
<td>Mr A Rama</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.0 metres; height to eaves and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 41 Dorothy Gardens Dagenham Essex RM8 2HR</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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