Notice of Meeting

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD

Monday, 31 July 2017 - 7:00 pm
Council Chamber, Town Hall, Barking

Members: Cllr Faraaz Shaukat (Chair), Cllr Syed Ahammad (Deputy Chair), Cllr Sanchia Alasia, Cllr Saima Ashraf, Cllr Faruk Choudhury, Cllr Edna Fergus, Cllr Irma Freeborn, Cllr Cameron Geddes, Cllr Syed Ghani, Cllr Amardeep Singh Jamu, Cllr Giasuddin Miah, Cllr Margaret Mullane, Cllr Adegboyega Oluwole, Cllr Chris Rice, Cllr Bill Turner, Cllr Dominic Twomey, Cllr Jeff Wade and Cllr John White (one vacancy)

Date of publication: 21 July 2017

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

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 3 July 2017 (Pages 7 - 23)

New Planning Applications

4. Farmhouse Venue, 649 Dagenham Road, Dagenham-17/00439/FUL (Pages 25 - 58)
5. Old Granary, Town Quay, Barking- 17/00574/FUL and 17/00575/LBC (Pages 59 - 109)

   Advertisement Applications

   Gascoigne

6. Town Planning Appeals (Pages 111 - 112)

   Alibon; Eastbury; Whalebone

7. Delegated Decisions (Pages 113 - 142)

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

9. 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.

10. 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Class</th>
<th>Use/Description of Development</th>
<th>Permitted Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1</strong> Shops</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><strong>A2</strong> Financial and professional services</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><strong>A3</strong> Restaurants and cafés</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><strong>A4</strong> Drinking establishments</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><strong>A5</strong> Hot food takeaways</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><strong>B1</strong> Business</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><strong>B2</strong> General industrial</td>
<td>General industry: use for the carrying 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><strong>B8</strong> Storage and distribution</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><strong>C1</strong> Hotels</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><strong>C2</strong> Residential institutions</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><strong>C2A</strong> Secure residential institution</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><strong>C3</strong> Dwelling houses</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>Footnotes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. Does not apply to listed buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 A1 (shops), A2 (financial and professional services), A3 (restaurants and cafes), A4 (pubs), A5 (takeaways), B1a (offices), B1b (light industry), B1c (R&amp;D), D1 (non-residential institutions) and D2 (assembly and leisure) can change to A1, A2, A3, B1a,b &amp; 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Does apply in Conservation Areas but not to listed buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 change 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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, 3 July 2017
(7:00 - 8:18 pm)

Present: Cllr Faraaz Shaukat (Chair), Cllr Syed Ahammad (Deputy Chair), Cllr Faruk Choudhury, Cllr Edna Fergus, Cllr Irma Freeborn, Cllr Cameron Geddes, Cllr Syed Ghani, Cllr Amardeep Singh Jamu, Cllr Giasuddin Miah, Cllr Margaret Mullane, Cllr Adegboyega Oluwole, Cllr Chris Rice and Cllr Dominic Twomey

Apologies: Cllr Sanchia Alasia, Cllr Saima Ashraf, Cllr Bill Turner, Cllr Jeff Wade and Cllr John White

1. Declaration of Members’ Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

2. Minutes (8 May 2017)

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 May 2017 were confirmed as correct.

3. Land at the junction of Porters Avenue and Gale Street, Dagenham-16/01990/FUL

The Development Management Manager (DMM) introduced a report on the application relating to the land at the junction of Porters Avenue and Gale Street, Dagenham.

The application site is located in Parsloes Park on land at the junction of Porters Avenue and Gale Street, Dagenham. The site is bounded to the west by Gale Street and to the north by Porters Avenue. Parsloes Park is designated as ‘Metropolitan Open Land’ (MOL).

The application related to the erection of a two storey Youth Zone facility including skate park, floodlit kick pitch, service yard, plant, minibus and blue badge parking and associated landscaping.

Internally, the facility would comprise a 4-court indoor sports hall, indoor climbing wall, fitness gym, performing arts studio, music studio, boxing gym, art and craft rooms, media suite, café, and recreational areas.

Consultations had been carried out widely and there had been ten responses received with objections from nine addresses in relation to, inter alia, encroachment on open spaces, potential for noise and traffic disturbance and inappropriateness in a residential setting.

The DMM noted that although the proposed application site was designated as Metropolitan Open Land, there were very special circumstances in order for officers to recommend approval for planning permission. The site would be
easily accessible and is regarded as a neutral area and a good central location. This area of Parsloes Park is under-utilised and by agreeing to the application, the Board would be addressing the importance of tackling obesity and health priorities, as well as employment opportunities for young people. In addition, although there would be some impact on the openness of the park, the harm was considered to be relatively limited in nature and the benefits of the scheme were such as to outweigh this harm.

The DMM advised that floodlighting could not be used after 10.00 pm and officers were satisfied that this would not be intrusive upon neighbours to the site.

The DMM also advised that on-street parking was discouraged and that most of the young people attending events would be unlikely to have cars and many would come by public transport, cycle or walk. Some would be dropped off by parents but the Highways Officer considered that there was adequate parking provision available on local roads.

The DMM considered that the application would provide a high quality facility with the potential to assist young people often in deprivation. This would be a positive benefit to the community in terms of health, wellbeing and employment opportunities for young people, helping to reduce anti-social behaviour.

The Chair invited Chris Galleyhawk, an objector to the application, to address the Board. He felt that although the Youth Zone was a worthy application, it would be in the wrong location as this was Metropolitan Open Land. He felt that the area was used extensively by local people and if the application were approved, it would have a detrimental and significant impact on local residents in terms of noise, traffic, floodlighting and potential anti-social behaviour. There would be a large increase in traffic in an already busy and dangerous area which had encountered several accidents already. In addition, Gale Street was very narrow and parking in local streets was very limited and drivers park in Wroxall Road to visit the Health Centre. He had been the GLC Parks Manager for Parsloes Park and for the Borough later and considered this application would be a recipe for disaster. He stated that the Mayor of London had considered this application was against the London Plan and asked that the Youth Zone should be considered for an alternative location instead of Parsloes Park.

The Chair invited Maureen Everett, an objector to the application, to address the Board. She informed the Board that she lived opposite the proposed application site and that the road was very dangerous and bad for traffic. She said there had been several accidents in recent times. In addition, she considered there was the potential for noise, disturbance and anti-social behaviour as she felt that events at the Youth Zone would not finish at 10.00 pm. She felt that if this application were agreed it would make residents lives a misery and stated that she never received a consultation letter from the Planning Officers. She asked for the Youth Zone to be sited in Mayesbrook Park which she considered was a more appropriate location.

The Chair invited Diane Joyes, an objector to the application, to address the Board. She asked the Board to preserve Parsloes Park. She advised that there was a serious problem in the locality with traffic and parking issues and
that if the application were approved, then there was nothing to stop more of
the park being taken to provide more parking. She was particularly concerned
about floodlighting and was not convinced that this would cease at 10.00 pm as
young people would be hanging around after that time. She had lived in this
location for thirty one years and felt that the look out onto the park was very
good but this would be ruined if this application were approved, moreover she
would have little option but to move which she did not want to do. She asked
the Board to preserve the park as a valued open space.

The Chair invited Rob Carter, the applicant, to address the Board. He
considered that the Youth Zone application would provide a very important
benefit to the Council. This location was prominent, neutral, appropriate and
accessible for young people in the community and this had been carefully
assessed. He was aware of the sensitivity of this location being on metropolitan
open space but was justified by the special circumstances of this application.
He considered that Parsloes Park was under-utilised by young people and this
application was beneficial and a worthwhile investment for this and future
generations. He stated that 99% of the Park would be protected and the
application was sustainable with no reliance on Council revenue funding. He
stressed that the Youth Zone wished to be good neighbours in the local
community. Although there were understandable concerns about anti-social
behaviour, experience in other Youth Zones had shown that any anti-social
behavior would decrease and cited positive examples where this had
decreased. He stated that 85% of those coming to the facilities would be via
public transport and therefore parking would not be a problem. There were
understandable concerns about floodlighting but he did not feel this would be a
problem. He added that this application was a unique opportunity for young
people in the borough and was sustainable for future generations.

Members asked about cycle and moped parking included in the application.
The DMM responded that officers had asked for an increase in cycle parking
but Moped parking often gets overlooked, and there was no specific parking
provision in this case. He re-iterated that on-site car parking would be actively
discouraged.

Members asked about the opportunity to increase bus provision particularly
route 145. In response, the Acting Head of Planning advised that officers met
with representatives of Transport for London (TfL) on a regular basis and TfL
constantly revised and reviewed bus services and their frequency.

Members felt that the provision of a Youth Zone was needed but were
concerned about the issue of potential Council funding. The applicant advised
that the Youth Zone would be funded from many different sources although the
Council had not been asked to provide a budgetary contribution.

Members sought clarification about the proposed location of the Youth Zone
and noted residents concern and asked for the appropriateness of other
considered venues for the Zone. The DMM advised that a number of other
sites were considered e.g. Barking Riverside, Thames View the Vibe and
Ivyhouse Road, although the Parsloes Park site was considered the most
appropriate for neutrality and transport accessibility.

In answer to a question, the DMM advised that although the application was on
Metropolitan Open Land, the applicant had demonstrated the very special circumstances necessary to grant permission and the Board needed to weigh up the loss of land with the benefits of the application to young people in the community.

The Board granted planning permission subject to any direction from the Mayor of London and/or the Secretary of State, and the conditions listed in this report (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 and the Secretary of State).

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).


   Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest 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) The development shall be used as a Youth Zone facility operated by Barking and Dagenham Youth Zone and for no other purpose.

   Reason: To protect the locality by avoiding the introduction of a use detrimental to its amenities in accordance with Policy BP8 of the Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Policies.

5) The landscaping scheme shown on drawing No.671-02 and 671-03 shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation or the 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.

6) Details of the areas to be hard surfaced including all skate park ramps shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing and completed prior to the occupation or completion of the development, whichever is the sooner and thereafter permanently retained.

Reason: To safeguard and improve the appearance of the area and to provide safe movement throughout the site in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document

7) The external lighting scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the details submitted. 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 the interests of enhancing security and safety, to avoid light pollution and safeguard neighbouring amenity and in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

8) The boundary treatment shall be carried out in accordance with the details indicated on drawing No.110:16:53:H prior to occupation or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. 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.

9) No external construction works, deliveries, external running of plant and equipment or internal works audible outside the site boundary shall take place on the site other than 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.

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.

10) The approved development shall make provision for cycle parking in accordance with a scheme that shall have been previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter retained permanently for the
accommodation of bicycles of occupiers and visitors to the premises and not used for any other purpose.

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.

11) Noise from activities taking place inside the Youth Zone building (AN) including any live and amplified music associated shall be controlled so as to be inaudible inside noise-sensitive premises in the vicinity of the Youth Zone. The initial test for compliance with ‘inaudibility’ criterion will be that noise should be no more than barely audible outside those noise sensitive premises. In the event there is a disagreement as to whether activity noise is or is not audible the following numerical limits shall be used to determine compliance with this condition:

The LAeq (AN) (15 minute) shall not exceed LA90 (WAN*) (15 minute) and;
The L10 (AN) (15 minute) shall not exceed L90 (WAN*) (15 minute) in any 1/3 octave band between 40Hz and 160Hz.

*WAN Without activity noise

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity, in accordance with Policies BR13 and BP8 of the Borough Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

12) The combined rating level of the noise from any plant installed pursuant to this permission 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: In the interest of residential amenity, in accordance with Policies BR13 and BP8 of the Borough Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

13) All external floodlighting of the kick pitch and skate park shall be switched off between the hours of 22:00 and 06:00.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity and protection of local ecology in accordance with Policies BP8 and BR3 of the Borough Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

14) 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.

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
15) 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 method statement is 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.

16) A scheme showing the provisions to be made for CCTV coverage, access control, and any other measures to reduce the risk of crime, shall be 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 users 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.
17) The building shall not be occupied by users except between 0800 and 2200 Monday to Friday, and 0900 and 2200 at weekends.

Reason: To protect the amenities of neighbouring residents in accordance with policies BR13 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

18) Before any works hereby permitted are commenced and until all such works are completed:

a) all trees to be retained shall be protected by secure, stout exclusion fencing erected at a minimum distance equivalent to the branch spread of the trees and in accordance with BS.5837;

b) any works connected with the approved scheme within the branch spread of the trees shall be by hand only. No materials, supplies, plant or machinery shall be stored, parked or allowed access beneath the branch spread or within the exclusion fencing. Any trees that are damaged or felled during construction work must be replaced with semi mature trees of the same or similar species.

Reason: To ensure that retained trees are identified prior to the commencement of development and adequately protected during the construction phase in accordance with Policy CR2 of the Core Strategy and policies BR3 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

19) No development shall be carried out until a method statement identifying the root protection areas of all trees on and around the site, and giving details of any works to be carried out within the root protection areas of the trees and the method to avoid damage to the trees during these works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that retained trees are adequately protected during the construction phase in accordance with Policy CR2 of the Core Strategy and policies BR3 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

20) The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a Travel Plan for the site which shall include proposals for minimising car-borne travel and encouraging walking, cycling and the use of public transport. 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 BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.
21) Prior to the commencement of the permitted use a Delivery and Servicing Plan to incorporate details of deliveries to the site, including size of vehicle, routing of deliveries, and times of deliveries shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall be adhered to thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

22) 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 the development 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.

23) Details of the surface of the sports hall and kick pitch shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation or completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. The development shall not be constructed other than in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the development is fit for purpose and sustainable in accordance with policies BC5 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

24) The accessible parking bays indicated on drawing Nos. 110:16:53 H and 110:16:55 H, as relevant, shall be clearly marked with a British Standard disabled symbol prior to the occupation of the development and permanently retained for the use of disabled persons and their vehicles and for no other purpose.


25) No development shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage strategy shall include a
restriction in run-off along with details of surface water storage on site. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

Reason: SUDS must be identified prior to the commencement of development to prevent flooding, improve and protect water quality, improve habitat and amenity, and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system in accordance with Policy CR4 of the Core Strategy (July 2010) and Policy BR4 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

26) The development hereby permitted shall achieve as a minimum a 35% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions over Part L of the Building Regulations (2013).

Reason: To ensure compliance with the proposed energy strategy in accordance with Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (March 2015) and Policy BR2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

27) Details of the photo voltaic roof panels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The panels shall be installed prior to occupation of the development in accordance with the approved details and thereafter permanently retained.

Reason: To ensure compliance with the proposed energy strategy in accordance with Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (March 2015) and Policy BR2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

28) No development shall commence, including any works of demolition, until an Employment and Skills Strategy applicable to the development 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. 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 in partnership with the Council's Employment and Skills Team.

Reason: 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, details are required prior to commencement in order to ensure that any demolition and groundworks are included within the approved Strategy.

4. **The Short Blue, Bastable Avenue, Barking-16/02007/FUL**

This item was deferred to the next meeting of the Board.
5. **79 Lodge Avenue, Dagenham - 17/00060/FUL**

The Development Management Manager (DMM) introduced a report on the application relating to 79 Lodge Avenue, Dagenham. The application site comprises a two-storey end of terrace house located on the eastern side of Lodge Avenue, Dagenham. The proposal seeks to erect two 2 storey semi-detached houses on land to the side of No.79 Lodge Avenue.

The surrounding area is predominantly comprised of short terraces of 2 storey dwellings and semi-detached pairs with hipped roofs typical of the Becontree Estate. The erection of a 2 storey semi-detached pair in this location would not materially impact on the character and appearance of the area.

The proposed development would not result in unacceptable levels of overlooking or loss of privacy and complies with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD 2011 which seek to protect residential amenity.

The proposed new dwellings accorded with the Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standards (March 2015).

Although no car parking could be provided for the new houses, the Highways Officer did not raise any objection and considered that any additional parking generated could be accommodated on-street.

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: LA/04, LA/05, LA/06, LA/07.
   
   **Reason:** For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest 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 showing the provisions to be made for external street lighting has 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 the interests of enhancing security and safety, and safeguarding neighbouring amenity in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

5) 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 London Plan.

6. Town Planning Appeals

The Board noted details of the following appeals:

Appeals Lodged

The following appeals have been lodged:

a) Erection of part first floor/part two storey side extension and part single/part two storey rear extension - 36 Stratton Drive, Barking (Ref: 16/01796/FUL)

   Application refused under delegated powers 10 January 2017 – Longbridge Ward.

b) Erection of single storey front extension and a two storey side extension – 3 Ivy Walk, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00084/FUL)

   Application refused under delegated powers 27 March 2017 – Alibon Ward.

c) Erection of single storey front extension and part single/part two storey side and rear extension - 28 Oglethorpe Road, Dagenham (Ref: 16/01943/FUL)

   Application refused under delegated powers 6 February 2016 – Heath Ward.

d) Subdivision of house into 2 one bedroom flats – 69 Salisbury Avenue, Barking (Ref: 16/01871/FUL)

   Application refused under delegated powers 25 January 2017 – Abbey Ward

e) Erection of two storey 1 bedroom dwelling – 1 Rockwell Road,
Dagenham (Ref: 16/02006/FUL)

Application refused under delegated powers 17 February 2017
– Alibon Ward.

Appeals Determined

The following appeal has been determined by the Planning Inspectorate:

a) Enforcement appeal – Unauthorised construction of a loft conversion to the side and rear of the property – 116 Blake Avenue, Barking (Eastbury Ward)

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 26 April 2017

b) Erection of two storey 2 bedroom detached house - 476 Ripple Road, Barking (Ref: 16/01309/FUL – Eastbury Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 3 November 2016 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed house would result in a harmful loss of spaciousness on a prominent corner site at the junction of Ripple Road and Tudor Road and result in an intrusive building located in a side garden projecting significantly beyond the building line of the adjacent terrace at 1-7 Tudor Road contrary to Policy 3.5 of The London Plan and policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

2. The proposed two storey house would have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers by virtue of its proximity to the existing house at the 476 Ripple Road resulting in a loss of light, outlook and privacy contrary to Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Polices DPD and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

3. The proposed off-street parking spaces would require the removal of on-street car parking spaces to the detriment of the overall availability of parking spaces in the locality. The proposed access would have an inadequate sightline which would compromise pedestrian and highway safety contrary to Policy BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 5 May 2017

c) Erection of first floor side/rear extension – 45 Clare Gardens, Barking (Ref: 16/01717/FUL – Longbridge Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 23 January 2017 for the following reason:
1. The first floor side/rear extension would partly close an important gap within the street scene which provides relief from the built up nature of the street. The proposed roof of the first floor side/rear extension would appear incongruous and out of keeping with the design of other terraces in Clare Gardens disrupting the appearance of the roofscape and resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene, and would therefore fail to maintain the character of the area and be harmful to the street scene and surrounding area. The proposed development is contrary to paragraph 56 of the NPPF, policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), 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 allowed 16 May 2017

d) Enforcement appeal – Unauthorised erection of independent residential unit at rear of property – 63 Salisbury Avenue (Abbey Ward)

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 22 May 2017

e) Erection of two storey side and rear extension – 83 Meadow Road, Barking (Ref: 16/01510/FUL – Eastbury Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 25 November 2016 for the following reason:

1. The proposed side extension and roof design, including a combination of pitched and flat roofs, would be unsympathetic to that of the existing house. The side extension would also close off an important gap within the street scene which positively contributes to the spaciousness of the local area. The first floor of the proposed two storey side extension would not be sufficiently set back from the front wall of the house and would therefore not be subservient to the host semi-detached house and would harm the symmetry of the house and its adjacent twin. The proposed development would therefore fail to maintain the character of the area and would be harmful to the street scene, and is therefore 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 26 May 2017

f) Conversion of outbuilding into two-bedroom bungalow (retrospective) – Annex to 1 Gay Gardens, Dagenham (Ref: 16/01306/FUL – Eastbrook Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 13 October 2016 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed bungalow, by reason of its siting and design
constitutes an unacceptable form of backland development that is 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), Policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011) and policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed bungalow does not comply with the minimum requirements of policy 3.5 of the London Plan March 2016 by reason of a shortfall in the Gross Internal Area of the dwelling, the lack of an adequately sized double bedroom and of any storage space and therefore results in the provision of a substandard unit of accommodation, detrimental to the living standards and amenities enjoyed by the occupiers.

3. The development cannot provide any 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 2016.

**Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 26 May 2017**

**g) Erection of part first floor/part two storey side extension and part single/part two storey rear extension – 36 Stratton Drive, Barking (Ref: 16/01796/FUL – Longbridge Ward)**

Application refused under delegated powers 10 January 2017 for the following reason:

1. The proposed side extension would partially close off an important gap within the street scene which provides relief from the built up nature of the street and would fail to maintain the character of the area and be harmful to the street scene. The proposed development is therefore 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 30 May 2017**

**h) Erection of single storey detached dwelling - Land to rear of 82 Saville Road, Chadwell Heath (Ref: 16/00948/FUL – Whalebone Ward)**

Application refused under delegated powers 8 September 2016 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by virtue of its siting, layout and location would constitute an unacceptable form of backland development which would be accessed via an undesirable narrow footpath and represent inappropriate development of a residential garden that
would materially reduce the open and spacious character of the
garden of the application property and 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 Development
Plan Document (March 2011) and the National Planning Policy
Framework.

2. The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its proximity to the northern site
boundary with number 76 Saville Road and the north facing
orientation of the bedroom windows, would result in these rooms
having a poor outlook and receiving limited sunlight detrimental to the
living standards and amenities enjoyed by occupiers of the
development, contrary to Policy BP11 of the Borough Wide

3. The proposed dwelling would be less than 117 square metres in
gross internal floor area and would not provide any in-built storage
provision and the dwelling has a poor internal arrangement whereby
all the WCs in the dwelling are only accessed via bedrooms and as
such the development would result in a poor standard of
accommodation detrimental to the living standards and amenities
enjoyed by future occupiers of the development, contrary to Policies
3.5 and 3.8 of the Housing Standards Minor Alterations to the
London Plan (March 2016).

4. The proposed development would fail to provide any off-street
parking for the dwelling and as such would result in an increase in
existing parking pressures in Saville Road and access for emergency
and refuse vehicles would be restricted by the increase in additional
on-street parking and as such the proposal would be harmful and
hazardous to pedestrian and 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 9 June 2017

7. Delegated Decisions

The Board noted details of delegated decisions for the period 27 February- 31
March 2017.

8. Membership of the Development Control Board Sub-Committees

It was agreed that the following Members of the Board would be appointed to
the Review and Visiting Sub-Committees for the 2017/18 municipal year in
addition to the Chair and Deputy Chair:

Councillors Alasia, Miah, Oluwole and Wade.
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The Farmhouse Venue, Dagenham Road, Dagenham
## Barking and Dagenham Council
### Development Control Board

**Date:** 31 July 2017

### Application No:
17/00439/FUL

### Ward:
Eastbrook

### Reason for Referral to DCB as set out in Part 2, Chapter 9 of the Council Constitution:
The proposed development is an application which, by reason of its scale, impact upon the environment or the level of public or likely Councillor interest should, in the opinion of the Acting Head of Planning, be determined by the Development Control Board.

### Address:
Farmhouse Venue, 649 Dagenham Road, Dagenham

### Development:
Erection of permanent marquee in the grounds for use as function venue for up to 400 guests and provision of additional car parking spaces on land between the existing Farmhouse Venue and the Millennium Centre car park.

### Applicant:
Mr G A Chowdhury

### 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 permanent marquee and overspill car park would result in inappropriate development within the Green Belt and would be harmful as a result of a loss of openness and a loss of visual amenity to the Green Belt. It is considered that there are no very special circumstances of sufficient importance that would outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and other harm to the Green Belt and therefore planning permission should be refused in accordance with the guidance of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Local Plan.

The proposed structure would be a substantial construction within the setting of the locally listed former Farmhouse Tavern, and it is considered that this would harm the character and appearance of the existing building.

The expansion in venue capacity that would result from the development is predicted to cause additional traffic congestion on Dagenham Road and to result in queuing on the highway to gain access to the site at arrival times for functions. It is considered that this would be detrimental to highway safety and the flow of traffic on Dagenham Road.

The impact on ecology, of the proposed overspill car parking spaces to be provided on land that was formerly maintained as part of the adjacent Country Park has not been fully assessed, and the clearing of this land would result in a loss of habitat. Whilst there is potential for replacement habitat planting within the site to mitigate the ecological impact of the proposed development, this cannot be adequately assessed in the absence of a full habitat survey.

### Recommendation:
That the Development Control Board refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would be inappropriate in the Green Belt and there are no very special circumstances to justify an exception to policy; further harm to the Green Belt would be caused by the loss of openness and visual amenity resulting from the erection of the permanent marquee and the use of the overspill parking area, and a loss of tranquillity for users of the adjacent Country Park resulting from the increase in noise and activity associated with the use of the marquee that would be sited in close proximity to the boundary, contrary to policy CM3 of the Core Strategy and policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The marquee would be harmful to the character and open setting of the Farmhouse Tavern, a locally listed building, contrary to policies BP2 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

3. The site is located in an area of poor public transport accessibility and the proposed marquee would significantly intensify the existing use attracting a large number of concentrated traffic movements which given the siting of the access/egress of the venue and the adjacent bend in the road would be harmful to highway safety and contribute to additional queuing and traffic congestion on Dagenham Road contrary to policy BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

4. The application does not include an adequate assessment of the impact of the proposed overspill parking area on ecology, and consequently the development has the potential to cause harm to the ecological value of the site contrary to policy BR3 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

1. Introduction and Description of Development

1.1 The Farmhouse Venue, formerly the Farmhouse Tavern, is located at the junction of Dagenham Road and The Chase. It backs onto Eastbrookend Country Park and is situated within the Green Belt.

1.2 The building is a locally listed former public house and is now in use as a function venue following the grant of planning permission for this change of use by the Development Control Board in 2015.

1.3 Officers recommended refusal of the above application on the grounds of the loss of the public house, harm to highway safety due to concentrated traffic movements at the site entrance, and the impact of overspill parking.

1.4 Members considered that the development would be acceptable and therefore granted planning permission, but sought to limit the impact of the development by imposing conditions that prevent the erection of temporary marquees or structures within the grounds unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and which limit the seating capacity at the venue to 180. A later planning application to delete these conditions was withdrawn (details below).
1.5 The current application is for a permanent marquee with a capacity of up to 400 guests, and therefore if granted, would effectively delete the existing condition restricting the capacity of the venue.

1.6 The marquee would be 4.5m in height with an area of 660m². The structure would have a capital T shape with dimensions of 35m x 15m (the top of the T) and 15m x 9m (the tail of the T). It would be located in the rear garden area of the building, formerly the beer garden of the public house. It would be positioned close to the rear of the Farmhouse building (1.6m at the closest point).

1.7 The materials of the structure would be a mixture of clear glass panels, and coloured uPVC panels, with a roof that would be green in colour with a camouflage design intended to reduce its visual impact.

1.8 The marquee would be clearly visible in views from the adjacent Country Park including the footpath across the park that is close to the rear boundary of the site.

1.9 The venue has an existing parking area providing parking spaces for 61 cars. The proposed area of additional parking would provide for a further 42 parking spaces resulting in a total number of 103 car parking spaces serving the development.

1.10 The additional parking area would be located on an area of grassland that the applicant has acquired situated between the curtilage of the Farmhouse Venue and the Millennium Centre car park. The proposal is to retain this as a grassed area but to install a metal mesh which the grass grows through. This is designed for vehicular use and protects the grass, it has already been used successfully on the front lawn of the Farmhouse Venue.

1.11 The land within the existing curtilage of the building is covered by a Tree Preservation Order that protects various individual trees on the site. The proposed overspill parking area is also subject to a Tree Preservation Order that protects all trees within this area.

1.12 The proposed parking area would require the removal of 7 trees on this land varying in height between 1.5m and 8m including elder, oak, sycamore, and hawthorn. All the proposed removals have been assessed, with the exception of one Category B (moderate quality) tree, as Category C trees (poor quality).

1.13 The tree screen along the east and west boundaries of this land would be retained.

2. Background

2.1 The following planning applications have been submitted since 2011 and are relevant to the current proposal.

2.2 11/00966/FUL - Erection of pavilion within public house garden and erection of ramp to front entrance and side staircase extension to the Farmhouse Tavern in connection with use of the premises for wedding and other events, and associated car parking and boundary fencing and gates; REFUSED AND DISMISSON APPEAL.
2.3 The above application followed the unauthorised erection of the pavilion though the use did not commence. An enforcement notice was issued and a subsequent appeal was dismissed. The notice requiring removal of the pavilion and associated fencing was then complied with. The structure in question was similar in design, scale and construction to the proposal the subject of the current application, though the pavilion the subject of the 2011 application was larger (6.5m in height compared with 4.5m in height in respect of the current marquee proposal, and with an area of 840m² compared with the currently proposed 660m²). Additionally, fewer parking spaces were provided in comparison with the current application.

2.4 13/00333/FUL - Change of use to function venue with ancillary restaurant use; REFUSED.

2.5 14/01256/FUL - Change of use to function venue with ancillary restaurant use and associated erection of single storey side extension and ramp to provide wheelchair access and accessible toilet; PERMITTED.

2.6 The latter case is the planning permission referred to above under which the business is currently operating.

2.7 16/00755/FUL - Application for removal of conditions following grant of planning permission: Removal of conditions 9 and 11 of 14/01256/FUL to allow temporary buildings and structures e.g. marquees to be erected on site and to remove limit on number of attendees; WITHDRAWN.

3. Consultations

Adjoining occupiers

3.1 Consultation letters were sent to approximately 90 local residents. The site has no immediate neighbours but letters were sent to those who had submitted comments in respect of the previous planning applications of similar character.

3.2 In response 62 letters and emails and 3 petitions were received all objecting to the proposal. Not all of these objection letters were from addresses included within the initial consultation. The total number of signatories to the 3 petitions combined is 288.

3.3 The main grounds for objection are the impact on the Green Belt, concern that it would result in additional highway congestion, and that the use of the marquee would disturb the wildlife and tranquillity of the Country Park.

Access Officer

3.4 No accessible car parking bays within the proposed overspill car park are indicated on the drawing. A 5% proportion of total parking provision should be accessible and this is not currently the case.

Planning officer note: It is considered that this matter could be adequately conditioned, and the 5% would be better provided within an amended parking layout for the existing car park that is closer to the Farmhouse Tavern building and the proposed marquee.
Arboricultural Officer

3.5 Requests a full arboricultural survey of the existing trees at the site along with an arboricultural implications assessment that should include consideration of additional soil compaction and issues relating to increased traffic and parking on existing open land.

3.6 The potential impact of the proposal on existing trees should be addressed and mitigated with protection plans and no-dig surfaces, particularly given that the site is covered by a Tree Preservation Order.

3.7 Any proposals for new planting should be presented in a formal landscape plan with species, size and maintenance proposals.

3.8 Following these initial comments an arboricultural and implications assessment was prepared and submitted.

3.9 In response to this the officer states that the proposed development would cause no significant loss from a tree point of view, on the basis that the proposed tree removals for the new parking area of a few elderberries, oak saplings, sycamore and hawthorn would not cause harm visually or in terms of loss of species.

3.10 Further details would be required of the proposed replacement planting to provide mitigation, in order to ensure that this adequately compensates for the losses.

3.11 If the proposal were to be approved additional details of measures to ensure the protection of the roots and health of retained trees within the proposed overspill parking area would be required.

3.12 In conclusion, the proposal can be carried out without seriously impacting trees if implemented carefully in the correct manner. There are no objections to the proposed tree removals subject to native replacements within the new proposed tree planting area.

Council for the Protection of Rural England

3.13 Planning Officer note: This organisation was not directly consulted on the application but has submitted an objection as follows:

“CPRE London objects to this proposed development on that basis that both the marquee and parking are inappropriate development on Green Belt. In addition we object because it would introduce additional parking and traffic into an area of country park and nature reserve, negatively impacting on both.”

Designing Out Crime Officer

3.14 No objections, and in the event that planning permission is granted recommends the imposition of conditions to secure CCTV cameras to public areas of the site, adequate lighting, and Secure by Design accreditation.

Environmental Health
3.15 The environmental protection issues raised are noise and possible light pollution.

3.16 Taking account of evidence related to existing background traffic noise levels on Dagenham Road and the distance from the venue to the nearest residential properties I am confident that noise emissions from the marquee will not cause significant detriment to aural amenity and accordingly I do not wish to object to the application on noise grounds.

3.17 Nevertheless, to safeguard the situation it is recommended that a noise limit condition be imposed that mirrors that which already applies to use of the Farmhouse Venue. It is also recommended that a restriction on the times of use of the marquee be imposed equivalent to the hours applied for within the application (10:00 to 00:30 weekdays; and 10:00 to 01:00 Saturdays, Sundays, and Bank Holidays).

3.18 In relation to external lighting, to safeguard the situation with regard to the protection of residential amenity, it is recommended that a condition be imposed that requires that the design and implementation of the lighting scheme conforms to The Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) guide, “Lighting Against Crime – A Guide for Crime Reduction Professionals”, and specifically that the lighting should be designed to satisfy the guide’s criteria for rural, small village or relatively dark urban locations.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

3.19 No objections.

Parks and Events

3.20 No comments received.

Parks and Countryside Ranger Services

3.21 There are a number of reasons why I am severely concerned about this application:

- This is a direct loss of part of the country park that has been managed for wildlife benefits for 20 years.
- Volunteers planted and maintain a coppiced Hazel Hedgerow on the land proposed for car parking which provides habitats for small mammals, insects and nesting birds. The impacts of having a car park and associated pollution will only be to the detriment of biodiversity here.
- We have had numerous impacts to the park over the last year when the Farmhouse Venue have erected their marquees for weddings, namely the noise disturbance to the park of an evening. Music often starts in the early evening when the park is still being enjoyed by many members of the public who come here to relax and unwind.
- The use of the Millennium Centre Car Park by guests of the venue will continue to be an issue even if they create additional car park spaces, as the capacity will still not be sufficient for the size of weddings they host there.
- It appears that there have been no opportunities taken by the Farmhouse management for increased community engagement in the park or increasing the awareness of the park and its assets to their guests.
- The marquee will be an eyesore and the temporary marquee when in use is visible from many areas in the park. This decreases the enjoyment of local residents when visiting the park and interferes with the feeling of being in the countryside.
- The park is used by many groups such as dementia groups, mental health groups and groups with learning difficulties who take many positive mental and physical health benefits from being submerged in nature. The presence of the Marquee and car park will reduce the opportunity in the park for being away from noise and disturbance.

**Transport Development Management**

3.22 Object on the grounds that it is considered that traffic congestion and parking on the local road network will be significantly increased by the proposed removal of any restriction on numbers that could attend events. This will lead to a negative impact on highway safety, the surrounding environment and other local activities and therefore, the proposal is unacceptable.

3.23 The proposed overspill car park would increase the parking capacity of the site, and this would result in additional traffic congestion at the site entrance and would increase the chance of traffic queuing.

3.24 Experience suggests that the majority of functions have a start time where those attending will tend to arrive close together (at a similar time). This is likely to result in a negative impact on the road network and is likely to cause queuing on the highway at the entrance to the site prior to the start time of events. It is accepted however, that departures from events, are more likely to be staggered with a lesser impact on the highway.

3.25 It should also be noted that there are other local amenities close by such as the Country Park, Millennium Centre, fishing lakes, and cemetery and at weekends activities and events occur at these locations and consequently traffic in the vicinity does increase on the local network.

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 contribution of £16,929.15.

4.2 The development would also be liable for the Borough CIL at a rate of £10 per square metre index linked from 2015 resulting in a contribution of £7,402.35.

5. **Equalities**

5.1 The Equality Act 2010 requires the Council to advance equality of opportunity in the exercise of its functions. It is not considered that the planning policy objective of protecting the Green Belt from encroachment raises any equalities issues.
5.2 It could be argued, as does the applicant below, that the provision of a large function venue would advance equality of opportunity for cultural groups that tend to hold large weddings and celebrations where there is a stated shortage of such facilities available. Culture is not a ‘protected characteristic’ within the Equality Act, though ‘Race’ which can include nationality; ethnic or national origin is.

6. Analysis

Green Belt

6.1 The proposed marquee would result in a permanent loss of openness to the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; and that the essential characteristic of Green Belts are their openness and permanence.

6.2 The NPPF defines such development within the Green Belt as inappropriate, and states that such proposals should be refused permission unless there are very special circumstances where the harm caused by inappropriateness together with any other harm is clearly outweighed by other circumstances.

6.3 The applicant has argued that the following very special circumstances exist and that would justify the granting of planning permission for inappropriate development:

A) The existing business, restricted to the capacity of the existing building is not economically viable; and the proposed development would contribute to the local economy and employment opportunities, and provide a facility that can serve the local community.

B) An economically viable business at the site will enable the continued maintenance and protection of the Farmhouse Tavern building which is a locally listed heritage asset.

C) Part of the site is previously developed land.

*Officer comment: there does not appear to be any evidence for this assertion.*

D) The proposal that would enable larger events to be held that would help to serve cultural needs. Specifically, some ethnic communities tend to hold large functions where the expectation is to invite a wide circle of family and friends. There is a shortage of such venues available in the local area. The proposed development would help to address this need.

6.4 In relation to viability the applicant has submitted a report prepared by Chartered Accountants that compares the options of utilising the existing Farmhouse Tavern building only for events; utilising the Tavern building and holding larger events in temporary marquees that are erected and dismantled for each event; and utilising the site for functions with the benefit of a permanent marquee that is the subject of this application.
6.5 The conclusion is that only the latter is profit making. The existing building is stated to be too small to cater for the demand for larger functions and events at this scale and are stated to be loss making. The option of utilising a temporary marquee (which also does not currently have planning permission) is also stated to be loss making due to the additional labour costs of erecting and dismantling the structure which it is calculated on average takes 69% of the sales revenue for each event.

6.6 Whilst there would be some benefit to the local economy in a profitable business operating at the site, this is not a very special circumstance that would justify harm to the Green Belt.

6.7 The building appears to currently be in a good state of repair, due to the actions of the applicant. With regard to the continued maintenance and protection of the Farmhouse Tavern building (which is on the Council’s Local List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest), the marquee is intended to operate in conjunction with the Tavern building, with the former public house being used as a reception area for events, with the banqueting element being held within the marquee. It is considered that the proposed development does have the potential to contribute to the continued maintenance of the locally listed heritage asset. However, by itself this it is not considered to be a very special circumstance that would justify inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

6.8 In relation to the comment regarding previously developed land the applicant states that the curtilage of the site previously hosted a beer garden and children’s play equipment such as swings and slides. Whilst this maybe the case such minor ancillary structures cannot be compared with the proposed building, albeit that it is a lightweight building, that is the subject of the proposed application in terms of the impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

6.9 Lastly, the applicant argues that there is a shortage of larger function venues in the area and that this disadvantages some communities that require such facilities. Whilst this maybe the case, evidence has not been provided in support of this argument, or to demonstrate that such a new facility could not be provide in a non Green Belt location. This is not therefore considered to be a very special circumstance, and even if some weight were to be given to such stated community needs, this must be balanced against the benefit to the wider community of maintaining the openness and character of the Green Belt and Country Park.

6.10 It is therefore concluded that there are no very special circumstances that would justify the proposed inappropriate development within the Green Belt and therefore planning permission should be refused.

6.11 In addition to the harm caused by inappropriateness it is considered that the proposed development would be harmful due to the loss of openness and that it would be harmful to the tranquillity and visual amenity of the Green Belt, particularly in views from the footpath within the Country Park to the rear of the site where it would appear as an urbanising feature within this semi-natural environment.

6.12 The NPPF (para. 81) states that opportunities should be made within the Green Belt to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity, amongst other matters. It is considered that the proposed development would conflict with these objectives.
6.13 In respect of the enforcement notice appeal (ref. APP/Z5060/C/12/2175183) which related to the previously installed permanent marquee at the site the Inspector stated: “this is a sizeable and intrusive structure that is alien and discordant in this context, significantly eroding the contribution to the openness of the surroundings that was previously made by the grounds of the Tavern, and detracting appreciably from the undeveloped character of the country park. For these reasons it therefore harms the visual amenities and the openness of the area.”

6.14 With regard to the Inspector’s comment it should be noted that the previous marquee had a white roof and sides (excluding the glazing) whereas the currently proposed marquee roof would be green camouflage. The previous marquee was 2m higher than the current proposal and the tree screen around the site boundary is now more mature.

6.15 It is considered that the intensification in the existing use that would result from the provision of the marquee would be harmful to the quiet enjoyment of the Country Park environment, as a result of the additional traffic and car parking, general activity, music and lighting.

6.16 In respect of noise the Inspector stated: “I consider the use of the structure is likely to cause a level of noise that would detract from the quiet and peaceful nature of the adjacent country park, undermining the opportunity it provides for outdoor recreation.”

6.17 The proposed overspill grassed parking area that would be required to serve the expanded facility would also be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This land is partially screened by an existing line of trees to its east side, and the applicant proposes additional tree planting to the south-east boundary to provide further screening of the parking area from the Country Park. Whilst such screening will help to reduce the visual impact of the proposed parking area the parked cars would remain visible particularly when the trees are not in leaf. Also the parked cars would be clearly visible from The Chase where the parking area would be adjacent to the road and there would be no vegetation screening. This would have a negative impact on the visual amenity and tranquillity of the Green Belt.

6.18 In his summary in relation to the Green Belt the Inspector stated: “Accordingly I conclude the works harm the openness and visual amenities of the Green Belt, conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt, and diminish the opportunities for outdoor recreation in the country park.”

6.19 Whilst as stated above the marquee in respect of the appeal scheme was slightly larger than that now proposed and the colour has changed, planning Inspector’s decisions are material planning considerations and should be given substantial weight.
Heritage

6.21 The proposed permanent marquee will be a substantial structure that would be clearly visible within the setting of the locally listed Farmhouse Tavern building. The footprint of the marquee would be significantly larger than that of the original building.

6.22 The marquee would substantially block views of the building particularly from the adjacent Country Park land to the rear of the site (south and west). The marquee is not considered unattractive, but it has no specific architectural merit, and does not have any relationship to the Farmhouse Tavern in terms of design. It is concluded that the proposed structure would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Farmhouse Tavern, however this must be balanced with the potential for the proposed development to contribute to the continued maintenance of the locally listed heritage asset.

6.23 In relation to this matter the Inspector considered that the marquee would occupy a sizeable proportion of the Tavern’s spacious grounds, and visually it would constrain and conceal the Tavern and as a result harm the significance of this heritage asset.

Transport

6.24 The submitted Transport Statement concludes that the proposed additional traffic generation resulting from the development would not adversely affect existing junction capacity within the wider road network.

6.25 The Transport Statement estimates that the parking demand for a typical 400 capacity event would be 84 vehicles. This it states, is based upon parking surveys that have been carried out for 11 events that have previously been held at the site where a travel survey of guest was carried out.

6.26 The applicant states that in addition to the proposed additional car park, it is possible to double park within the existing car park increasing its capacity to 93 spaces. It would appear that this figure may be over optimistic given the constraints of the site layout however, it does appear that 80 or so cars could be accommodated in this manner.

6.27 The Transport Officer states that parking may increase on the highway as a result of the proposed development. Whilst there is potential for this to occur the proposed parking capacity of 103 is substantial, and in somewhat in excess of the typical parking demand estimated by the transport consultant that is stated to be based upon previous experience of events at the site. In the circumstances the proposed level of parking provision to serve the development is considered to be adequate.

6.28 The Transport Officer also objects on the grounds that the proposed development would result in additional traffic congestion on Dagenham Road and in particular would result in queuing at the access into the site at peak periods when guests are arriving for events.

6.29 The applicant’s Transport Statement supports the view that there is potential for the use of the venue to contribute to additional peak traffic congestion. However, this is
only at specific times and days of the week, and it is unlikely that events would be booked for every such occasion.

6.30 Nevertheless, it has been assessed that the proposed development would cause additional traffic generation and queuing on Dagenham Road and this would be harmful to the free flow of traffic and have a negative impact on the road network.

6.31 The two vehicular access points into the site are on a tight bend within the road, and further intensification of the use of such access would be likely to diminish the degree of safety in the operation of the existing junction.

6.32 The eastern-most access into the site is located directly at the junction of The Chase with Dagenham Road to the extent that if a vehicle is waiting to exit The Chase onto Dagenham Road, it would not be possible for another vehicle to enter the site from Dagenham Road as this vehicle would be in its path.

Ecology

6.33 The planning application site is designated as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation, a designation which also covers The Chase and Eastbrookend Country Park.

6.34 An Ecological Appraisal was submitted by the applicant in support of the proposal. The main conclusions of the report are that the area of land proposed for the car park has the potential to provide bird nesting habitat and reptile habitat, both legally Protected Species.

6.35 The areas of potential habitat are the trees proposed for removal and an area of scrub and grassland at the north end of the proposed car parking area that would also need to be cleared to facilitate the development.

6.36 In relation to bird nesting the solution is to impose a condition that prevents tree and vegetation clearance within the bird nesting season, with a proviso that where clearance is required within the season it may be carried out if a qualified ecologist undertakes a survey and confirms that there are no nesting birds present.

6.37 With regard to reptiles the report states that further surveys should be carried out to check for the presence of reptiles. This is the correct approach because if reptiles are present planning policy states that where possible the habitat should be protected. In such circumstances, it would then be appropriate to consider whether the layout of the development could be amended to facilitate the retention of the existing habitat.

6.38 Whilst translocation of reptiles to a replacement habitat can be carried out Government guidance contained within “Reptiles: surveys and mitigation for development projects” states that this approach should only be considered as a last resort.

6.39 In the event that there are no reptiles present then the potential habitat provided by the scrub and grassland could be replaced as mitigation within a proposed landscaped area between the proposed car park and the Country Park as the applicant proposes. However, because further surveys are required there is
insufficient information to conclude that the proposed development would not cause ecological harm and therefore the application should be refused on this basis.

6.40 In addition, the planning policy officer has advised that the location of the site and recent evidence, would suggest that there is potential for Great Crested Newts on the site, and a habitat survey should also be carried with respect to that species.

Conclusions

6.41 The proposed marquee and additional car parking would be inappropriate development within the Green Belt and there are no very special circumstances to overcome the harm. The development would adversely affect the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt and reduce its tranquillity.

6.42 The scale and siting of the marquee is such that it would harm the character and open setting of the locally listed Farmhouse Tavern building but this must be balanced with the potential of the proposed development to facilitate a commercially viable business at the site that would enable the long-term retention and maintenance of this former public house.

6.43 The development of the overspill car park has the potential to harm the ecological value of the site, and therefore planning permission should not be granted in the absence of further surveys that fully assess the habitat potential of the site.

6.44 The intensification in the use of the site would result in additional traffic queues on Dagenham Road associated with events at the venue, and would have a negative impact on highway safety due to the existing poor layout of the vehicular access to the site.

Background Papers

- Planning Application File: [http://paplan.lbbd.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=OMUP4KBLGMD00](http://paplan.lbbd.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=OMUP4KBLGMD00)
• **Local Plan Policy**

**Core strategy**

Policy CM1 General Principles for Development  
Policy CM3 Green Belt and Public Open Spaces  
Policy CR2 Preserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment  
Policy CP2 Protecting and Promoting our Historic Environment  
Policy CP3 High Quality Built Environment

**Borough Wide Development Policies**

Policy BR3 Greening the Urban Environment  
Policy BR9 Parking  
Policy BR10 Sustainable Transport  
Policy BR11 Walking and Cycling  
Policy BC7 Crime Prevention  
Policy BP2 Conservation /Areas and Listed Buildings  
Policy BP11 Urban Design

• **London Plan**

Policy 6.9 Cycling  
Policy 6.13 Parking  
Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment  
Policy 7.3 Designing out crime  
Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology  
Policy 7.16 Green Belt

• **National Policy**

National Planning Policy Framework  
National Planning Practice Guidance
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Proposed Front Elevation

New semi-permanent marquee constructed with ABS panels & 6mm tempered glass windows. Green uPVC panels to front Elevation.
New semi-permanent marquee constructed with ABS panels & 6mm tempered glass windows

Proposed Rear Elevation

Proposed Side Elevation

Note: DO NOT SCALE THIS DRAWING.
All dimensions and levels to be checked by contractor on-site prior to construction or installation.

We will not be responsible for the content after having obtained Planning Permission and/or BuildingRegulation Approval and that there can be no guarantee that Planning Permission and/or Building Regulation will be obtained.

Any works that are started before approvals will be at owner’s risk. No responsibility will be taken for works which are undertaken without the owner’s consent.

Contractor to check site thoroughly, verify dimensions before work and report any discrepancies.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barking and Dagenham Council Development Control Board</th>
<th>Date: 31 July 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application Nos.</strong></td>
<td>17/00574/FUL and 17/00575/LBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for Referral to DCB as set out in Part 2, Chapter 9 of the Council Constitution</strong></td>
<td>The applications involve the creation of new residential dwellings (6 in total) without any private amenity space and there are shortfalls in internal space standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address:</strong></td>
<td>Old Granary, Town Quay, Barking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development:</strong></td>
<td>Applications for Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent: Refurbishment and restoration of building in connection with conversion of building from storage to a restaurant/bar on ground floor with associated deck and visitor mooring pontoon and 5 two-bedroom and 1 three-bedroom flats on upper floors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>Lewisham Works Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>The application site comprises the Old Granary at Town Quay, Barking which is a Grade II listed building. The site is located in the Barking Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) area but outside of the Barking Town Centre boundary. The site also falls within the Abbey and Barking Town Centre Conservation Area and the Abbey Road Riverside Conservation Area is located nearby. Planning permission and listed building consent are sought for the refurbishment and restoration of the existing building in connection with conversion of the building from storage to a restaurant/bar on the ground floor and conversion of the upper floors to create 5 two-bedroom and 1 three-bedroom flats. The proposed works include reinstating original openings and sensitively restoring the envelope of the building. A deck is proposed adjacent to the river for the restaurant/bar use. A pontoon is also proposed as a visitor mooring. In response to the consultation process, officers have received 2 letters of objection, 2 letters of support and 2 letters neither objecting to nor supporting the application. The main areas of concern relate to loss of amenity, particularly around noise/disturbance associated with the hours of use proposed by the developer. The proposed development would result in the welcome protection, enhancement and re-use of a Grade II listed building. The proposed restaurant/bar use is welcomed and would help to stimulate the night-time economy which is currently poorly provided for in the Barking Town Centre AAP area. The principle of the proposed use of the upper floors for residential accommodation is also considered to be acceptable. The proposed deck and pontoon associated with the restaurant/bar use would help to encourage more active use of the river/riverside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed works to the interior and exterior of the listed building, including the new deck and pontoon, are considered to result in less than substantial harm and any detriment is outweighed by the protection and re-use of the building. Furthermore, the proposed development is not considered to significantly affect the setting of nearby heritage assets.

Officers also conclude that the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the two Conservation Areas. It is considered that the public benefits of the scheme outweigh any harm to the two Conservation Areas.

The listed status of the building restricts its internal layout and results in a minor shortfall in the gross internal floor area of one flat and a shortfall in storage cupboard space in all of the flats. Overall, it is considered that future occupiers of the proposed development would still enjoy a satisfactory standard of accommodation.

Officers accept that there is no potential to provide any on-site external amenity space in this case given the listed status of the building which prevents the addition of balconies/terraces.

Officers have proposed a balanced restriction on the hours of use of the restaurant/bar that take into account the concerns of neighbouring residential occupiers, whilst not restricting the night-time economy.

The residential element of the proposed development is considered to be acceptable as car-free given the constraints of the site and a clause within a S106 Agreement would prevent future occupiers from obtaining a parking permit for any Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). Three existing car parking spaces are to be retained for use in association with the restaurant/bar, one of which would be marked out as a blue badge space.

As a means of helping to justify the provision of the deck and pontoon on the river and contributing to riverside activity, a S106 Agreement would secure a clause that requires the developer to commit to hosting at least four events a year that clearly attract people to the riverside. A financial contribution of £10,000 (index linked) would also be secured for dredging costs to help unlock the Council’s Town Quay community mooring project.

The proposal complies with the relevant policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, the London Plan and the Local Plan, with the exception of internal space standards and external amenity space provision as discussed within the main report.

It is recommended that planning permission and listed building consent be granted subject to a S106 Agreement to secure the matters set out in Section 6.7 of this report and the conditions listed in this report (with any amendments that might be necessary up to the issue of the decisions).

Recommendation:

That the Development Control Board grants planning permission and listed building consent subject to:

1. A Section 106 legal agreement to secure the matters set out in section 6.7 of this report; and

2. The following conditions (with any amendments that might be necessary up to the issue
Conditions for Planning Application No. 17/00574/FUL

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:

VINE77/SV/00, 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10 and 11; and

VINE77/PR00 Rev 2, 01 Rev 3, 02 Rev 2, 03 Rev 2, 04 Rev 2, 05 Rev 3, 06 Rev 2, 07 Rev 2, 08 Rev 2, 09 Rev 2 and 10.

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

3. 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.

4. No deliveries, external running of plant and equipment, or demolition and construction works, other than internal works not audible outside the site boundary, shall take place on the site other than 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.

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.

5. No demolition or development shall take place until an 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 take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, which shall include the statement of significance and research objectives, and

A. 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

B. 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 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.

6. No above ground new development shall commence 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 CP2 and CP3 of the Core Strategy, policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan.

7. No above ground new development shall commence until full details of the hard landscaping have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The hard landscaping scheme shall include, but not be limited to, details of the following:

a) surface materials;
b) refuse storage;
c) cycle parking;
d) railings; and
e) management and maintenance.

The hard landscaping scheme shall be implemented prior to occupation of the development in accordance with the approved details and thereafter permanently maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of design quality, residential amenity, walking, accessibility and public safety, in accordance with policies CP2 and CP3 of the Core Strategy and policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

8. No work on the proposed pontoon and deck shall commence until full details of the design and construction of them, including the method of piling and an associated assessment of the impacts of piling on residential amenity and ecology, and details regarding the provision for water and electricity to the pontoon, have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing in consultation with the Port of London Authority. The design shall also incorporate measures to prevent litter arising from the proposed development entering the water. The pontoon and deck shall be implemented prior to occupation of the development in accordance with the approved details and thereafter permanently maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of design quality, residential amenity and to protect the ecology of the area, in accordance with policies CR3, CP2 and CP3 of the Core Strategy and policies BR3, BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

9. No above ground new development shall commence 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, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The external lighting of the development 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. All external lighting shall also be designed to prevent light spill into the watercourse or adjacent river corridor habitat and to minimise its impact on navigation and the ecology of the River Roding. The development shall not be occupied until the approved scheme has been installed. Thereafter the approved measures shall be permanently retained.

Reason: In the interests of security and safety, to avoid light pollution, to safeguard neighbouring amenity and to minimise any impact on ecology, and in accordance with policies BR3, BC7 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

10. The 3 car parking spaces as indicated on drawing No. PR/00 Rev 2 shall be constructed and marked out prior to the occupation of the development. 1 of the car parking spaces shall be marked as an accessible parking bay (to be clearly marked with a British Standard disabled symbol). The car parking spaces shall thereafter be retained permanently.
Reason: To ensure and promote easier access for disabled persons and to ensure sufficient off-street parking, 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.

11. The combined rating level of the noise from any plant installed pursuant to this permission 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 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.

12. Any kitchen extract system to be installed pursuant to this permission shall include measures for the removal and treatment of cooking odours, details of which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details of any external flue required shall also be submitted for approval. The measures shall have regard to and be commensurate with the guidance and recommendations in the publication 'Guidance on the Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems', DEFRA, 2005.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed residential units are adequately protected from noise and cooking smells and odours and in accordance with policies BP8 and BR13 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 7.15 of the London Plan.

13. Any machinery and equipment to be installed pursuant to this permission shall be designed and installed to ensure that structure borne (re-radiated) noise emissions shall 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.

14. No above ground new development shall commence until details of sound insulation measures to mitigate noise transmission between the ground floor restaurant/bar and first floor residential accommodation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be fully implemented before the first occupation of the residential unit to which they relate 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.

15. The restaurant/bar use is permitted to trade between the hours of 0800 to midnight Sunday to Thursday and 0800 to 0100 Friday and Saturday, and at no other time.

Reason: To prevent the uses causing any undue disturbance to residential occupiers and occupants of neighbouring properties at unreasonable hours and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.
16. The serving of food and drink at tables located outside the building is permitted to take place between the hours of 0800 to 2300 Sunday to Thursday and 0800 to midnight Friday and Saturday, and at no other time.

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

17. The handling of bottles and movement of bins and rubbish is not permitted to take place outside the restaurant/bar between the hours of 2300 on one day and 0700 the following day.

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

18. The delivery/collection of goods associated with the restaurant/bar is only permitted to take place between the hours of 0700 and 2100 on any day.

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

19. Noise from entertainment including live and amplified music associated with the restaurant/bar use hereby permitted shall be controlled so as to be inaudible inside adjoining and other noise-sensitive premises in the vicinity of the restaurant/bar. 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 $\text{L}_{\text{eq}}$ (EN) shall not exceed $\text{L}_{\text{A90}}$ (WEN); and
the $\text{L}_{10}$ (EN) shall not exceed $\text{L}_{90}$ (WEN) in any 1/3 octave band between 40Hz and 160Hz.

EN = entertainment noise level and WEN = representative background noise level without the entertainment noise; both measured 1 metre from the façade of the noise-sensitive premise.

Reason: To ensure that noise-sensitive premises in the vicinity of the development 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.

20. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until details of riparian life saving equipment as recommended by the Port of London Authority have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Port of London Authority. The life saving equipment shall be to a standard recommended in the Hayes Report on the Inquiry into River Safety and provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development. The life saving equipment shall be permanently retained to an acceptable standard.

Reason: In the interests of public safety and to accord with policy BP9 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.
21. No development shall commence until two dusk or dawn bat surveys have been undertaken between 1 May and 1 September in accordance with the recommendations contained in the submitted Ecological Report dated 30 June 2017. If the surveys find the building is being used by bats, a strategy to ensure the protection of the roost and/or hibernation site must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the commencement of works.

Reason: Bats are a protected species and therefore the survey work and associated assessment must be completed prior to commencement of development and in accordance with policy CR2 of the Core Strategy.

22. No more than two days prior to commencement of any works that may affect nesting birds (including river works, building work, roof works, tree works and vegetation clearance), buildings, river edges, trees and hedges shall be checked by a qualified ecologist to determine if nesting birds are present. A report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority confirming the presence or absence of birds before the works commence. If nesting birds are found, works should be delayed until the nesting season is over and the fledglings have left the area and a strategy should be agreed with the Local Planning Authority to ensure the nesting birds are not disturbed by any other works taking place on the site.

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.

Conditions for Listed Building Consent Application No. 17/00575/LBC

1. The works must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which consent is hereby granted.

Reason: To comply with Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) 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:

VINE77/SV/00, 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10 and 11; and

VINE77/PR00 Rev 2, 01 Rev 3, 02 Rev 2, 03 Rev 2, 04 Rev 2, 05 Rev 3, 06 Rev 2, 07 Rev 2, 08 Rev 2, 09 Rev 2 and 10.

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

3. No new plumbing, pipes, soilstacks, flues, vents, ductwork, grilles, security alarms, lighting, cameras or other appurtenances shall be fixed on the external faces of the listed building except where this is in accordance with details which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To preserve the character of the building and locality and in accordance with policies CP2 and CP3 of the Core Strategy and policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough

4. No demolition or development shall take place until an 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 take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, which shall include the statement of significance and research objectives, and

A. 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

B. 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 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.

5. Any hidden historic features which are revealed during the course of the works shall be retained in-situ, work suspended in the relevant area of the building and the Local Planning Authority notified immediately. Provision shall be made for the retention and proper recording of the features as required by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To preserve the character of the building and in accordance with policy CP2 of the Core Strategy and policy BP2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

6. All new works and improvements inside and outside the building must match existing original adjacent work in terms of the choice of materials, method of construction and finished appearance. This applies unless differences are shown on the approved drawings or are required in conditions attached to this permission.

Reason: To preserve the character of the building and locality and in accordance with policies CP2 and CP3 of the Core Strategy and policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

7. No above ground new development shall commence until details and samples of all new external facing materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All new brickwork to the existing listed building must exactly match adjacent original brickwork in terms of the colour, size, texture, brick bond and pointing. The relevant works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and samples.

Reason: To preserve the character of the building and locality and in accordance with policies CP2 and CP3 of the Core Strategy and policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

8. No above ground new development shall commence until detailed drawings showing the design of the deck and pontoon and the means of fixing them to the listed building have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The relevant works
shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings.

Reason: To preserve the character of the building and locality and in accordance with policies CP2 and CP3 of the Core Strategy and policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.
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1.0 Introduction and Description of Development

Existing Site

1.1 The application site comprises the Old Granary at Town Quay, Barking which is a Grade II listed building. The existing building was built in 1870 and was once part of Barking Mill. The site incorporates a timber dock which is now submerged.

1.2 The site falls within the Abbey and Barking Town Centre Conservation Area and the Abbey Road Riverside Conservation Area is located nearby.

1.3 The existing building is currently used as a storage warehouse by a card/stationery company.

Proposal

1.4 Planning permission and listed building consent are sought for the refurbishment and restoration of the existing building in connection with conversion of the building from storage to a restaurant/bar on the ground floor and conversion of the upper floors to create 5 two-bedroom and 1 three-bedroom flats.

1.5 The proposed works include reinstating original openings and sensitively restoring the envelope of the building. A deck is proposed adjacent to the river for the restaurant/bar use. A pontoon is also proposed as a visitor mooring to replace the submerged dock.

2.0 Background

2.1 There is a lengthy planning history for the site for the period of 1949 – 1967, however, there has been no planning history since that time.

3.0 Consultations

3.1 Neighbours / Publicity:

3 site notices were posted on 21 April 2017 and expired on 12 May 2017.

A press notice was published in the Barking and Dagenham Post on 26 April 2017 and expired on 17 May 2017.
62 neighbouring occupiers were consulted on 21 April 2017 and the 21 day consultation period expired on 12 May 2017.

Officers have received 2 letters of objection to the proposed development, 2 letters of support and 2 letters neither objecting to nor supporting the application. These are summarised below.

**Objectors:**

**2 Benedicts Wharf, Highbridge Road, Barking**

Concerns raised about:

* Loss of privacy arising from occupiers of the proposed flats looking directly across the road into my living room window.
* The proposed restaurant use and the noise/violence this would bring to the area. At the moment it is a relatively quiet area and to have a restaurant/bar across the road would bring substantial noise to the area, leading to complaints from myself and other owners in the block of flats. Also the increased risk of violence and higher police activity around the area due to the bar serving alcohol and the late nights it would be open leaves me with huge concerns that we will not be able to sleep until the bar has fully closed and all of the customers have dispersed. I believe it is too close to a residential block of flats for this to be approved. I also strongly believe that the future residents living above the restaurant would not be happy living above a noisy restaurant/bar.

**33 Benedicts Wharf, Highbridge Road, Barking**

Concerns raised about:

* The A3/A4 commercial use due to noise and disturbance in late evenings and early mornings.
* The preferred opening times for the A3/A4 use of 11.00 – 03.00.
* We strongly believe that the A4 status should be rejected only keeping the A3 status (restaurant/cafe) due to the surrounding residential area with young families.
* If a compromise can be made where respectful hours are enforced, we are in a more neutral position with an A3 commercial use as it is good for the regeneration of the immediate area and Barking itself.

**Supporters:**

**Unit 1 Fresh Wharf Estate, Barking**

* I support the application as a refurbishment of a landmark conservation building in the borough which acts as a ‘signpost’ from Abbey Green to the River Roding. I support the inclusion of flats in the building and a restaurant offer on the ground floor to add interest and life to this corner of the town centre. It could make a significant contribution to the further development of Town Quay and local riverside spaces.
22 Benedicts Wharf, Highbridge Road, Barking

- I support the redevelopment of this building. What sound proofing will be added to reduce the noise of any bar/restaurant? I presume any licensing issues are handled later? What will the restrictions be on construction times? The road outside frequently gets issues due to lack of signage of who has right of way outside the Old Granary. Will this be rectified as part of this work? The local BT Openreach cabinet for this site has not been upgraded to fibre so there is limited internet. Will this development contribute to getting this upgraded? With this being a bar will the smoking area be outside the main entrance or on the pontoon?

Comments neither objecting to nor supporting the applications:

23 Benedicts Wharf, Highbridge Road, Barking

- The amenity section of the Design and Access Statement states that the preferred closing hours of the proposed restaurant/bar are 01.00 Sunday - Wednesday and 03.00 Thursday - Saturday. Given the proposed development is in a quiet residential section of Barking which currently only hears noise from the odd vehicle passing after 20.30 and the faint sound of vehicles on the A406 dual carriageway, what stipulations will be proposed to minimise/nullify any potential noise pollution derived from the restaurant/bar?

43 Benedicts Wharf, Highbridge Road, Barking

- I broadly support the application but with the caveat that in regards to the restaurant/bar, I believe licensing the premises to open and/or to serve alcohol up to 03.00 on weekends as proposed would have the potential of causing significant disturbance not only to the residents of the proposed flats above but also to neighbouring properties, and the additional potential of putting those residents at risk of harm. If a licence is to be granted, it should be no later than 23.00 on any day.
- A licence to serve alcohol beyond 23.00 would have the likelihood of creating unacceptable levels of noise as customers left the premises and make their way home. Since the period between 23.00 and 03.00 is well beyond the point where most restaurants serve food, it seems likely that the proposed restaurant/bar would be functioning as a bar or club at that time, possibly serving customers leaving other pubs or bars after standard closing time.
- As there is no public transport directly adjacent to the proposed site and no public parking in the planning application, it seems likely that customers of the proposed bar would pass directly by Benedicts Wharf in order to access bus or train routes on their way home. Experience of living opposite other licensed premises has shown that it is rarely, if ever, possible for licensees to control customers’ noise levels as they exit a building.
- I would certainly be concerned for the potential impact on safety of any new premises serving alcohol late into the night.
- I believe that Barking needs projects that support the regeneration of the area and, broadly speaking, I think this proposal would contribute positively to this. However, the site is in an area where people live and where there are no other licensed premises in the immediate vicinity.
I think it is very important that any new developments support the needs of the local community and a new high quality restaurant or bar with reasonable opening times that respected the needs of local residents would do so, as probably would some new flats. However, a late opening premises attracting those not able to find food or alcohol elsewhere in Barking would not be a positive contribution. My view is that such establishments would be better remaining in the area of the High Street where there is better access to public transport, better street lighting and better policing.

**Officer Note:** The comments made by the various parties above are addressed as follows:

With the exception of a new glazed staircase to the Highbridge Road elevation of the building, no new windows are proposed that would impact on the privacy of adjacent occupiers.

Matters relating to noise/disturbance associated with the restaurant/bar use are dealt with in the Environmental Health Officer’s comments in the ‘Consultation’ section of this report and at section 6.4 of this report. Conditions would also be imposed on any planning permission to ensure that there is suitable noise protection between the proposed restaurant/bar use and the proposed flats above.

There is nothing to suggest that the proposed use would result in an increased risk of violence in the locality.

Licensing issues would be dealt with by the Council’s Licensing Team in due course.

Standard construction working hours would be secured by condition on any planning permission granted.

The matters relating to road signage and upgrading of the local BT Openreach cabinet are not considered to be relevant planning matters.

Smoking areas have not been identified at this stage and that would be for the restaurant/bar owner to designate in due course. This would no doubt be on the outside deck area. Officers would not wish to see a smoking area designated outside the main entrance to the building.

### 3.2 Consultees:

**Environmental Health** – The issues raised by the proposed development are possible land contamination and operational/construction phase impacts as set out below:

- Odour/noise from any commercial kitchen extract system;
- Noise from any fixed plant installed pursuant to any permission that might be granted;
- Noise transmission from the ground floor restaurant to first floor residential accommodation;
- Noise from the use of the outdoor dining area;
• Possible disturbance from deliveries/collections at unsocial hours;
• Possible light pollution from the lighting of outdoor areas; and
• Construction phase impacts, including noise and dust and exhaust emissions to air from non mobile plant.

The submitted land contamination report draws on relevant, publically available sources of information but does not make reference to the planning history as set out in the pre-application letter from the Council to the applicant which identifies that one of the previous uses of the building is for the manufacture of toys. However, I note that no potentially contaminative items were encountered during the walkover survey.

I concur with the conclusion presented in the report that the conceptual model has demonstrated that there is a low risk of contamination on this site and that there should be no significant geo-environmental issues that would prevent the site from being developed for its intended end use.

I do not think it is necessary to impose the standard contaminated land conditions in this case but recommend that any permission that might be granted be subject to a suitably worded informative to safeguard against the possibility of the discovery of unexpected contamination during development.

In my view operational/construction phase impacts can be addressed by way of conditions.

I would note that the proposed restriction on the times when food and drink can be served outside the building is to allow for patrons to finish their meals before 2300 which is normally taken to be the start of the particularly sensitive night-time period.

Officer Note:

The planning conditions recommended above by the Environmental Health Officer will be secured on any planning permission granted, with the exception that officers have proposed that food and drink may be served outside on Fridays and Saturdays until midnight instead of 2300 given the proposed longer hours of operation on those days. It is considered that keeping the deck area open longer would mean that smokers could use it as opposed to potentially congregating outside the front of the building which is considered to be less desirable.

When asked to comment further on the developer’s proposed hours of use of the restaurant/bar in light of objections from neighbouring properties, the Environmental Health Officer responded as follows:

The restaurant has no windows facing nearby existing dwellings and I have recommended a restriction on the times of use of the outdoor area so I think it is unlikely that noise associated with the operation of the restaurant/bar will cause significant disturbance.

Clearly, there is always the possibility that on occasion a group of rowdy patrons leaving the premises in the early hours will cause disturbance and so a judgement has to be made as where to strike the balance between safeguarding a high
standard of aural amenity and avoiding placing unreasonable restrictions on
development and inhibiting the development of the evening/night-time economy.

There are examples of restaurants/bars in the Borough that have similar opening
hours to those proposed in this case which operate without giving rise to complaints
of noise disturbance.

My view is that if the locality is regarded as one of mixed residential / commercial /
cultural activities, as opposed to a primarily residential area, then the proposed
opening hours are reasonable.

Officer Note: Officers have considered the Environmental Health Officer’s response
above, but still have concerns about allowing the bar to open till 0300 on Thursday
to Saturdays and 0100 on other days. Whilst it is appreciated that the Council
wants to improve the night-time economy, it is considered premature to allow such
late openings. The location is currently very quiet in the evening and, whilst it is
hoped that this will change in the future, any noise generated will be very apparent.
Moreover, officers currently have no idea who the operator will be and therefore
there is no track record to assess this against. If the premises operate successfully
over time, and are well-managed, the owner could potentially consider applying to
extend the hours of use in the future.

Environmental Health (Food Safety) – With respect to the restaurant/bar use we
would like to see details of the kitchen layout, sinks, wash basin, cookers and the
location of the extract ventilation system.

Officer Note: This information is not currently available as a restaurant/bar operator
has not yet been secured. Furthermore, this information is not considered
necessary for the purposes of determining these applications. A condition would be
imposed on any planning permission granted requiring the submission and approval
of the kitchen extract ventilation system associated with the restaurant/bar use.

Transport Development Management Officer – There are no apparent major
adverse highway safety implications arising from the proposed development.

Access Officer – The accessible parking bay must have 1.2 metre hatched transfer
zones to at least one side and to the rear of the bay.

Detailed comments were also made which relate to minimum part M (Building
Regulations) requirements and the developer’s duties under the Equality Act 2010.

Officer Note: The developer has confirmed that the part M matters are achievable
and will be addressed at the Building Regulations stage; and that the accessible car
parking space will be accommodated with 1.2 metre hatched transfers zones to one
side and to the rear of the bay.

Refuse Team – The residential refuse storage area and quantity of one euro bin for
residual and one euro bin for recycling is adequate for the six flats.

The developer should consider revising the size of the commercial refuse storage
area so that it would accommodate a minimum of one 1,100 litre euro bin for
residual waste and one 1,100 litre euro bin for recycling.
The proposed collection points for commercial and household waste will be reasonably accessible by our refuse crews.

*Officer Note:* The commercial refuse storage area has been amended in line with the Refuse Team’s comments.

**Lead Local Flood Authority** – We have no objections as there is little scope to incorporate the use of sustainable drainage systems for this development. We consider that the proposed finished floor levels are sufficient to mitigate the risk of flooding to the site but recommend that the flood resilience measures outlined in the Flood Risk Assessment are considered.

**Civil Protection Service** – No concerns regarding the safe evacuation for residents of this block if the measures outlined in sections 4.4-6 of the Flood Risk Assessment are implemented.

*Officer Note:* An informative would be imposed on any planning permission granted.

**Employment and Skills Team** – No response.

**Culture and Communities** – No response.

**Historic England (Archaeology)** – The planning application lies in an area of archaeological interest. The Victorian granary is a key reminder of Barking’s industrial strength and wealth during the nineteenth century and its conversion may offer the last opportunity to record many aspects of its construction and development before they are covered or removed.

The development is likely to cause some harm to archaeological interest but not sufficient to justify refusal of planning permission provided that a condition is applied to require an investigation to be undertaken to advance understanding.

*Officer Note:* The recommended planning condition will be secured on any planning permission granted.

**Historic England (Buildings)** – We do not consider that it is necessary for this application to be notified to Historic England under the relevant statutory provisions.

**Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings** – No response.

**Ancient Monuments Society** – No response.

**Council for British Archaeology** – No response.

**Georgian Group** – No response.

**Victorian Society** – No response.

**Twentieth Century Society** – No response.
**Thames Water** – No response.

**Environment Agency** – We have no objections to the proposed development on flood risk safety grounds, but would recommend that, where feasible, finished floor levels for the proposed development are set as high as is practically possible, or flood resilience/resistance measures are incorporated. This is to protect the proposed development from flooding.

You are the competent authority on matters of evacuation or rescue, and therefore should assess the adequacy of the evacuation arrangements, including the safety of the route of access/egress from the site in a flood event or information in relation to signage, underwater hazards or any other particular requirements. You should consult your emergency planners (i.e. Civil Protection Service) as you make this assessment.

**Natural England** – The proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes.

**Port of London Authority (PLA)** – The PLA initially objected to the proposed deck/pontoon on the basis that insufficient information had been provided to assess the proposal and its impacts. The PLA also requested that notice be served on them as a landowner (i.e. Certificate B). Further discussions have since taken place between the developer’s consultants and the PLA culminating in the submission of technical notes and a Water Directive Framework Assessment. The PLA has provided the following response:

It is confirmed that notice under Certificate B has now been served on the PLA.

The PLA welcomes the discussions that have taken place with Marina Projects but unfortunately it does not alter the PLA’s position on the applications.

London Plan policy is clear that the use of the water space should be prioritised for water related purposes. What is proposed is principally a deck for use in connection with a ground floor restaurant use and then a pontoon which will have very limited use at best due to the restrictions that would be applied to it (hours of use linked to the restaurant, no access to land, etc.) and the tidal constraints in the creek. To the PLA the balance appears to be wrong, prioritising non-river related uses rather than river related ones.

The supporting text to policy 7.24 of the London Plan is clear that “the starting point for consideration of development and use of the Blue Ribbon Network (BRN) and land alongside it must be the water.” In the absence of a document that demonstrates otherwise, it appears that the starting point of the proposal was the restaurant not the water. I would also draw your attention to the part in the London Plan that states “the BRN should not be used as an extension of the developable land in London”. Tables and chairs for use in connection with a restaurant is clearly an extension of the developable land.

The PLA therefore continues to object in principle to this development that is non-river related and located over water and is clearly an extension of developable land.
In the event of planning permission being granted, a condition should ensure that details of riparian life saving equipment are submitted for approval. A condition should also require the submission and approval of external lighting details which demonstrate how the lighting has been designed to minimise light spill and ensure no negative impacts on any wildlife (including, where relevant, bats, birds and fish) or navigating vessels.

**Officer Note:** Officers have considered the PLA’s objection and whilst their point that the proposal relates to commercial space is acknowledged, it is argued that the proposal also opens up the riverside to numerous more people and it generates new moorings where there are none.

The Council is keen to see that the river is more actively used. There are theatre boats, cinema boats, etc. that could ideally be moored at the site to attract people to the riverside. On this basis, officers consider that as a means to addressing the PLA’s objection a S106 Agreement should secure that the developer commits to hosting at least four events a year that clearly attract people to the riverside.

Silting issues associated with the river is something that is also going to be a problem for the community moorings that the Council’s Regeneration Team is exploring in Town Quay. As a further means to addressing the PLA’s objection, a S106 contribution should secure £10,000 (index linked) for dredging costs to help unlock the community mooring project and make these moorings more accessible.

The developer has agreed to the above two S106 planning obligations being secured as part of any planning permission being granted. Officers conclude that the proposed development does not prevent any river related use, but rather opens up the riverside to other users by providing an opportunity to eat, drink and socialise alongside it and/or attend events. Furthermore, the proposed financial contribution for dredging costs would help to deliver further mooring opportunities in the vicinity. On this basis, officers consider that the planning obligations offer sufficient remedy to the PLA’s in principle objection relating to non-river versus river uses.

It should be noted that the developer would need to discuss and obtain a River Works Licence from the PLA in due course. The PLA is also yet to provide comments to the developer on their submitted Water Framework Directive Assessment. Both of these matters are for the PLA to agree and are not considered to affect the planning process.

Conditions would be imposed on any planning permission granted relating to riparian life saving equipment and external lighting.

**Designing Out Crime Officer** – It is recommended that this development seeks to achieve Secured by Design accreditation.

**Essex and Suffolk Water** – Our records show that we have apparatus located in the proposed development. We have no objection to this development subject to compliance with our requirements. Consent is given to the development on the condition that a water connection is made onto our company network for the new dwellings for revenue purposes.
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority – The Brigade is satisfied with the proposals with regard to the ground floor. Access to the flats should comply with 16.3 of Approved Document B Volume 2 of The Building Regulations 2010. A pump appliance should be able to approach to within 45 metres of all points in all flats measured along a line suitable for the laying of hose. If this cannot be achieved a fire main should be installed and access for a pump appliance provided to within 18 metres of the inlet of the fire main which is usually sited on the face of the building. The inlet should be visible from the appliance. If no fire hydrant already exists within 100 metres of the entrance to the building, a fire hydrant should be provided within 90 metres of the fire main inlet.

Officer Note: The developer has advised that it is their understanding, and through consultation with an Approved Inspector, that the proposal as it stands responds to paragraph 16.3 of Approved Document B Volume 2 of the Building Regulations.

London Fire Brigade – Water Team – No additional hydrants are required and no further action is required by our office.

Association for Industrial Archaeology (AIA) – The AIA is the national organisation for people who share an interest in Britain’s industrial past. The Association was not directly consulted by officers, however, they have submitted the following comments:

The new uses should ensure that the building survives and is maintained in good condition. Residential use is not always the most suitable re-use for an industrial building but it is usually the most secure. The Association welcomes a re-use. The present use may mean that some original features are not currently visible. Therefore, it is essential that any which come to light during the conversion are at the very least recorded and efforts should be made to retain them in-situ.

4.0 Local Financial Considerations

4.1 The proposed development is considered to be liable for the Mayoral and Borough Community Infrastructure Levies (CIL) as new dwellings are created. However, as there is no new floorspace being created and the existing floorspace meets the relevant use criteria the overall charge is considered to be nil.

5.0 Equalities Considerations

5.1 The Equality Act 2010 requires the Council to advance equality of opportunity in the exercise of its functions. In this respect, all entrances and thresholds to the restaurant and residential lobby are to be levelled and step-free.

6.0 Analysis

6.1 Principle of Development

6.1.1 The site is located in the Barking Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) area but outside of the Barking Town Centre boundary. Policy CM2 of the Core Strategy sets a target of 6,000 new homes in the Barking Town Centre AAP area through redevelopment in line with the AAP.
6.1.2 Policy BTC5 of the Barking Town Centre AAP states that the Council will regard small scale, commercial leisure uses as appropriate in the area around Town Quay provided proposals demonstrate improved public transport access to the area, improved pedestrian and cycling links with the town centre and the protection/enhancement of the character of the Abbey Road Riverside Conservation Area and of the various listed buildings in the area.

6.1.3 Officers accept that given the small scale nature of the proposed development it would not be viable to provide for any improved public transport or pedestrian/cycling links as part of the development. It is considered, however, that the proposed development seeks to protect/enhance the two Conservation Areas, the listed building itself and other nearby heritage assets.

6.1.4 The proposed restaurant/bar use is welcomed and would help to stimulate the evening economy which is currently poorly provided for in the Barking Town Centre AAP area.

6.1.5 The principle of the proposed use of the ground floor of the existing building as a restaurant/bar and the use of the upper floors for residential accommodation is considered to be acceptable subject to the matters below being satisfactorily addressed.

6.2 Design and Heritage

6.2.1 Paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that “In determining planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should take account of:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness”.

6.2.2 Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that “When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a Grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional”.

6.2.3 Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that “Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use”.

6.2.4 Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy and Policy BP2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD seek to protect and enhance the historic environment in Barking and Dagenham.
6.2.5 Policy BP2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD states that “Proposals to alter, change the use of and/or extend any listed building, or for development in the vicinity of a listed building, must demonstrate that there will be no adverse impact (individual or cumulative) on the significance including its special architectural or historic interest of the building and its setting. Development proposals and regeneration initiatives which affect a listed building or its setting will be expected to demonstrate that any social and economic benefits of the scheme are balanced to ensure the development is in keeping with its significance including its special architectural and historic interest”.

6.2.6 The Old Granary was Grade II listed on 17 December 1968 and the listing reads as follows:

Mid C19. Yellow brick. Slate roof. Casement windows. Four storeys. Seven windows. Tower of one extra storey and 3 windows to the return front of Italinate character with wide projecting eaves and pyramidal roof, at the right hand end. Gable end to the left hand return front of 3 windows. Small gable in the centre which originally had a projecting hoist beyond it.

6.2.7 The site falls within the Abbey and Barking Town Centre Conservation Area and the Abbey Road Riverside Conservation Area is located nearby. The site is also located in an archaeological priority zone.

6.2.8 The site is located near to the Barking Abbey Scheduled Ancient Monument, the Grade I Listed Parish Church of St Margaret, the Grade II Listed Tomb of Captain John Bennett at St Margaret’s Church, the Grade II Listed remains of Barking Abbey and the old churchyard walls, the Grade II* Listed Fire Bell Gate (Curfew Tower) and the Grade II Listed bridge over the River Roding.

Existing Building

6.2.9 The Old Granary is built on a reclaimed site and from the south and west can be seen to rest on a yellow brick base that rises directly out of the water of the Mill Pool, with a stone plinth course that supports the main structure of the building.

6.2.10 The Old Granary is built of yellow brick laid in English bond under a slate roof. It is seven bays long from east to west and three bays wide. The building is four storeys high, except for the eastern-most bay which is wider than the others and rises by an extra storey to form a low tower with a hipped roof. The glazing consists mainly of double-opening timber casements. The architectural treatment of the building has been described as ‘austerely elegant’.

6.2.11 On the southern (river facing) elevation of the building, there are windows to each bay of each floor. There is a folding jib crane adjacent to the third floor openings, bracketed out from the wall surface with a diagonal beam to brace it. A luccam (extension running outward from the wall of a building to allow materials to be lowered by a hoist) has previously been removed from this elevation.

6.2.12 The eastern elevation of the building comprises the existing main entrance. There is a central doorway at ground level, flanked by windows that have been blocked up. Directly above at first floor level there is evidence of another doorway, probably
originally used for loading vehicles, which has been reduced in size to make a window. There are three windows to each of the upper floors of the building.

6.2.13 The northern elevation of the building fronts Highbridge Road and is almost entirely blind with the exception of two windows to the second and third floors, made by partly blocking doorways to a lost luccam. There is a folding jib crane adjacent to the third floor opening. Directly beneath this pair of openings are two doorways which have been modified. The first floor doorway has been widened and then blocked up, while the ground floor doorway has been partly blocked and a newer, smaller doorway has been inserted.

6.2.14 The western elevation of the building is similar in pattern to the eastern elevation. All of the windows at ground floor level, two at first floor level and two at third floor level have been blocked up. In the centre of the gable is a circular louvered opening to ventilate the roofspace.

6.2.15 Internally the existing building incorporates a goods lift. A modern concrete staircase rises from the ground floor to the office directly above in an enclosure formed of blockwork. There is also a modern enclosed staircase on the northern side of the building, which rises all the way to the third floor. At its lowermost landing there is an exit onto Highbridge Road through a narrow doorway. The building is currently used as a storage warehouse by a card/stationery company and so the interior is largely open plan.

6.2.16 Very little work has been carried out to the building in recent years. Looking at the condition of the existing building, it is clear that some movement (historical or otherwise) is present and vegetation growing up the river fronting facade has allowed some water into the building/mortar and some localised rot has occurred. There are also a number of blocked up windows as described above. Missing roof tiles have lead to pigeons in the roof space and rainwater ingress. The structural timber beams have been reinforced and the timber windows, sarking boards (covering the rafters), barge boards and doors are all in need of repair/replacement.

**Proposed Alterations to the Building’s Exterior and Interior**

6.2.17 The brickwork and joinery would be repaired where necessary and the existing folding jib cranes would be retained and conserved. All of the existing windows would be replaced by conservation-grade, timber-framed casements painted in white with insulated double glazing. The roof would be restored and new natural slates to match the existing would be provided where necessary.

6.2.18 On the southern elevation, the openings at second and third floor levels, where the luccam was removed, would be modified. The upper opening would be unblocked and the lower opening widened and deepened to give it the same dimensions. Both would then be fitted with timber stable doors with glazed upper sections. The openings at ground and first floor levels directly beneath would be turned back into doorways and also fitted with stable doors with glazed upper sections. In total, three windows at ground floor level would be converted to doors in order to provide access onto the proposed deck/pontoon. The existing roof lights in the southern roof slope would be modified and three more openings made to give a total of five, all uniform in size and aligned in a row. These would be fitted with conservation-type, low profile skylights.
6.2.19 A deck would be constructed over the Mill Pool on the southern side of the building to provide an outdoor seating area and access to a mooring pontoon for pleasure-craft. This would rest on Y-shaped supports rising out of the water. It would have a balustrade constructed of steel rods with a timber handrail, and a floor of timber decking.

6.2.20 On the northern elevation of the building, a new internal staircase providing access to the upper floor flats would be constructed in the central bay of the four-storey section of the building. This would have an entrance to Highbridge Road fitted with a timber door painted a neutral colour. A new, curtain-glazed opening fitted with steel-framed glazing would be created to light the proposed staircase, along with two new doorways at ground level to provide access to the internal bin stores. These would be fitted with timber double doors painted a neutral colour. Soil vent pipes would exit through the north roof slope near the eaves, with slate vents for the third floor kitchen and bathroom. Six boiler flues would also be routed out through this elevation – four through the wall and two through the roof. All would be finished in a neutral colour to minimise their visual impact.

6.2.21 On the eastern and western elevations of the building, the blocked up windows would be reopened and timber-framed glazing reinstated to match the timber-framed casements to be installed elsewhere. Those to the eastern elevation at ground level would be fitted with shutters. The existing main entrance to the building would be fitted with stable doors. The opening above it would be returned to its original dimensions and fitted with stable doors with glazed upper sections.

6.2.22 The existing internal partitions, linings, false ceilings and staircases that post-date the original fabric of the building would all be removed.

6.2.23 Cast iron columns, marked with the installation date and similar to those at second-floor level, would be installed on the ground and first floors to reinforce the structure.

6.2.24 The existing floor boards would be retained, but new floor boards would be laid on top of them above timber battens to provide a level base and a layer of acoustic insulation. Galvanised wall straps, concealed in the floor build up and covering a minimum of three joists, would be inserted. The existing ceiling structure would be retained and restored.

6.2.25 The existing brickwork would be cleaned and exposed, including the chamfered window jambs. The accommodation on the third floor would be open to the roof, which would be insulated. Lined insulation would be fitted to the walls on the north side in the kitchens and bathrooms and to the north wall of the fourth floor bedroom.

6.2.26 New partition walls would be introduced to provide for the proposed new functions. A new staircase would be constructed to provide access from the third floor to the fourth floor living room and bedroom in the tower.

6.2.27 It is considered that the application proposes a sensitive restoration of the building envelope, including reinstating original openings that have been blocked up over time. The restoration of the building is welcomed and will help ensure the long-term protection of this important heritage asset.
Proposed Deck and Pontoon

6.2.28 The proposed deck and pontoon additions would be sited 500mm away from the existing building. The proposal minimises the impact of the new construction on the original building and offers the opportunity to showcase the foundation of the building. The proposed deck would be reached via bridges (the same width as the proposed doors on the rear elevation of the building) of lightweight construction that cantilever over the gap to the door. This design means that there is a minimal (if any) physical fixing into the building to support the deck therefore marking the distinction between the old and the new. The proposed pontoon would be reached via the deck. The deck and pontoon designs are considered to be sympathetic to their surroundings.

6.2.29 Provision for water and electricity would be provided on the pontoon. Sewage facilities are excluded as the mooring is not proposed to be an overnight mooring because the only access to land is through the restaurant/bar which will be securely locked when the restaurant/bar or deck area closes.

6.2.30 The proposed pontoon would be 17.5 metres long. Visiting boats of a compatible length and draft would be welcome and encouraged to moor while the deck area is open.

6.2.31 The detailed design of the deck and pontoon would specify measures such as board spacing and toe rails to ensure that any dropped items of litter cannot enter the water. Innovative solutions (e.g. ‘Seabin’) could also be installed that would actively improve the condition of the general Mill Pool area by collecting rubbish and floating debris.

6.2.32 The exact piling requirements associated with the installation of the proposed deck and pontoon would be identified during the detailed design stage of the development, once the ground investigations and surveys have been completed. To minimise impacts on ecology during installation there are a number of different methodologies and solutions that could be promoted. The timing of the works would also be managed to take place during set tidal windows, such as during high or low water period, or to avoid sensitive periods.

Heritage Assessment

6.2.33 The application was accompanied by a Heritage Assessment which provides an assessment of the impacts of the proposed development on the listed building itself and the two Conservation Areas and surrounding heritage assets.

6.2.34 Historic England and the six amenity societies were consulted as part of the application process however no comments or letters of objection have been received.

6.2.35 The proposed works to the interior and exterior of the listed building, including the new deck and pontoon, are considered to result in less than substantial harm and any detriment is outweighed by the re-use of the building as a restaurant/bar and residential accommodation. Furthermore, the proposed development is not considered to significantly affect the setting of nearby heritage assets, comprising the Barking Abbey Scheduled Ancient Monument, the Grade I Listed Parish Church...
of St Margaret, the Grade II Listed Tomb of Captain John Bennett at St Margaret’s Church, the Grade II Listed remains of Barking Abbey and the old churchyard walls, the Grade II* Listed Fire Bell Gate (Curfew Tower) and the Grade II Listed bridge over the River Roding. In reaching these conclusions, officers have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving features of special architectural or historic interest, and in particular, listed buildings in accordance with Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

6.2.36 Officers have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the two Conservation Areas in accordance with Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Officers conclude that the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the two Conservation Areas. It is considered that the public benefits of the scheme, comprising a restaurant/bar use, new residential accommodation and the long-term protection of a heritage asset, outweigh any harm to the Abbey and Barking Town Centre Conservation Area and the Abbey Road Riverside Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore aligned with paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

6.2.37 Officers consider that the proposed development is in keeping with the spirit of the relevant national, regional and local policies which seek to protect and enhance the historic environment.

Internal Space Standards

6.2.38 The proposed flats have been designed where reasonably possible to meet the nationally described space standards and the minimum space standards set out in the London Plan. Given that the building is Grade II listed and also has a fixed envelope, it is acknowledged that there are limitations to the overall internal space and its layout.

6.2.39 Flat 2 which is a 2-bedroom/3-person unit falls short of the required gross internal floor area by 0.7 square metres. All of the other flats meet the policy requirement with respect to gross internal floor area.

6.2.40 All 6 flats fail to meet the general storage cupboard space requirements set out in policy. Despite this shortfall, the combined built-in general storage cupboard space and bedroom storage space in each flat is over 2 square metres. This is considered to be a reasonable level of storage in the circumstances.

6.2.41 Having regard to the constraints of the site arising from its listed status and considering the nature of the shortfalls in internal space referred to above, officers do not consider that the shortfalls amount to a reason for refusal in this case. It is considered that future occupiers of the proposed development would still enjoy a satisfactory standard of accommodation.

6.3 External Amenity Space

6.3.1 Officers accept that there is no potential to provide any on-site external amenity space in this case given the listed status of the building which prevents the addition of balconies/terraces. The development is in short walking distance to Abbey
Green providing occupiers of the residential units with easy access to outdoor space.

6.4 Amenity Issues

6.4.1 The proposed development is not considered to pose any issues of overlooking from the proposed flats or restaurant/bar use to surrounding residential units. There are also not considered to be any impacts on sunlight/daylight to surrounding residential units.

6.4.2 It is noted that neighbouring residents have raised concerns about the proposed hours of use sought by the developer and associated noise/disturbance, namely:

Sunday to Wednesday - 1100 to 0100; and
Thursday to Saturday - 1100 to 0300.

6.4.3 Officers, including the Environmental Health Officer, have given due consideration to the proposed hours of use of the restaurant/bar as set out in the ‘Consultation’ section of this report. It is considered that the hours of use proposed by the developer are currently not justified having regard to the fact that the area is relatively quiet at present, albeit expected to become more mixed-use in the future. Officers have proposed a balanced restriction on the hours of use that take into account the concerns of neighbouring residential occupiers, whilst not restricting the night-time economy. Furthermore, officers have allowed for earlier opening hours to potentially allow for the future operator of the restaurant to open for breakfast. As set out in the attached conditions, officers propose the following hours of use be secured on any planning permission granted:

Sunday to Thursday - 0800 to midnight; and
Friday and Saturday - 0800 to 0100.

6.4.4 The matter of alcohol licensing for the restaurant/bar would be dealt with by the Council’s Licensing Team in due course.

6.5 Transport / Parking

6.5.1 The application site has a poor Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 2.

6.5.2 Policy BR9 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD states that the car parking standards set out in the London Plan will be used as maximum parking standards for new development. For example, the maximum parking standards set out in Policy 6.13 of the London Plan are less than 1 space for a unit with 1-2 beds.

6.5.3 Two out of three existing car parking spaces at the front of the building are to be retained in association with the restaurant/bar use. The third space is to be converted to a blue badge parking bay in association with the restaurant/bar use.

6.5.4 The residential element of the proposed development is considered to be acceptable as car-free given the constraints of the site. Despite the poor PTAL, it is considered that the site is within reasonable walking distance of the town centre amenities and Barking Station. A S106 clause to be secured would prevent the
occupiers of the proposed flats from obtaining parking permits for any Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) given the existing high demand for car parking in the area.

6.5.5 Six new cycle stands are to be installed adjacent to the car parking spaces. These are most likely to be used in association with the restaurant/bar use. Given the constraints of the site, officers accept that it is not possible to provide secure covered cycle parking for the residential occupiers in this case.

6.6 Ecology

6.6.1 The River Roding is a Grade I site of Borough importance for nature conservation.

6.6.2 The applications were accompanied by an Ecology Report which considers, amongst other things, the impacts on the ecology of the river arising from the proposed deck and pontoon. A site survey and internal bat roost inspection were undertaken as part of the assessment in order to review the ecology of the site and its potential for protected species.

6.6.3 The Ecology Report states that as the site is located directly next to the River Roding, there is likely to be some impact on it during construction works in terms of noise and pollution. It is understood that high level background ecological checks have not identified any specific protected species or ecological markers that would be impacted by the pontoon and vessel grounding. Overall, the Ecological Report considers that the development would have a negligible long-term effect on the River Roding’s biodiversity. It is suggested that the proposals may in fact improve the quality of the area of the River Roding immediately next to the site, as the rubbish items that are currently there will likely be removed and the general area cleaned, improving the water quality. The report recommends that all standard operating procedures for working in, or near, water be implemented, which should include measures to protect the river and prevent any pollution or contamination of the watercourse, either directly or indirectly. Furthermore, it is recommended that any work that will create visual and acoustic disturbance within the aquatic river habitat be undertaken outside the key time for fish spawning in the River Roding (April - May) in order to avoid disturbance of fish species during that key time.

6.6.4 The Ecology Report states that the installation of the deck and pontoon will likely increase suspended sediment loads and remobilise pollutants in the River Roding due to bed disturbance. Whilst this has the potential to impact on the river habitat, the report concludes that due to the tidal nature of the Roding, suspended sediment loads are naturally high and the biotic communities that are present are adapted to these conditions.

6.7 S106 Planning Obligations

6.7.1 A Section 106 Agreement would secure the following planning obligations:

Riverside Events

The developer shall commit to hosting at least four events a year that clearly attract people to the riverside.

Financial Contribution for Dredging Costs
Secure a financial contribution of £10,000 (index linked) for dredging costs to help unlock the Town Quay community mooring project and make these moorings more accessible.

**Restriction on Obtaining a Permit for any Controlled Parking Zone**

Ensure that all head leases for the residential units contain a provision to secure the obligation that the leaseholder shall not apply for a parking permit for any Controlled Parking Zone unless the occupant is the holder of a disabled persons badge issued pursuant to Section 21 of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970.

**S106 Legal Fees**

Pay the Council’s professional fees associated with the preparation and completion of the S106 Agreement.

### 7.0 Conclusion

#### 7.1

The proposed development would result in the welcome protection, enhancement and re-use of a Grade II listed building. The proposed restaurant/bar use would help stimulate the night-time economy which is currently poor in the Barking Town Centre AAP Area and the proposed flats would offer a satisfactory standard of accommodation for future occupiers. The proposed deck and pontoon associated with the restaurant/bar use would help to encourage more active use of the river/riverside.

#### 7.2

The proposal complies with the relevant policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, the London Plan and the Local Plan, with the exception of internal space standards and external amenity space provision as discussed and justified in Sections 6.2 and 6.3 above.

#### 7.3

It is recommended that planning permission and listed building consent be granted subject to a S106 Agreement to secure the matters set out in Section 6.7 of this report and the conditions listed in this report (with any amendments that might be necessary up to the issue of the decisions).

### Background Papers

- Planning Application Files:
  
  [http://paplan.lbbd.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=ONZG3LBLGQY00](http://paplan.lbbd.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=ONZG3LBLGQY00)
  
  [http://paplan.lbbd.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=ONZG5SBLGR000](http://paplan.lbbd.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=ONZG5SBLGR000)

- **Local Plan Policy**

  **Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011):**

  Policy BR3 – Greening the Urban Environment
Policy BR9 – Parking
Policy BR10 – Sustainable Transport
Policy BR11 – Walking and Cycling
Policy BR13 – Noise Mitigation
Policy BR14 – Air Quality
Policy BR15 – Sustainable Waste Management
Policy BC2 – Accessible and Adaptable Housing
Policy BC7 – Crime Prevention
Policy BC8 – Mixed Use Development
Policy BE4 – Managing the Evening Economy
Policy BP1 – Culture and Tourism
Policy BP2 – Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings
Policy BP3 – Archaeology
Policy BP5 – External Amenity Space
Policy BP8 – Protecting Residential Amenity
Policy BP9 – Riverside Development
Policy BP10 – Housing Density
Policy BP11 – Urban Design

Core Strategy (July 2010):

Policy CM2 – Managing Housing Growth
Policy CM5 – Town Centre Hierarchy
Policy CR2 – Preserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment
Policy CR4 – Flood Management
Policy CE1 – Vibrant and Prosperous Town Centres
Policy CP1 – Vibrant Culture and Tourism
Policy CP2 – Protecting and Promoting our Historic Environment
Policy CP3 – High Quality Built Environment

Barking Town Centre Area Action Plan (BTCAAP) (February 2011):

Policy BTC5 – Leisure Uses and the Evening Economy
Policy BTC6 – Barking as a Visitor Destination
Policy BTC11 – Cycling Facilities
Policy BTC13 – Housing Supply
Policy BTC16 – Urban Design
Policy BTC19 – Heritage and Historic Environment
Policy BTC21 – Riverside Development and Informal Leisure

Other Guidance:


London Riverside Opportunity Area Planning Framework (September 2015)

- The London Plan (March 2016):

Policy 3.5 – Quality and Design of Housing Developments
Policy 3.8 – Housing Choice
Policy 5.12 – Flood Risk Management
Policy 6.9 – Cycling
Policy 6.10 – Walking
Policy 6.13 – Parking
Policy 7.1 – Lifetime Neighbourhoods
Policy 7.2 – An Inclusive Environment
Policy 7.3 – Designing Out Crime
Policy 7.4 – Local Character
Policy 7.6 - Architecture
Policy 7.8 – Heritage Assets and Archaeology
Policy 7.14 – Improving Air Quality
Policy 7.15 – Reducing and Managing Noise, Improving and Enhancing the Acoustic Environment and Promoting Appropriate Soundscapes
Policy 7.19 – Biodiversity and Access to Nature
Policy 7.24 – Blue Ribbon Network
Policy 7.30 – London’s Canals and Other Rivers and Waterspaces
Policy 8.3 – Community Infrastructure Levy

‘Housing’ Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016)

- National Planning Policy Guidance

  National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)
  Planning Practice Guidance
  Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (March 2015)
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1. NW Elevation - Proposed

- Roof tiles to be vertically aligned and finish of a neutral dark colour
- New steel framed double glazed Crittall style window at residential level entrance
- New timber door to residential level entrance
- Finish of a neutral dark colour
- Rear door to aluminium p. & hopper - framed in black
- Rear slate roof
- New iron rainwater gaps to edge of roof (see)
- Move iron rainwater gaps to edge of roof

Notes:
- This drawing is for planning purposes only.
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Title: Town Planning Appeals

Report of the Development Management Manager, Regeneration Division

Open Report

For Information

Wards Affected: Alibon, Eastbury, Whalebone

Key Decision: No

Report Author: Dave Mansfield, Development Management Manager

Tel: 020 8227 3999
E-mail: dave.mansfield@lbfd.gov.uk

Accountable Director: John East, Growth and Homes

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

Recommendation:
The Development Control Board is asked to note this report.

1. Appeals Lodged

   The following appeals have been lodged:

a) Erection of two storey side extension – 81 Keir Hardie Way, Barking (Ref: 16/01840/FUL)
   Application refused under delegated powers 19 January 2017 - Eastbury Ward

b) Erection of first floor side extension incorporating rear dormer window and single storey side/rear extension – 113 Hunters Hall Road, Dagenham (Ref: 16/01962/FUL)
   Application refused under delegated powers 1 March 2017 - Alibon Ward

c) Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and front rooflights – 378 Heathway, Dagenham (Ref: 16/01684/CLU_P)
   Application refused under delegated powers 23 December 2016 - Alibon Ward

d) Demolition of bungalow and erection of 3 two storey two bedroom dwellings – 37 Gordon Road, Chadwell Heath (Ref: 16/01503/FUL)
e) Demolition of garage and erection of part single/part two storey side/rear extension to provide new dwelling (retrospective) – 15 Rosslyn Road, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00170/FUL)

Application refused under delegated powers 2 May 2017 – Whalebone Ward

2. Appeals Determined

2.1.1 The following appeal has been determined by the Planning Inspectorate:

None.
<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>3 April 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00186/ADV</td>
<td>Permitted on 3 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr V Nguyen</td>
<td>Installation of fascia sign. Puppy Salon 239 Oxlow Lane Dagenham Essex RM10 7YA</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00194/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 3 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr O Iulian-Liviu</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and installation of front rooflight. 411 Wood Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 3NR</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00199/ADV</td>
<td>Permitted on 3 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr T Riaz</td>
<td>Installation of internally illuminated fascia sign. 126 Fanshawe Avenue Barking Essex IG11 8RQ</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00316/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 3 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr N Mohemed Serali</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: 3.0 metres). 78 Campden Crescent Dagenham Essex RM8 2RU</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 April 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00994/FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 4 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Patwal</td>
<td>Installation of extract ventilation ducting (retrospective). 574 Longbridge Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2AR</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>17/00097/OUT</td>
<td>Application refused on 4 April 2017</td>
<td>Ms C McEwen</td>
<td>Erection of two storey building comprising 2 one bedroom flats. 8 Bonham Gardens Dagenham Essex RM8 3BE</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00150/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 4 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Ullah</td>
<td>Demolition of rear store and erection of single storey rear extension. 102 Hulse Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9UP</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00204/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate refused on 4 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Volskis</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of part single/part two storey rear extension. 31 Cannington Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4BE</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00205/FUL</td>
<td>Application refused on 4 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Islam</td>
<td>Loft conversion involving construction of side dormer window. 76 Blackborne Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8SP</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00209/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 4 April 2017</td>
<td>Barking Riverside Ltd</td>
<td>Application for the approval of details reserved by condition 13 (verification report) in respect of planning permission 08/00887/FUL (Plot 2.22.1). Barking Riverside Area Renwick Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00321/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 4 April 2017</td>
<td>Mrs L Gonta</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.2 metres). 75 Standfield Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8JT</td>
<td>Alibon</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>17/00322/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 4 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Shahzad</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). 90 Bennetts Castle Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 3XS</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00326/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 4 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr M A Hassan</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). 10 Upney Lane Barking Essex IG11 9LW</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00379/NMA</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 4 April 2017</td>
<td>Moo Print Ltd</td>
<td>Application for non-material amendment following grant of planning permission 16/01653/FUL (relocation of condenser units, alterations to intake and extract ventilation louvres and grilles and details of sub-station). Unit 12 Thames Gateway Park Chequers Lane Dagenham Essex RM9 6FB</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 April 2017

<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>16/00224/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 5 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Patwal</td>
<td>Application for variation of condition following grant of planning permission: Variation of condition 5 of TP/1/95 to allow use of premises between the hours of 7.00am and 11.00pm Monday to Sunday. 574 Longbridge Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2AR</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>17/00103/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 5 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr K Singh</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 34 Tenterden Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1PX</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00104/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 5 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr K Singh</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 36 Tenterden Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1PX</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00215/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 5 April 2017</td>
<td>LBBD - Mrs J Hardy</td>
<td>Installation of access ramp with handrails to front of house. 29 Ingleby Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8SB</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00216/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 5 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs S Awe</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 181 Keith Road Barking Essex IG11 7TY</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00218/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 5 April 2017</td>
<td>Mrs Daise-Marie Murphy</td>
<td>Installation of access ramp with handrails to front of house. 15 Morrison Road Barking Essex IG11 0UA</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>17/00220/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 5 April 2017</td>
<td>Miss D Samuels</td>
<td>Installation of access ramp with handrails to rear of house. 66 King Edwards Road Barking Essex IG11 7TN</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00221/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 5 April 2017</td>
<td>Miss L Moore</td>
<td>Installation of access ramp with handrails to front of house. 633 Heathway Dagenham Essex RM9 5TA</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00222/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 5 April 2017</td>
<td>Mrs J Barber</td>
<td>Installation of access ramp with handrails to front of house. 32 Scrattons Terrace Barking Essex IG11 0TY</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00223/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 5 April 2017</td>
<td>Ms L Ashman</td>
<td>Installation of access ramp with handrails to front of house. 320 Rugby Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4AT</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00224/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate refused on 5 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Agbo</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey rear extension. 78 Hainault Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6BJ</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00225/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 5 April 2017</td>
<td>Mrs V Gordon</td>
<td>Installation of access ramp to the front of the property 146 Stamford Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4ES</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00327/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 5 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Dave</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.90 metres and maximum height: 3.85 metres). 76 Halbutt Street Dagenham Essex RM9 5AR</td>
<td>Alibon</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>17/00331/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 5 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Krivickas</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves 2.63 metres and maximum height: 2.96 metres). 79 School Road Dagenham Essex RM10 9QD</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00340/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 6 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Hoxha</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves 2.85 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 206 Bonham Road Dagenham Essex RM8 3BJ</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00341/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 6 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr M C Tillakaratne</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). 37 Arden Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 6TJ</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00343/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 6 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr R E Mihalache</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves 2.85 metres and maximum height: 3.7 metres). 14 Melbourne Gardens Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6TB</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6 April 2017**

<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>16/01484/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 April 2017</td>
<td>London Wholesale Ltd</td>
<td>Roof alterations and erection of 4 external staircases in connection with formation of 2 additional floor levels. Rear Of 73 River Road Barking Essex</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>16/01604/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 April 2017</td>
<td>Pocket Living (2013) LLP</td>
<td>Engineering operations involving excavation of soil and other material, remediation of land, provision of new capping layer with associated re-grading and landscaping of site. Land Between Whiting Avenue and Gurdwara Way Barking Essex</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01960/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Afzal</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side and part single/part two storey rear extension. 85 Warley Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 1JS</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00157/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 April 2017</td>
<td>McDonald's Restaurants Ltd</td>
<td>Refurbishment of restaurant including reconfiguration of drive thru lane, car park and kerb lines to accommodate side by side ordering, formation of new island, alterations to elevations including erection of extensions (14m2), recladding of roof and replacement of drive thru booths. McDonalds Drive In Restaurant Whalebone Lane North Romford Essex RM6 5QT</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00158/ ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 April 2017</td>
<td>McDonald's Restaurants Ltd</td>
<td>Installation of 5 internally illuminated fascia signs and resiting of 1 internally illuminated fascia sign. McDonalds Drive In Restaurant Whalebone Lane North Romford Essex RM6 5QT</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00159/ ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 April 2017</td>
<td>McDonald's Restaurants Ltd</td>
<td>Relocation of 3 internally illuminated freestanding signs and installation of 5 internally illuminated and non-illuminated freestanding signs. McDonalds Drive In Restaurant Whalebone Lane North Romford Essex RM6 5QT</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</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>17/00164/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 April 2017</td>
<td>DVSA Barking</td>
<td>Change of use from B1(a) office to car licence testing centre (sui generis) for temporary period of 2 years. First Floor Unit 9 Town Quay Wharf Abbey Road Barking Essex IG11 7BZ</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00234/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 April 2017</td>
<td>LBBD - Mrs J Hardy</td>
<td>Installation of access ramp with handrails to front of house and replacement hard surface in front garden. 824 Dagenham Road Dagenham Essex RM10 7UB</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00247/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 7 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr M S Baig</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof and rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 103 Whalebone Lane South Dagenham Essex RM8 1AJ</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00345/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 7 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr N Huda</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: 3.0 metres). 81 Westrow Drive Barking Essex IG11 9BL</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10 April 2017**

<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>16/02015/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 10 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Alim</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of outbuilding in rear garden. 22 Glenmore Way Barking Essex IG11 0LY</td>
<td>Thames</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>17/00055/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 10 April 2017</td>
<td>LBBD - James Cambell Primary School</td>
<td>Erection of single storey extension to dining hall to provide staff room. James Cambell Primary School Langley Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 6TD</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00126/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 10 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Islam</td>
<td>Demolition of garage and erection of two storey side extension, single storey front extension and front porch. 24 Rowney Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4PP</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00128/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 10 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr M R Ali</td>
<td>Erection of outbuilding in rear garden. 58 Dereham Road Barking Essex IG11 9HA</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00173/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 10 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Singh</td>
<td>Erection of part single storey/part two storey/part first floor side and rear extension. 121 Stevens Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2PU</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00212/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate refused on 10 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Akerman</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey rear extension and loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 62 Dunkeld Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2PT</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00237/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 10 April 2017</td>
<td>Mrs H Rahman</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side extension and part single part two storey rear extension. 2 Dereham Road Barking Essex IG11 9HA</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>17/00249/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 10 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Ahmad</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof and rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 108 Sheppey Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4LB</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00275/TPO</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 10 April 2017</td>
<td>Dr B Azodo</td>
<td>Application for tree works subject to a tree preservation order: Crown reduction by up to 3 metres, crown lifting to 4 - 5 metres and removal of deadwood. 17 Foxglove Road Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0YW</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00257/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 10 April 2017</td>
<td>LBBD - Strategic Director Service Development &amp; Integration</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 5 (soft landscaping) in respect of planning permission 15/00106/FUL. Barking Riverside Area Renwick Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00359/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 10 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Hussain</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.95 metres and maximum height: 2.95 metres). 16 Basedale Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4QA</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00369/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 10 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Shamaun</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). 38 Chittys Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 1UP</td>
<td>Valence</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>17/00403/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required on 10 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr Onut</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: 3.0 metres). 61 Rugby Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4AJ</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00506/ NMA</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 10 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr Turja</td>
<td>Application for non-material amendment following grant of planning permission 16/01950/FUL (change to location of front door and alteration of window size). 63 Hunters Hall Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8HX</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00022/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 11 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Branch</td>
<td>Erection of first floor rear extension. 174 Beam Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 9BL</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00201/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 11 April 2017</td>
<td>Mrs Sahota</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and installation of front rooflight. 112 Dawson Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9QQ</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00227/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 11 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs M Buzura</td>
<td>Erection of outbuilding in rear garden. 175 Valence Wood Road Dagenham Essex RM8 3AJ</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 April 2017
## 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>17/00262/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 11 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Yates</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 33 Rose Glen Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0SL</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12 April 2017

<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>16/02013/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 12 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Alim</td>
<td>Erection of part single/part two storey side/rear extension. 22 Glenmore Way Barking Essex IG11 0LY</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00269/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 12 April 2017</td>
<td>Mrs N Kanwal</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear conservatory. 115 Connor Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5UT</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00432/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 12 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr I Latif</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: 3.2 metres). 66 Thatches Grove Romford Essex RM6 5LH</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13 April 2017

<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>16/01185/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>Pollock Lifts</td>
<td>Erection of lift shaft. 98A Ford Road Dagenham Essex RM10 9JP</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00053/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>Ms I Iusco</td>
<td>Erection of outbuilding in rear garden to be used as 'granny annexe'. 56 Thatches Grove Romford Essex RM6 5LH</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</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>17/00152/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>Mrs D Patel</td>
<td>Application for variation of condition following grant of planning permission 09/00978/FUL: Variation of condition 4 (to increase the number of children attending the nursery from 10 to 28). 132 Lambourne Road Barking Essex IG11 9QA</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00168/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate refused on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>Mrs D Patel</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of outbuilding in side garden. 12 Sterry Road Barking Essex IG11 9SJ</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00177/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>Ms R Kaur</td>
<td>Erection of single storey side extension and part single/part two storey rear extension. Faircross Care Home 100 Faircross Avenue Barking Essex IG11 8QZ</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00188/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>GLS Properties Investment Limited</td>
<td>Erection of two storey one bedroom house. 58 Central Park Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 7BU</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00263/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>Express Concrete Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 6 (external materials), 7 (boundary treatment) and 21 (cycle parking) in respect of planning permission 16/00252/CTY. D B Schenker Barking Freight Terminal Ripple Road Barking Essex</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>17/00281/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>Sabo Bread</td>
<td>Installation of shopfront and extract ventilation ducting to rear in connection with use as sandwich shop (Class A1). 269 Heathway Dagenham Essex RM9 5AQ</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00282/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr F Miah</td>
<td>Erection of first floor side/rear extension and single storey rear extension. 28 Victoria Road Barking Essex IG11 8PY</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00290/ CLU_E</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Iqbal</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for an existing use: Use of property as two self-contained flats. 112 Fanshawe Avenue Barking Essex IG11 8RQ</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00292/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr L Juozapaitis</td>
<td>Erection of part single/part two storey rear extension. 31 Lynnett Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1RJ</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00295/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>Ms C Goodchild</td>
<td>Erection of first floor side/rear extension and loft conversion. 108 Maxey Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5HS</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00392/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Awan</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.85 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 36 Hedingham Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2NA</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</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>17/00395/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Sarkar</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: 3.0 metres). 49 Woodward Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4SJ</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00396/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr A K Azad</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). 37 Monmouth Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5DD</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00404/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Kervi</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.5 metres and maximum height: 3.5 metres). 34 Wheel Farm Drive Dagenham Essex RM10 7AR</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00405/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr L Bacchus</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: 3.0 metres). 93 Beam Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 9BS</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00406/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 13 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Camber</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: 3.0 metres). 104 Croppath Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8DB</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>17/00191/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 18 April 2017</td>
<td>LBBD</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 36 (Code for Sustainable Homes - Phase 1, Block D only) in respect of planning permission 13/00229/FUL. Leys Redevelopment Site Wellington Drive Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00301/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 18 April 2017</td>
<td>Mrs L Mercer</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey rear extension. 15 St Georges Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5JH</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00302/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 18 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr S A Hamza</td>
<td>Demolition of existing detached garage and erection of a single storey side extension to dwelling. 84 Hewett Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2XS</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 19 April 2017

<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>16/00281/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 19 April 2017</td>
<td>East Thames Group &amp; LBBD</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 34 (surface water drainage) and 35 (ground levels) in respect of Phase 1A (Block A1, Sub-Phase A) of planning permission 15/01084/FUL. Gascoigne Estate East King Edwards Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Gascoigne</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>17/00102/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 19 April 2017</td>
<td>Mrs A Sohanpal</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side and rear extension and conversion of garage to habitable room. 1 Stern Close Barking Essex IG11 0XW</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00261/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 19 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr Choudhury</td>
<td>Erection of part single/part two storey side and rear extensions. 63 Dewey Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8AP</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00278/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 19 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr G Breaban</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 21 Review Road Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00310/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 19 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Rahman</td>
<td>Erection of first floor side/rear extension including the construction of a gable end roof over existing two storey side extension and installation of a first floor window on existing dwelling. 104 Chelmer Crescent Barking Essex IG11 0QA</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00413/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 19 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr G Schintee</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). 2 Campsey Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4DR</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 20 April 2017

<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>16/00380/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 20 April 2017</td>
<td>East Thames Group &amp; LBBD</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 9 (external materials) in respect of Phase 1A (sub-phases A1, B1, B2) of planning permission 15/01084/FUL. Gascogne Estate East King Edwards Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Gascogne</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>16/01161/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 20 April 2017</td>
<td>LBBD - Children's Services</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 18 (school management plan) and 19 (school travel plan) in respect of planning permission 15/00106/FUL. Barking Riverside Area Renwick Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01834/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 20 April 2017</td>
<td>Grannell Steel Ltd</td>
<td>Erection of single storey extension to cafe, external staircase and part three storey extension/part first and second floor extension to provide enlarged cafe on ground floor with offices above. Thames Café 31A River Road Barking Essex IG11 0DA</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00125/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 20 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Kesarwani</td>
<td>Erection of front porch and two storey side extension and loft conversion involving construction of front and rear dormer windows. 2 Broomfield Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6JT</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00317/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 20 April 2017</td>
<td>LMP Dagenham Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 9 and 10 (site investigation and remediation report) in respect of planning permission 16/01475/FUL. Eddie Stobart Logistics 1 Poole Lane Dagenham Essex RM9 6RS</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00417/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 20 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr T Ho</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). 55 Mayesbrook Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2EA</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>17/00421/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 20 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr J Ahmed</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.930 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 46 Craven Gardens Barking Essex IG11 0BN</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00461/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 20 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Hussain</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.65 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.25 metres). 3 Manor Road Barking Essex IG11 9JA</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 April 2017

<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>16/01739/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 21 April 2017</td>
<td>Mrs A Bibi</td>
<td>Erection of single storey side extension. 166 Canonsleigh Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4DB</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01757/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 21 April 2017</td>
<td>LBBD - Strategic Director Service Development &amp; Integration</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 32 (external lighting), 35 (levels), 53 (access), 56 (car parking), 57 (cycle parking) and 64 (refuse) in respect of Phase 2A, Sub-Phase H of planning permission 15/01084/FUL. Gascoigne Estate East King Edwards Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01937/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 21 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr Z Sheikh</td>
<td>Erection of part single/part two storey rear extension. 61 Victoria Road Barking Essex IG11 8PY</td>
<td>Abbey</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>16/01989/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 21 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Smith</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension and two storey side extension. 1 Oakley Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9JD</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/02023/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 21 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr E Christian</td>
<td>Erection of single storey front and rear extension in connection with subdivision of house into two 2 bedroom units. 8 Denny Gardens Dagenham Essex RM9 4DD</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00217/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 21 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs S Awe</td>
<td>Erection of two storey rear extension. 181 Keith Road Barking Essex IG11 7TY</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00325/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 21 April 2017</td>
<td>Mrs Y Trofimova</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window, hip-to-gable end roof and installation of front rooflights. 12 Fordyke Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1PJ</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 April 2017

<p>| 16/01918/ CLU_P       | Certificate issued on 24 April 2017  | Mr T Safiu      | Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window. 147 Lillechurch Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2EW | Mayesbrook |</p>
<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>17/00099/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 24 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr G Vintu</td>
<td>Erection of 2 storey, 2 bedroom end of terrace house. 156 School Road Dagenham Essex RM10 9QL</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00264/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 24 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Melis</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 165 Salisbury Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9XS</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00332/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 24 April 2017</td>
<td>Greggs Plc</td>
<td>Installation of shopfront. 59 East Street Barking Essex IG11 8EN</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00333/ ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 24 April 2017</td>
<td>Greggs Plc</td>
<td>Installation of internally illuminated fascia and projecting signs and 2 non-illuminated internal posters. 59 East Street Barking Essex IG11 8EN</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00433/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 24 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Jordan</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.77 metres and maximum height: 3.17 metres). 13 Havering Gardens Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 5BH</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00448/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 24 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Abul Kalam</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: 3.9 metres). 181 Westrow Drive Barking Essex IG11 9BS</td>
<td>Longbridge</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>25 April 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01302/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 25 April 2017</td>
<td>LBBD - Children's Services</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 3 (highway scheme) in respect of planning permission 15/00106/FUL.</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01773/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 25 April 2017</td>
<td>LBBD - Strategic Director Service Development &amp; Integration</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 17 (construction management plan), 19 (construction logistics plan) and 39 (air quality assessment) in respect of Phase 2A, Sub-Phase H of planning permission 15/01084/FUL. Gascoigne Estate East King Edwards Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Gascogine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00008/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 25 April 2017</td>
<td>Sanofi</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 10 (remediation scheme) in respect of planning permission 15/00951/OUT (In respect of Area 5 and part of Area 6 of planning permission 15/00951/OUT). London East Business And Technical Park Yewtree Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 7FN</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00297/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 25 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Zeeshan</td>
<td>Erection of outbuilding in rear garden. 12 Mayswood Gardens Dagenham Essex RM10 8UU</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00314/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 25 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr H Uddin</td>
<td>Erection of part two/part single storey side, part two/part single storey rear and single storey front extension. 29 Hardie Road Dagenham Essex RM10 7BS</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>17/00337/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 25 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr R O'Connor</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side extension. 19 Sovereign Road Barking Essex IG11 0XQ</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00339/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 25 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr S M Cheung</td>
<td>Erection of single storey side extension to form annexe and games room to dwelling. 326 Becontree Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 2TP</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00346/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 25 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr P Allet</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 34 Surrey Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8ES</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00348/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 25 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr C Woodward</td>
<td>Erection of storey rear extension and conversion of garage to habitable room. 414 Dagenham Road Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0NT</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00356/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 25 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr K Ahmad</td>
<td>Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window. 3 Cavendish Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9DR</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00378/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 25 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr P Clavero</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and front rooflights. 130 Ilchester Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2YX</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>17/00444/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 25 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr V Rosioru</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.5 metres; height to eaves: 2.5 metres and maximum height: 2.8 metres). 6 Thompson Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5TH</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00449/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 25 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Ali</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: 3.5 metres). 17 Sandringham Road Barking Essex IG11 9AB</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00583/NMA</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 25 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Fatbardha Pellumbi &amp; Elvia Pellumbi</td>
<td>Application for non-material amendment following grant of planning permission 16/01973/FUL (alterations to roof design). 65 Eldred Road Barking Essex IG11 7YH</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**26 April 2017**

<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>17/00115/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 26 April 2017</td>
<td>Mulalley And Company Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 4 (materials) in respect of planning permission 15/01779/FUL. Ilchester Road Garages Ilchester Road Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00116/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 26 April 2017</td>
<td>Mulalley And Company Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 4 (materials) in respect of planning permission 15/01780/FUL. Fitzstephen Road Garages Fitzstephen Road Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Becontree</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>17/00229/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 26 April 2017</td>
<td>Hatchlin Limited</td>
<td>Erection of 2 storey two-bedroom house. 12 St Chads Gardens Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6JD</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00273/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 26 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr J Muscat</td>
<td>Repositioning of rear external staircase in connection with use of upper floors as 3 bedroom flat. 22 Rowallen Parade Green Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 1XU</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00349/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 26 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr C Gotobed</td>
<td>Demolition of existing extensions and erection of single storey side and rear extension. 37 Rose Glen Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0SL</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00452/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 26 April 2017</td>
<td>Mrs S Begum</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). 195 Marlborough Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2EX</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00459/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 26 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Ali</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 129 Westrow Drive Barking Essex IG11 9BW</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00460/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 26 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr T Sacco</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.85 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 51 Cornshaw Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1SS</td>
<td>Valence</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>17/00207/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 27 April 2017</td>
<td>Dr M Fateh</td>
<td>Demolition of garage and erection of two storey extension. 2 First Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 9AT</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00266/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 27 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr J Raven</td>
<td>Installation of shopfront. 221 Oxlow Lane Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00270/ CLU_E</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 27 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr D McGuinness</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for an existing use: Use of roof accommodation as independent dwelling. 34C Suffolk Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00624/ NMA</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 27 April 2017</td>
<td>Berkeley Square Developments Dagenham Limited</td>
<td>Application for non-material amendment following grant of planning permission 15/00810/REM: Minor amendments to increase the amount of opacified glazing to windows to allow introduction of an internal sill and to change the material of the roof service enclosure from render to a single ply membrane. London East Business And Technical Park Yewtree Avenue Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 April 2017

<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>16/01608/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 28 April 2017</td>
<td>East Thames Group &amp; LBBD</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 17 (construction environmental management plan) in respect of Phase 1A (sub-Phase D) and Phase 1B of planning permission 15/01084/FUL. Gascoigne Estate East King Edwards Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Gascoigne</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>16/01609/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
<td>East Thames Group &amp; LBBD</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 19 (construction logistics plan) in respect of Phase 1A (sub-Phase D) and Phase 1B of planning permission 15/01084/FUL. Gascogine Estate East King Edwards Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Gascogine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01964/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Uddin</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 133 Sandringham Road Barking Essex IG11 9AH</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00200/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on</td>
<td>Mr L Gashi</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 26 St Johns Road Barking Essex IG11 7XL</td>
<td>Gascogine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00355/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on</td>
<td>Mr Y Murati</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer windows and front rooflights. 251 Morley Road Barking Essex IG11 7DL</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00362/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate refused on</td>
<td>Mr U Ali</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of outbuilding in rear garden. 38 Mayesbrook Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2EB</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>17/00363/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 28 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Franklin</td>
<td>Erection of part single storey/part two storey side and rear extension. 242 Hedgeman Road Dagenham Essex RM9 6DH</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00367/ ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 28 April 2017</td>
<td>Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd</td>
<td>Installation of 2 internally illuminated fascia signs, 1 internally illuminated panel, 1 non-illuminated freestanding double sided printed vinyl panel and 2 non-illuminated poster frames. Sainsburys 97 - 131 High Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6PB</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00373/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 28 April 2017</td>
<td>Mrs Gargan</td>
<td>Erection of front porch and two storey side extension. 331 Porters Avenue Dagenham Essex RM9 4LX</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00374/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 28 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr C Farr</td>
<td>Erection of part single/part two storey side and rear extensions 162 Gorseway Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0SH</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00375/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 28 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr H Yousaf</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and front rooflights. 68 Cecil Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9TG</td>
<td>Abbey</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>17/00481/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 28 April 2017</td>
<td>Miss M Sood</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.6 metres and maximum height: 2.7 metres). 167 Bennetts Castle Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 3YJ</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00482/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 28 April 2017</td>
<td>Mrs A Opesanwo</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: 3.3 metres). 50 Fanshawe Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 5ES</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00487/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 28 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr M A Hafiz</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: 3.0 metres). 2 Shirley Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9UZ</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00489/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 28 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Albert</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.6 metres and maximum height: 2.75 metres). 127 Maybury Road Barking Essex IG11 0PG</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00494/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 28 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr I Patel</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: 3.25 metres). 953 Longbridge Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2BU</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>17/00505/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 28 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr Soheil</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). 12 Wilmington Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9TP</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00512/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 28 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr V T Koshy</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: 2.8 metres). 518 Goresbrook Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4XA</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00578/ NMA</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 28 April 2017</td>
<td>Mr J Fenton-Jones</td>
<td>Application for non-material amendment following grant of planning permission 16/00809/REM (Replacement of green walls on Units B and C with 4 metre high hedging). London East Business And Technical Park Yewtree Avenue Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>