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

Recommendation:
The Planning Committee is asked to note this report.

1. Appeals Lodged

The following appeals have been lodged:

a) Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of part single/part two storey rear extension and loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window – 34 Bull Lane, Dagenham (Reference: 17/02011/CLU_P – Heath Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 22 February 2018

b) Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and front rooflights – 45 Bevan Avenue, Barking (Reference: 17/01984/CLU_P – Eastbury Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 5 March 2018

c) Erection of 2 bed end terrace house – 105 Church Elm Lane, Dagenham (Reference: 18/00317/FUL – Village Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 20 April 2018

2. Appeals Determined
The following appeals have been determined by the Planning Inspectorate:

a) **Erection of two bedroom house (chalet) in garden – 44 Rugby Gardens, Dagenham (Reference: 17/01275/FUL - Mayesbrook Ward)**

Application refused under delegated powers 15 November 2017 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed chalet house would be out of scale and character with the surrounding development, with a cramped and awkward siting, that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the rear garden environment and street scene, and would create a narrow and oppressive approach to the front doors of the adjacent maisonettes and could create a precedent for future similar developments, contrary to policy CP3 of the Core Strategy, and policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD.

2. The area of the proposed rear garden to serve the proposed dwelling is inadequate to provide a good standard of accommodation in accordance with the requirements of policy BP6 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

**Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 11 June 2018 (see attached)**

b) **Erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear extension in connection with the conversion of dwelling into 2 x two bedroom flats – 264 Rugby Road, Dagenham (Reference: 17/01698/FUL – Mayesbrook Ward)**

Application refused under delegated powers 22 December 2017 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development does not comply with policy 3.5 of the London Plan (March 2016) and the Technical Housing Standards - nationally described space standards in that the gross floorspace for the proposed new dwellings is inadequate and provides insufficient space for daily living detrimental to the living standards and amenities enjoyed by future occupiers.

2. The proposed development fails to provide adequate functional and useable external amenity space for the proposed first floor flat to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers contrary to Policy BP5 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

**Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 20 June 2018 (see attached)**

c) **Erection of part single/part two storey side and rear extension – 36 Stratton Drive, Barking (Reference: 17/01414/FUL – Longbridge Ward)**

Application refused under delegated powers 17 January 2018 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 25 June 2018 (see
attached)

d) Erection of two storey side and rear extension – 67 Oulton Crescent, Barking
(Reference: 17/02072/FUL - Longbridge Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 6 February 2018 for the following
reasons:

1. The proposed side extension would completely 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 DPD (March 2011), and the
Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document
(February 2012).

2. The proposed two storey rear extension, in view of its size and siting, would
appear overbearing and result in a loss of outlook to occupiers of the
neighbouring property at No. 65 Oulton Crescent. The impact on the amenity of
this property would be contrary to Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide
Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 25 June 2018 (see
attached)

e) Erection of two storey side/rear extension and single storey rear extension –
98 Westrow Drive, Barking (Reference: 17/02093/FUL - Longbridge Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 13 February 2018 for the following
reason:

1. The proposed two storey 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 be harmful to the street scene. The proposed gable roof would
be incongruous with neighbouring houses and out of keeping in the street scene
contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies
DPD (March 2011), and the Residential Extensions and Alterations
Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012).

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 25 June 2018 (see
attached)