


LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING & DAGENHAM
PLANNING COMMITTEE
16th February 2021
Application for Planning Permission

Case Officer:	Kathryn McAllister	Valid Date:	03.11.2020
Applicant:	D Darby (Cedarmill Development Ltd.)	Expiry Date:	29.12.2020
Application Number:	20/02167/FULL	Ward:	Eastbrook
Address:	Fels Farm, Dagenham Road, Rush Green, Romford, RM7 0NT		

The purpose of this report is to set out the Officer recommendations to Planning Committee regarding an application for planning permission relating to the proposal below at Fels Farm.

Proposal:

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of new residential scheme comprising 7 new dwellings (3 x 4-bedroom and 4 x 3-bedroom) and utilisation of existing vehicular access.

Officer Recommendations:

Planning Committee is asked to resolve to:

1. agree the reasons for approval as set out in this report; and
2. delegate authority to the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham's Head of Planning and Assurance to grant planning permission based on the Conditions & Informative listed in Appendix 5 and summarised below.

Conditions Summary:
Mandatory conditions

- Time
- Approved Drawings & Documents

Prior to all works/commencement Conditions

- Contaminated Land and Remediation Scheme
- Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP)
- Arboricultural Assets
- S.278 Agreement
- Surface Water Drainage Scheme
- Marketing Strategy

Prior to above ground works Conditions

- Materials
- Boundary Treatment
- Soft and Hard Landscaping
- Lighting
- Refuse Store
- Scheme of Acoustic Protection

Prior to first occupation and/or use Conditions

- Cycle Parking Facilities

Monitoring & Management Conditions

- Removing PD Rights
- Boundary Fences
- Secure by Design

OFFICER REPORT

Planning Constraints:

Green Belt

Site, Situation, and relevant background information:

The application site is known as Fels Farm and situated off Dagenham Road. A previous application was submitted for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a mixed-use scheme comprising 9 new dwellings (5x4 bedroom and 4 x 3- bedroom) and a 3- storey office block (Use Class B1(a)) including basement; and utilisation of existing vehicular access (20/00282/FUL) and was withdrawn.

This application seeks permission for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of new residential scheme comprising 7 new dwellings (3 x 4-bedroom and 4 x 3-bedroom) and utilisation of existing vehicular access. It is different to application 20/00282/FUL as they have reduced the number of dwellinghouses proposed on site and removed the office block.

Key issues:

- Principle of the proposed development
- Dwelling mix and Quality of accommodation
- Design and quality of materials
- Impacts to neighbouring amenity.
- Sustainable Transport

Planning Assessment:

1.0 Principle of the development:

1.1 Development within the Green Belt

1.1.1 Section 133 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that the government attaches great importance to Green Belts whereby the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. This is further supported by policy 7.16 of the London Plan, policy G2 of the Draft London Plan, policy CM3 of the Core Strategy DPD and policy SP6 of the Draft Local Plan reg 19 which denote the Green Belt will be protected and maintained in accordance with national policy.

1.1.2 Barking and Dagenham has 531.25 hectares of designated green belt land which equates to 14% of the boroughs total land area. The boroughs green belt was last reviewed and modified in 1996. Since then, the borough has witnessed significant change. As such the council carried out a Green Belt Review (October 2015) in order to make sure that the green belt is still fit for purpose. The aim of this review is to explore if the green belt still fulfils a planning purpose, and secondly, if boundaries can be changed to create a more effective and defensive green belt. The review uses a set scoring system whereby green belt parcels are assessed against all national green belt priorities, as such, if a parcel works against one of the five national planning policy green belt criteria it is denoted with a score of 1. If a green belt receives at least one mark it is deduced that the parcel is undertaking a green belt function in principle. The 5 green belt priorities are as follows:

1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. To prevent neighbouring towns (neighbourhoods) merging into one another
3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
5. To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

1.1.3 The application site is located within green belt land designated within the councils 2015 review as GB05: Eastbrook Park and the Chase. This parcel has an area of 135.17 hectares and formed of three different areas which are distinctive in their own right: The Chase Nature Reserve, Eastbrook Grove and Easbrookend Country Park. The review states that this parcel should be seen as part of a wider green belt whereby the green belts sites help to resist and check the unrestricted sprawl of the two neighbouring areas of Dagenham to the west and Elm Park to the east. As such the parcel performs the duty of resisting unrestricted sprawl which could lead to the coalescence to the two neighbouring areas. It therefore prevents coalescence of neighbouring areas; thus, it is denoted with a score of 1 for priority 2. As such, it is evident that this parcel provides a green belt purpose. Consequently, the review recommended that this parcel of green belt is retained in full.

1.1.4 It is evident from the above review that the green belt of which the application site forms a part of plays an important role in preventing urban sprawl and keeping the land permanently open. As such, it would be expected that the land at this location is kept open where possible. Therefore, a thorough assessment in line with the NPPF's Green Belt policies must be carried out to determine whether the proposed development is considered appropriate at this location. The GLA was consulted with regard to this scheme, however, they have chosen not to provide any comments.

1.2 Exceptions to Inappropriate Development

Section 143 of the (NPPF) states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Inappropriate developments include the construction of new buildings within the Green Belt. However, as set out in section 145 there are exceptions which are defined in sections 145(a) through to 145(g). Developments which do not sit within one of these categories are considered inappropriate. Nonetheless, given the sites current existing use officers consider Section 145(g) to be relevant. Section 145(g) states that developments which seek limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development or not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified housing need within the area of the local planning authority are considered appropriate development.

1.3 Previously Developed Land

The NPPF defines previously developed land (PDL) as land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land. The application site is occupied by two permanent structures with several smaller storage units and is currently used as a storage and skip hire depot. Therefore, it is evident that a large part of the site is covered by a yard with open storage for skips which forms the curtilage of the developed land. Hence, officers consider the application site to be previously developed land. Nonetheless, it remains to be assessed whether the proposed development would meet the relevant exceptions to inappropriate development, namely, whether or not the proposal would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

1.4 Impact on the Openness of the Green Belt

1.4.1 Having determined that the application site is previously developed land officers now turn to Part 1 of Section 145(g) which states that development should not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. Prior to assessing this impact officers refer back to section 145(g) highlighting in particular that previously developed land excludes land covered by temporary buildings.

1.4.2 The application site was granted a certificate of lawfulness for the existing use of the site as a storage and skip hire depot whereby a height limitation of 7 skips was imposed (18/01493/CLU_E & 17/00630/CLU_E) existing use of the site was deemed lawful following an application for a

certificate of lawfulness whereby a height limitation of 7 skips was imposed. The submitted planning statement outlines the applicants view that given a certificate of lawfulness was granted for the use of the site as skip storage up to the height of 7 bins the height and volume of the stacked skips should, therefore, be considered when establishing the existing floorspace, height and volume of the development. Notwithstanding, officers do not consider stacked skips to be permanent development but temporary structures as their presence on site fluctuates overtime. This is evidenced by the photographs submitted with the certificate of lawfulness: existing use application as proof to verify the lawful use of the site. These photos clearly show fluctuations in the presence of skips whereby some photos show more skips present on site whilst others show fewer. In addition, virtual images of the site found today show no skips present on site. Therefore, officers contend that the presence of stacked skips fluctuate on a day-to-day basis, as such they would be classified as temporary development. Hence, their volume and height will not be included as part of the built form of the site.

- 1.4.3 As shown on the existing plans there are three existing buildings. The following table illustrates the footprint, floorspace and volume of the existing and proposed development as shown within the design and access statement and include the stacked skips.

Feature	Existing	Proposed	Change
Footprint	1,180m ²	491m ²	-689 m ²
Floorspace	356.8 m ²	854.8m ²	+498 m ²
Volume	9,400 m ³	3,303 m ³	- 6097 m ³

It is evident from the above table that the applicant has considered the stacked skips to be permanent development, and as such the proposed development would result in a significant reduction in the footprint and volume of the site. Notwithstanding, as noted previously given the presence of stacked skips fluctuating on a day-to-day basis officers do not consider these to be permanent structures and hence, they should not be included as part of the built form of the existing site. Hence, the footprint, floorspace and volume of the existing and proposed development should be denoted as follows:

Feature	Existing	Proposed	Change
Footprint	356.8 m ²	491m ²	+134.2 m ²
Floorspace	356.8 m ²	854.8m ²	+498 m ²
Volume	Approx. 1,773 m ³	3,303 m ³	+1530 m ³

It is evident that the proposed development will result in an increase in the footprint, floorspace and volume of the built form on site, hence, officers consider the massing and volume of the proposed development to have a greater impact on the openness of the green belt. Therefore, the proposal is considered inappropriate development as defined in section 145 of the NPPF.

1.5 Harm to the Openness and Affordable Housing

- 1.5.1 Part 2 of section 145.g seeks to ensure that the proposed development does not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting and identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority. Policies 3.10, 3.11, 3.12 and 3.13 of the London Plan and policies H1 and H5 of the draft London plan states that the strategic target is for 50% of all new homes delivered across London to be genuinely affordable. Policy BC1 of the Borough Wide DPD and policy DMH1 of the Draft Local Plan Regulation 19 supports this noting that all development with the capacity to provide 10 or more self-contained units or have a gross internal residential floorspace of more than 1,000sqm will be required to provide affordable housing.

- 1.5.2 The proposal seeks permission for 7 new dwellinghouses. As such, in accordance with the development policies, the proposal is not required to provide affordable housing. Notwithstanding, discussion with the applicant has confirmed that “the proposed dwellings will be initially marketed

locally for a minimum of 6 months before releasing them to the national market; should that be necessary after this period prior to being accessed by a wider market". Given the size of the development does not have a planning requirement to provide affordable housing officers consider this to be acceptable and as such the proposal is considered to comply with part 2 of section 145(g). Nevertheless, a condition will be placed on this application securing this matter.

1.5.3 Nonetheless, whilst the proposal is considered to satisfy part 2 of section 145(g) officers do not consider the proposal to satisfy part 1 of this section, as such, the proposed development fails to comply with section 145(g) of the NPPF in full hence it is considered to be inappropriate development. Therefore, in line with section 143 an assessment as to whether the proposal is considered to provide very special circumstances will be assessed.

1.6 Very Special Circumstances

1.6.1 The applicant has put forward 4 very special circumstances for this application which officers will assess:

1.6.2 *VSC1: Floorspace and Volume Comparison*

1.6.3 The applicant states "if paragraphs 145(g) are not accepted it still, nonetheless, remains the case that there is a significant amount of built form on the site and this will be replaced by a 7-unit residential scheme which in the opinion of the appellant is clearly preferable in terms of openness. The pre-existence of what is on site currently and its loss is clearly a foundation to our very special circumstance case."

1.6.4 As noted previously the proposal will result in an increase in footprint, floorspace and volume of the site given the stacked skips do not constitute existing built form of the site. Nonetheless, it is evident from the figures which include the stacked skips as permanent development that should the site be used at maximum skip capacity the site would have a significant impact on the openness of the site than the proposed development. Therefore, the impact on the openness of the green belt would be greater.

1.6.5 Further, as shown on google maps and as stated on the design and access statement "the site is almost completely hard surfaced with a small area of planting along the front boundary. This hard surfacing of approximately 2941.8sqm equates to around 97% of the site". As noted within the council's green belt review this parcel of green belt performs the duty of resisting unrestricted sprawl which has been designed to be an unmanaged and therefore is has countryside like features. The applicant states "the new proposal aims to return 1540 sqm or approximately 51% of the site back to soft landscaping". Hence, it is evident that a greater proportion of the floorspace of the proposed development will be more in keeping with the design and character of the Green Belt than the existing use of the site, as such, the impact on the Green Belt is considered to be minimised as the visual appearance of the site will be more akin to that of the surrounding area.

1.6.6 Therefore, it is evident from the two points raised above the site has the potential to cause greater harm to the openness of the green belt than the proposed scheme should there be the maximum number of skips on site. Additionally, considering the site is almost completely hard surfaced it appears at odds with the green belt surrounding. As such, whilst officers acknowledge that the volume, footprint and floorspace of the proposed development would exceed that of what is considered existing permanent development, as the proposal will stabilise the sites impact on the openness of the green belt and return the majority of the site back to soft landscaping, on balance officers consider the proposal to cause lesser harm to the green belt than the existing use of the site, hence, officers consider this to be a very special circumstance as denoted in section 143 of the NPPF.

1.6.7 *VSC2: Loss of Non-Conforming Use*

- 1.6.8 The application site is located adjacent to Eastbrookend Country Park and situated within a predominately residential area. As noted previously the existing use of the site as a storage and skip hire depot was deemed lawful with the understanding that the height of the skips does not exceed 7 bins following an application for a certificate of lawfulness. As such the site has an existing open industrial use whereby the applicant states “there is no control over house of operation due to it having been achieved via the effluxion of time and lorries will be coming and going opposite residential properties”. Officers believe that the existing site could lawfully be in operation 24 hours a day producing significant levels of noise, comings and goings and general disturbances at all times. Therefore, by nature of use officers do not consider this to be compliant with the surrounding residential use.
- 1.6.9 The proposal seeks to demolish all the existing buildings and construct 7 new dwelling houses. AS such, the proposed use is considered to be compliant with the surrounding residential use as the noise, comings and goings, general disturbances, and impact on neighbouring amenity caused by the proposal is more harmonious with that of the predominately residential surrounding. Hence, given the sites existing use and its location officers consider this to be a very special circumstance as denoted in section 143 of the NPPF.

1.6.10 VSC3: Aesthetic Improvements

- 1.6.11 The applicant states “the scheme relates positively to the road and introduces a residential scheme which is complementary to what is seen locally... There is quite clearly an enhancement and both the character and amenity of the area are enhancing. This is a positive matter which arises from the scheme to which a significant amount of weight should be attributed as this is the public face of the site”. As noted in VSC1 and VSC2 officers consider the existing use of the site to generate more noise, comings and goings and fluctuation in the impact on the openness of the site as a result of stacked skips. As such, officers agree with the applicant as they believe the proposal will provide aesthetic improvements.
- 1.6.12 Firstly, as mentioned in VSC1 the proposal seeks to return the majority of the site back to soft landscaping and planting as each property will have a large rear garden and there will be planting situated around the site which would be more in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding green belts, hence, officers consider the visual appearance of the proposed site will be an improvement to the existing site whereby the development will look more consistent with the appearance of the surrounding green belt area.
- 1.6.13 Secondly, as stated in the design and access statements “the proposal will use a wide palette of materials which can be found in the local vernacular. Likewise, the decision to use cladding with elements of facing brickwork attempts to reflect the barn-like nature of the existing buildings within the site, without challenging the existing vernacular of the wider surrounding”. Therefore, it is clear to officers that the applicant has provided a bespoke design to the proposal whereby extra effort has been placed to ensure that the character and visual appearance of the proposed dwellings respects and reflect that of the existing buildings found on site. Hence, officers consider the proposal to respect, reflect and enhance the character and appearance of the existing site. As such, improving the character and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding local area.
- 1.6.14 Lastly, the proposal will result in an active frontage along Dagenham Road. As stated on the application form “proposed plots 1-4 have been positioned along the front boundary of the site in a comparable location to the existing storage barn which is to be removed”. From virtual images of the site, it is evident that whilst there is an existing building at this location it does not provide an active frontage along Dagenham Road, nonetheless, the proposed 3-bedroom properties will be accessed directly from Dagenham Road as such providing an active frontage which officers welcome at this location as the proposal will be consistent with the patterns of development and appear congruous with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

1.6.15 Overall, officers consider the proposal to improve the visual appearance of the site and as such it will appear more coherent with the character and appearance of the surrounding green belt area. Therefore, this matter is considered to represent a very special circumstance as set out in section 143.

1.6.16 VSC4: *The Additional Housing*

1.6.17 The proposal seeks permission for the construction of 7 new family sized homes which the applicant states are clearly a benefit to the borough. The proposal will provide 100% 3 + bedroom properties which is the type of housing in high demand within the borough which policies seek to provide. In addition, developments within the town centre often face a shortfall in the provision of family sized housing, as such, this proposal will help make this up and contribute to a wider mix of family sized housing across the borough. Notwithstanding, whilst officers welcome the construction of new family sized houses as it will contribute to the Boroughs housing mix and remains in keeping with the development policies as outlined below, they do not consider the construction of new houses within the green belt to be a very special circumstance.

1.6.18 Overall, officers consider points VSC1, VSC2 and VSC3 to be very special circumstances. Notwithstanding, in line with section 144 of the NPPF very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

1.7 Very Special Circumstances > Impact on Openness

1.7.1 As noted above the proposed development would result in an increase in volume and massing onsite whereby the proposed volume, floorspace and footprint will be greater than the volume, footprint and floorspace of the existing permanent development. Nonetheless, the proposal seeks to reintroduce soft landscaping to the majority of the site, introduce a use which conforms to the surrounding uses and improve the visual amenity of the site. On balance, whilst the openness of the site may be compromised officers consider the proposed development to be more compatible with the character and appearance of the surrounding green belt and the use of the surrounding local area. Hence, officers consider the very special circumstances to outweigh the harm caused to the openness of the Green Belt. As such, the principle of development is considered acceptable at this location and in keeping with the development policies. Regarding, the construction of new dwelling houses the policies relating to this are outlined below.

1.8 Construction of new dwelling houses

1.8.1 At a national level, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at Chapter 5 has specific regard to housing stating that ‘to determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment...[and] within this context, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies.

1.8.2 The London Plan outlines through Policies 3.3, 3.5 and 3.8 that there is a pressing need for more homes in London and that a genuine choice of new homes should be supported which are of the highest quality and of varying sizes and tenures in accordance with Local Development Frameworks. Policy 3.8 requires that Londoners have a genuine choice of homes that they can afford which meets their requirements for different types of high-quality accommodation. The London Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) which formed the evidence base for London Plan policy 3.8 denotes that new developments are failing to provide enough affordable and family sized homes for London’s growing population. To this end, this policy requires LPA’s to take account of their housing requirements to identify the range of needs likely to arise within their areas. Policy 3.14 of the London Plan states that the loss of housing should be resisted unless the housing is replaced at existing or higher densities with at least equivalent floor space. The Housing SPG supports the London Plan on such matters.

- 1.8.3 The Draft London Plan Objective GG4 states that to create a housing market that works better for all Londoners, those involved in planning and development must create mixed and inclusive communities, with good quality homes that meet high standards of design and provide for identified needs, including for specialist housing. The policies outlined in Chapter 4 (Housing) further acknowledges the stress on housing demand and provides increased targets for Local Authorities and revised policies in respect of ensuring additional housing contribution according to local needs. Policy H1 and H2 echoes existing policy 3.3 reinforcing the need to increase the housing supply to promote opportunity and provide real choice for all Londoners. In particular policy H2 seeks to ensure Borough's pro-actively support well-designed homes on small sites.
- 1.84 Policy SPDG1 of the Draft Local Plan Reg 19 seek to ensure developments contribute to meeting the Borough's housing targets and supports the delivery of a suitable variety of housing to meet high levels of identified need within the Borough. Policy SP3 emphasising the need to optimise suitable sites to help deliver suitable housing for the Borough's high levels of identified housing need. This is further supported by policies CM1 and CM2 of the Core Strategy DPD and policy BP10 of the Borough Wide DPD.
- 1.85 As noted in the above policies there is a clear need for additional family sized homes. This proposal seeks to demolish the existing buildings and construct 7 new dwelling houses 3x 4-bedroom and 4 x 3-bedroom properties which are all considered family sized homes. Furthermore, the proposal will result in the net increase of 7 dwellings to the Borough's existing housing stock. Overall, the principle of development is considered acceptable and in keeping with the NPPF, policies 3.3, 3.5 and 3.8 of the London Plan, policy GG4, H1 and H2 of the Draft London Plan, policies SPDG1 and SP3 of the Draft Local Plan Reg 19, policies CM1 and CM2 of the Core Strategy DPD and policy BP10 of the Borough Wide DPD.

2.0 Dwelling mix and Quality of accommodation:

2.1 Internal Space Standards

- 2.1.1 At national level, the 'Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard' deals with internal space within new dwellings and is suitable for application across all tenures. It sets out requirements for the gross internal area of new dwellings at a defined level of occupancy, as well as floor areas and dimensions for key parts of the home, notably bedrooms, storage, and floor to ceiling height. London Plan Policy 3.5 and Draft London Plan Policy D6 seek for new housing to achieve the space standards in line with those set at national level. The Local Plan also reiterates the need for housing developments to conform to these requirements.
- 2.1.2 Policy D4 of the Draft London Plan also sets out the importance for homes across London to be designed to a high quality – 'New homes should have adequately-sized rooms and convenient and efficient room layouts which are functional, fit for purpose and meet the changing needs of Londoners over their lifetimes. Particular account should be taken of the needs of children, disabled and older people'. Further policy GG3 seeks to ensure that new buildings are well-insulated and sufficiently ventilated to avoid the health problems associated with damp, heat and cold.
- 2.1.3 Policy 3.8 of the London Plan and Policy D5 of the Draft London Plan also outline that 90% of new build homes should meet requirement M4(2) (accessible and adaptable dwellings) of Building Regulations Approved Document M and that 10% should meet requirement M4(3) (wheelchair user dwellings). This target is reflected at local level by Policy DMH3 of the Draft Local Plan Reg 19.
- 2.1.4 The technical housing standards- nationally described space standards state that properties that are 3 bedroom, 6-person, 2- storey should provide 93 sqm of gross internal floor area and 2.5 sqm of built-in storage; 4-bedroom, 8-person, 2 storey properties should provide 124sqm of gross internal area and 3.0 sqm of built-in storage. In addition, double bedrooms should have a floor area of at least 11.5 sqm and a width of 2.75 metres; single bedrooms should have a floor area of

at least 7.5 sqm and a width of 2.15 metres. The space standards for the proposed dwelling house as shown on the proposed plans are set out below:

Property 1 (3 -bedroom, 6 -person, 2-storey)

Gross Internal Area: 101.5sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 1: 11.7sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 2: 11.6sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 3: 9.8 sqm **Complies**
Storage: 2.15sqm **Fails to comply.**

Property 2 (3 -bedroom, 6 -person, 2-storey)

Gross Internal Area: 101.5sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 1: 11.7sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 2: 11.6sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 3: 9.8 sqm **Complies**
Storage: 2.15sqm **Fails to comply.**

Property 3 (3 -bedroom, 6 -person, 2-storey)

Gross Internal Area: 101.5sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 1: 11.7sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 2: 11.6sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 3: 9.8 sqm **Complies**
Storage: 2.15sqm **Fails to comply.**

Property 4 (3 -bedroom, 6 -person, 2-storey)

Gross Internal Area: 101.5sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 1: 11.7sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 2: 11.6sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 3: 9.8 sqm **Complies**
Storage: 2.15sqm **Fails to comply.**

Property 5 (4 -bedroom, 8 -person, 2-storey)

Gross Internal Area: 149.6sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 1: 16.4sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 2: 13.0sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 3: 11.5sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 4: 11.5sqm **Complies**
Storage: 2.29sqm **Fails to comply.**

Property 6 (4 -bedroom, 8 -person, 2-storey)

Gross Internal Area: 149.6sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 1: 16.4sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 2: 13.0sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 3: 11.5sqm **Complies**
Bedroom 4: 11.5sqm **Complies**
Storage: 2.29sqm **Fails to comply.**

Property 7 (4 -bedroom, 8 -person, 2-storey)

Gross Internal Area: 149.6sqm **Complies**

Bedroom 1: 16.4sqm **Complies**

Bedroom 2: 13.0sqm **Complies**

Bedroom 3: 11.5sqm **Complies**

Bedroom 4: 11.5sqm **Complies**

Storage: 2.29sqm **Fails to comply.**

2.1.5 The gross internal area and bedroom area of all 7 properties would exceed the minimum requirements set out by the technical housing standards- nationally described space standards for properties of their size. Nonetheless, all properties fail to provide the minimum required built-in storage provision expected for properties of their size, however, as all properties exceed minimum gross internal area and bedroom floor area and as an ample provision of built-in storage has been provided officers do not consider the shortfall of storage space to have a considerable impact on the quality of accommodation or the standard of living the properties will provide, as such, officers do not consider this matter to warrant a reason for refusal. Further, all rooms will be appropriately sized for their use and well-lit by daylight and naturally ventilated by open windows as such officers consider the proposal to provide high quality accommodation which will support an adequate standard of living. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable and in keeping with the development policies. Notwithstanding, a condition will be placed on the proposal requiring details of contaminated land and a scheme of acoustic protection so as to ensure that risks from land future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised and proposed residential units are adequately protected from noise.

2.2 External Amenity Space

2.2.1 Chapter 8 of the NPPF seeks to promote healthy and safe communities by ensuring planning decisions achieve healthy, inclusive, and safe places which enable and support healthy lifestyles and wellbeing needs. Policy 3.5 of the London Plan and policy D6 of the Draft London Plan supports this by ensuring new housing provides adequate outside space. Policy DMNE1 of the Draft Local Plan Reg 19 seeks to ensure proposals provide adequate external amenity space whereby developments should not rely on upon existing publicly accessible open space to contribute towards onsite amenity space and children play space. This is further supported by Policy BP5 of the Borough Wide Development Plan Document which states that new developments must provide adequate external private and/ or communal amenity space to meet the need generated by development.

2.2.2 Policy BP5 of the Borough Wide DPD states that 3-bedroom properties should have 60sqm of external amenity space and 4+ bedroom houses should have 75sqm of external amenity space. In addition, this area should be safe, functional, private, and useable. The external amenity space for the proposed dwellings are as follows:

Property 1: 75sqm

Property 2: 79sqm

Property 3: 78sqm

Property 4: 86sqm

Property 5: 261sqm

Property 6: 152sqm

Property 7: 104sqm

- 2.2.3 As detailed above all the proposed properties will provide sufficient external amenity space which meets minimum requirements for properties of their size. In addition, as shown on the proposed plans the external amenity space for the 4-bedroom properties will be located to the rear of the dwellings, as such, officers are confident that these will be private, functional, safe, and useable. Notwithstanding, as the development has been designed so that the 3-bedroom properties sit in front of the 4-bedroom properties as a result whilst the external amenity space for these properties sit behind the dwelling house, a road runs to the rear of them to provide access to the 4-bedroom properties and off-street parking for the 3-bedroom properties. Consequently, it is clear from the proposed block plan that the rear gardens for the 3-bedroom properties may be used as an access route to the dwelling given residents will park to the rear and access the property from the rear. Nonetheless, as this layout has allowed for an active frontage along Dagenham Road whereby the front entrances which will be used for deliveries, visitors etc will be off the main road officers consider the use of the rear entrance to be exclusive to residents of the property, as such, on balance officers consider this area to be private, safe, functional, and useable.
- 2.2.4 Further, it is noted that the amenity space for the property at plot 1 will be located adjacent to the primary access route into the site, as such, to ensure that the proposed garden space remains private, safe, functional, and useable it is paramount that suitable boundary treatment is installed at this location to protect the amenity of residents. Therefore, a condition will be placed on this application requiring details of boundary treatment.
- 2.2.5 In addition, the application site is located adjacent to Eastbrookend Park and a 3-minute walk from its entrance. This is a large green space which resident can use for recreation.
- 2.2.6 Overall, officers consider the proposal to provide ample provision and access to external amenity space both on and off site. As such, the proposal is considered acceptable and in keeping with the development policies.

3.0 Design and quality of materials:	
<i>Does the proposed development respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling?</i>	Yes
<i>Does the proposed development respect and accord to the established local character ?</i>	Yes
<i>Is the proposed development acceptable within the street scene or when viewed from public vantage points?</i>	Yes
<i>Is the proposed development acceptable and policy compliant?</i>	Yes

- 3.1 Paragraphs 127 and 128 of the NPPF (2019) outline that planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of an area not just for the short-term, but over the lifetime of the development. Paragraph 130 advises that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.
- 3.2 London Plan (2016) Policy 7.1 stated that the design of new developments and the spaces they create should help reinforce the character of the neighbourhood. Policy 7.4 requires development to have regard to the form, function and structure of an area, place or street and the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings and other forms of development. It is required that in areas of poor, or ill-defined, character, new development should build on the positive existing elements that can contribute to establishing an enhanced character for the future function of the area. Policy 7.6 seeks the highest quality materials and design appropriate to its context. It is advised that the buildings and structures should be of the highest architectural quality and comprise details and materials that complement the local architectural character. Draft London Plan (2019) Policy D4 discusses the need for good design to be thoroughly scrutinised at application stage, including elements relating to layout, scale, density, land-uses, materials, detailing and landscaping.

3.3 This is further supported by policies SP2, SP4 and DMD1 which seek to ensure developments contribute to providing a high-quality built environment which contributes positively to the character of the surrounding area. This is further supported by policy BP11 of the Borough Wide DPD and policy CP3 of the Core Strategy DPD.

3.4 Mass, Bulk, Size and Scale

3.4.1 The area surrounding Fels Farm is made up predominately by residential properties which are characterised by being low rise 2 storey detached, semi-detached and terraced properties, as such, it would be expected that the proposed residential development respects and reflects the built form and character of the area.

3.4.2 The proposed residential development covers a 3,029 sqm area and seeks to construct 2-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings occupying generous sized plots. The proposed site layout consists of the 4 x 3-bedroom semi-detached properties which sit long Dagenham Road and form an active frontage. The 3 x 4-bedroom properties sit behind the 3-bedroom properties. The urban design officer was consulted and was in support of the proposed layout of the scheme noting in particular the support for the active street frontage that the development will provide.

3.4.3 Furthermore, each 3-bedroom property (plots 1-4) will be 'L-shaped' and have a depth of 11.85 metres. The 2.63 metres of depth closest to the front elevation will have a width of 3.15 metres and the remaining will have a width of 5.41 metres at both levels. Nevertheless, on the ground floor there is a set-in porch measuring 1.67 metres in width and 0.55 metres in depth. The property will have a pitched roof with a hipped end whereby the height of the eaves will be 5.01 metres and the maximum height 8.85 metres. The semi-detached pair will measure 11.85 metres in depth whereby the bulk will be 11.11 metres wide and the narrow part to the front of the property will be 6.60 metres wide and share a single roof scape.

3.4.4 The proposed 4-bedroom properties (plots 5-7) will be detached 'L-shaped' properties. Each property will have a depth of 11.22 metres whereby the 2.78 metres of depth at the front elevation of the property will have a width of 4.20 metres and the remaining part will have a width of 8.58 metres at both levels. The property will have a set-in porch at ground floor level measuring 1.13 metres in width and 0.84 metres in depth. The property will have a pitched roof with a gabled end whereby the height of the eaves will be 5.0 metres and the maximum height 8.65 metres.

3.4.5 Overall, officers consider the mass, bulk, size, and scale of the proposed development to be acceptable, notwithstanding an assessment as to the impact on the openness of the green belt will be carried out below.

3.5 Impact on Openness of Green Belt

3.5.1 As noted previously in the section which explores development within the green belt the application site currently comprises of hardstanding to facilitate the existing uses. Therefore, at present the site is considered to appear at odds with the surrounding Green Belt and nearby residential areas. Further, as highlighted previously the proposed volume, footprint and floorspace of the proposal will be greater than that of the existing development officers note that given the development will be in the form of 2 storey detached and semi-detached dwellings the proposed layout, scale and massing is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the green belt. The urban design officer was consulted and agreed with the points raised above noting that the overall appearance and layout of the scheme would be more congruous with the character and appearance of the surrounding area, as such, the impact on the openness of the green belt is considered to be negligible. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable and in keeping with the development policies. Notwithstanding, a condition will be placed on this application removing permitted development rights so as to prevent the overdevelopment of the site, maintain visibility lines and ensure the openness of the green belt is preserved.

3.6 Materials

3.6.1 Regarding, materials the urban design officer was consulted who noted that the quality of materials and architectural detailing and the extent to which they derive from and reference local/site context is key as such it would be expected that a high-quality brick/timber cladding, aluminium/ timber composite window and high-quality architectural detailing is proposed. As stated in the design and access statement “the size and shape of each dwelling have been designed to reflect the positioning within the site and the relationship with adjoining properties. This design approach has resulted in two different house types; however, the decision has been taken to use complementing materials to add a cohesiveness to the site as a whole”. The proposed materials include cedar lap cladding (‘pewter’ colour) and takeley facing red brickwork for the walls and marley modern ‘anthracite’ coloured roof tiles for the roof to reflect the barn-like nature of the existing buildings. The urban design officer considers the architectural approach comprising of a limited palette of materials namely brickwork facing and timber cladding to reference the original agricultural barn-like structure/ local Essex vernacular to be acceptable as it reflects the origins of the site and its use of materiality will help create a distinctive character and identity to the proposed development. Notwithstanding, they do not consider the proposed choice of brick and the use of UPVC windows indicated on the plans to reflect the level of quality that is expected. Consequently, they do not consider this element to reference the local/ site context. Officers have revised this and agree with the points raised above and as such consider the proposed materials to be unacceptable. Therefore, a condition requiring the applicant to submit details of the proposed materials prior to construction will be placed on this proposal so as to ensure the finished development reflects and respects the character and appearance of the surrounding local area.

3.7 Landscaping

3.7.1 With regard to landscaping it would be expected that the proposal integrates high-quality landscaping with natural sustainable drainage measures. Likewise, the design, maintenance and management of the proposed soft landscaping areas should be carefully considered to avoid neglected ‘left over’ spaces”. The applicant seeks to return the majority of the site back to soft landscaping to improve the visual outlook from the surrounding area and reduce the current impact of the barren site on the surrounding greenbelt. The design and access statement outlines that “in addition to private gardens, the proposals aim to introduce planting to communal areas and around the new dwellings to improve the visual amenity of the site when viewed from outside. The introduction of native hedging and plants will also encourage biodiversity and bring the site into harmony with the aspirations of the adjacent Country Park”. The urban design officer was consulted and note that the proposed soft landscaping elements including tree planning across the site is welcomed and will contribute towards creating a quality of place for future resident. Officers agree with the points raised by the urban design officer, however, as limited details have been provided as to what the soft and hard landscaping or boundary treatment is proposed for the site a condition will be placed on the application to ensure this detail is submitted to the council prior to construction to ensure it remains in keeping with the visual amenity and character of the surrounding local area. Likewise, limited details of a drainage strategy have been submitted as such a condition will be placed on the application requiring these details to be submitted for approval prior to commencement of any above ground works.

3.8 Trees

3.8.1 The proposal does not seek to remove any trees or alter the treescape from any notable public viewpoint, as such, in principle the proposal is considered acceptable. The Arboricultural officer was consulted with regard to the scheme and agree that the proposed impact on the existing trees does not warrant an objection. Nonetheless, they have raised a few points for consideration.

3.8.2 The proposal seeks to retain the existing tree line which to the south of the site which borders on to Bell House. This will act as a screen between the two plots which officers and the Arboricultural officer consider to be acceptable. Nonetheless, limited details have been provided with regard to the impact of surfaces changes where the car parking is going as this may be in the roof protection

area. Likewise, no details have been provided as to the tree protection plan to prevent damage during the demolition and building stages for those trees and the county park trees to the west of the site. As such officers will place a condition on the application to ensure a tree protection plan and method statement to ground preparation and re-surfacing are submitted prior to any above ground works taking place.

- 3.8.3 Further, the Arboricultural officer notes that the biggest issues arising from the properties being built up against woodland is potential boundary fouling, or damage, from the parkland trees. They note that the trees on the west side are under the LBBD Ranger Service and are not managed for maintenance pruning. Whilst this is not a concern for the existing use of the site with the proposed development being new dwellinghouses whereby gardens border these parkland trees, there is a change that this could lead to a high number of complaints and costs resulting in the crown of these trees being within falling distance of the properties. Under the current proposed plans this area will be hard to access for any parties. As such they have advised that a clear boundary of 1.5 metres is established between the new dwellings and the park tree line whereby the area of land should be under the ownership of the dwellings so they can maintain a clearance to their fences and gardens and be maintain their boundaries. Likewise, it enables the site to be inspected and access is provided for maintenance to those trees should it be necessary whereby side access and rear gates should be accessible for work at the rear of these gardens to prevent adjacent landowners from being saddled with damage claims and additional costs for maintenance not currently necessary.
- 3.8.4 Officers have reviewed this and note that from visual images it is evident that these parkland trees sit in most parts a significant distance from the site boundary. Likewise, they hold concerns that by creating a clear boundary to the rear which will be accessible via a side access and rear gate this area of land may become unsightly and poorly maintained due to potential unregulated use by future residents of the dwellings. As such a condition will be placed on this application requiring all boundary fences to be positioned at least 1.5 metres from any pre-existing tree so as to prevent the adjacent landowner from being saddled with damages claims and additional costs for maintenance not currently necessary.

3.9 Lighting

- 3.9.1 Similarly, it is evident from the proposed block plan that bollard lighting will be placed throughout the site, however, limited details of lighting provision have been provided as such officers will secure this by condition to ensure a safe environment for residents and visitors.

3.10 Setting of nearby listed and locally listed buildings.

- 3.10.1 The application site is located within the setting of a Grade II listed building Bell House and Fels Farmhouse a locally listed building, as such, heritage policies are relevant to this application.
- 3.10.2 Chapter 16 of the NPPF states that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be covered in a manner appropriate to their significance so they can be enjoyed by existing and future generations. As such proposals should set out a positive strategy is in keeping with the conservation and enjoyment of historic environments. Policies 7.8 and 7.9 of the London Plan seek to ensure that these heritage assets are identified and play a positive role in place shaping. This is further supported by policy HC1 of the draft London Plan.
- 3.10.3 Bell House and Fels Farmhouse form part of the rich local history of the area as such it is referenced in policy CP2 of the Core Strategy as forming an important symbol of the past. This policy seeks to respect the local context and reinforce local distinctiveness. Likewise, policy BP2 of the Borough Wide DPD also references this heritage value and is concerned with preserving heritage areas of their instinctive and historically important feature and ensuring developments do not detract from the heritage area's significance. This is further supported by policy DMD4 of the Draft Local Plan regulation 19.

- 3.10.4 Further, section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1991 (as amended) places a general duty on the Council with respect to listed buildings in exercising its planning functions. In considering whether to grant listed building consent for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Likewise, Section 72 of this act has special regard to conservation areas and places a duty on the council to ensure the character and appearance of the area is protected and enhanced.
- 3.10.5 Bell House is two storey symmetrical building which is characterised by being five window bays wide and represents a form of early 18th century architecture which was later altered in early 19th century. As such, the property forms part of the rich local history and became Grade II listed in 1981. This property sits 40.70 metres south of the shared boundary with the application site.
- 3.10.6 Fels Farmhouse is a two-storey detached building which became a locally listed building in 2008. This property sits 27.51 metres north of the shared boundary with the application site.
- 3.10.7 Given the separation between the proposed development and the Grade II listed and locally listed building officers do not consider the proposal would cause harm to the setting of the nearby heritage assets. The urban design officer was consulted and agreed with the points raised by officers noting additionally that given the layout, scale, and massing of the site the impact on the heritage assets will be significantly diminished. Therefore, officers consider the proposal to be acceptable and in keeping with the development policies and section 66 and section 72 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990).

3.11 Refuse Storage

- 3.11.1 No details of refuse storage have been provided showing the proposed design and materials used, as such a condition will be placed on this application requiring these details to be submitted prior to any above ground works.
- 3.11.2 Overall, officers consider the proposal to have an acceptable impact on the openness of the green belt and the character and appearance of the surrounding local area, as such, it is considered to be in keeping with the development policies. Notwithstanding, limited details have been provided with regard to crime prevention, as such, a condition will be placed on this application to ensure the development is compliant with a secure by design scheme.

4.0 Impacts to neighbouring amenity:

- 4.1 The NPPF, The London Plan Policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.15, draft London Plan Policies GG1, GG3 and D14, all have relevance to the importance of quality development which addressing neighbouring amenity and avoiding unacceptable impacts.
- 4.2 Policy DMD1 of the Draft Local Plan Reg 19 seeks to ensure all development proposals consider the impact on neighbouring amenity with regard to significant overlooking (loss of privacy and immediate outlook) and overshadowing (unacceptable loss of daylight/sunlight). Policy DMSI3 further expands on this noting development proposals which generate an unacceptable level of nuisance including noise, waste, comings and goings and general disturbances will be resisted. This is supported by policy DMD6 of the Draft Local Plan Reg 19 and policy BP8 of the Borough Wide DPD.
- 4.3 As stated in the design and access statement “the site currently contains two large industrial barns along with a number of smaller storage units. The site is almost entirely hard surfaced... Current storage and skip hire use allows skips to be stacked to 7 bins high around the site, this is a fluctuating site coverage on a day-to-day period”. The current use of the application site was deemed lawful following an application for a certificate of lawfulness: existing use based on the

understanding that the skip bins do not exceed a height of 7 bins. No other restrictions apply as to the hours of operation or the number of skips permitted on site. As such, given the sites location within a largely residential setting and adjacent to Eastbrookend Country Park the current unrestricted industrial use of the site is considered to be at odd with the environment and setting of the surrounding local due through the generation of noise and visual disturbances detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring properties.

- 4.4 This application seeks permission for the construction of 7 family sized dwelling houses as such increasing the number of households on site by 7 and the number of permanent residents to a maximum of 44. Whilst officers acknowledge that introducing 7 new dwellings for up to 44 residents at this location may result in an increase in noise, light, waste, comings and goings and general disturbances. The assessment of the proposal must be made as a comparison to the amount of noise, waste, light, comings and goings and general disturbances currently produced by the site. As mentioned above the site is currently benefits from unrestricted industrial use, as such, as a comparison to the existing use officers do not consider the proposal to produce greater levels of noise, waste, comings and goings, light and general disturbances than currently produced by the site. In addition, giving the location of the site within a largely residential area officers consider the proposed development to be more suited to the setting of the application site than the existing use.
- 4.5 Further, Fels Farmhouse sits to the north of the site and shares a boundary line with the application site. The property at plot 4 offsets the boundary by 1.0 metres however, the remaining proposed works along this boundary line are ground works. In addition, Fels Farmhouse offsets the shared boundary by 31.84 metres, as such officers consider the distance to mitigate any significant levels of overshadowing and any material loss of daylight, outlook, and privacy.
- 4.6 Bell House sits to the south of the site and shares a boundary line with the application site. The property at plot 5 will offset the shared boundary by 3.24 metres and sit adjacent to the eastern corner. The property at plot 1 will offset the boundary line by 9.49 metres and sit to the western corner. In addition, Bell House is located 41 metres from the shared boundary line, as such, officers consider the distance between the proposed development and Bell House to mitigate any significant levels of overshadowing and any material loss of daylight, outlook a privacy.
- 4.7 414 and 412 Dagenham Road sit to the south and share a rear boundary line with the application site whereby the proposed dwelling houses sit 30 metres from the boundary line. As shown on the proposed block plan the area directly behind these properties consists of plot 5's garden as such officers so not consider the proposal to result in overshadowing or the material loss of daylight and outlook.
- 4.8 The properties along Dagenham Road to the west offset the sites boundary line by 17 metres as such officers consider the distance to mitigate any overshadowing or material loss of daylight, outlook, and privacy. Likewise, Eastbrookend Country Park sits to the east and north east, as such there will be no impact on neighbouring amenity in this location.
- 4.9 Notwithstanding, objections were received from neighbouring properties with regard to the impact the proposal will have on the visual amenity and openness of the green belt namely there are concerns that the proposal will set precedence for further development on green belt land. Officers have covered these matters in the principle of development and design sections.
- 4.10 Further, significant concerns have been raised with regard to increased traffic, pedestrian, and cyclist's safety. These matters will be assessed in the sustainable transport section below.
- 4.11 Moreover, concerns were raised with regard to noise from demolition and building works. Whilst officers acknowledge that the construction of the proposal may result in the creation of more noise and general disturbances, these disturbances will only occur in the short term as they will only last the duration of construction, as such, officers do not consider this matter to warrant a reason for refusal.

- 4.12 Overall, officers consider the proposal to have an acceptable impact on neighbouring amenity in keeping with the development policies. Notwithstanding, a condition regarding construction environmental management and site waste management will be placed on this application to reduce the environmental impact of the construction and the impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents.

5.0 Sustainable Transport:

- 5.1 The NPPF recognises that sustainable transport has an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also contributing to wider health objectives. It offers encouragement to developments which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and those which reduce congestion. The NPPF also outlines that developments which generate significant vehicle movements should be located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport options can be maximised. It is also expected that new development does not give rise to the creation of conflicts between vehicular traffic and pedestrians. However, it also stated that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
- 5.2 This is echoed by the London Plan through Policies 6.3, 6.9 and 6.13, and policies T6.1 and T5 of the Draft London Plan and further supported by policies DMT 2 and DMT 3 of the Draft Local Plan Reg 19 and policy BR9 of the Borough Wide DPD.
- 5.3 Car Parking
- 5.3.1 The application site has a PTAL of 1b which represents poor access to public transport. Table 10.3 of policy T6.1 of the Draft London Plan states that outer London locations with this PTAL should provide no more than 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling. The proposal seeks to provide two off-street parking per dwelling whereby accessible spaces are available at 5 of the dwellings- the car parking spaces for the 4-bedroom properties will be located to the front of the dwelling houses and for the 3-bedroom properties the spaces will be located to the rear. In addition, two visitor parking spaces will be provided. These will be located adjacent to the access road. The transport development manager was consulted and noted the car parking provision proposed does not comply with policy T6.1 of the Draft London Plan or policy DMT 2 of the Draft Local Plan as such the number should be reduced to at least 1.5 spaces per unit. Further they note that the transport technical note states "all car parking will be provided with passive provision for ECVP's from the outset with possibility of future occupiers choosing to have them fitted at a later stage". This does not comply with the London Plan which requires 20% active provision installed, the remainder passive with locations for both indicated on a plan. Officer have relayed these comments to the applicant and sought amendments. An amended block plan has been provided reducing the car parking for each property to 1 and showing the ECVP points for each space. Officers consider the amended provision of parking to be acceptable and in keeping with the development policies.
- 5.4 Cycle Parking
- 5.4.1 Further, Table 10.2 of policy T5 of the Draft London Plan states that properties with 2 or more bedrooms should provide at least 2 safe and secure cycle storage spaces per dwelling. In addition, developments which to construct between 4 and 20 dwellings should provide at least 2 short-stay cycle parking spaces for visitors. As such, it would be expected that the proposal provides sufficient long-term and short-term cycle storage. The proposal will provide 2 x safe and secure cycle storage spaces within the rear garden of each property. In addition, there will be 3 short-term cycle spaces for visitors adjacent to the access road. Overall, officers consider the proposal to provide adequate provision of safe and secure cycle storage. Notwithstanding, officers have placed a condition regarding cycling on this application to ensure the proposed cycle storage spaces are designed in accordance with London cycle design standards and relevant development policies.

5.5 Public Transport

- 5.5.1 Lastly, the application site is located 1minute walk from two bus stops on Dagenham Road which are served by the 174-bus route and provide regular services to Romford Station and Dagenham Heathway Station both of which are an 11-minute bus journey. Further Dagenham East Tube Station is located a 24-minute walk away. As such, it is evident that whilst public transport links are accessible, they are not convenient, hence, it is likely that residents and visitors to the site will use private cars and bicycles. Therefore, officers are in full support of the cycle and parking arrangements which are provided on site.
- 5.5.2 In addition, a new tabletop entrance will be installed at the vehicular entrance of the property which will prioritise the cycle path, hence, highlighting that the proposal supports more sustainable modes of transport.

5.6 Access

- 5.6.1 The swept path analysis submitted with the application demonstrates the road design is suitable for access by refuse and emergency vehicles to enter and leave in a forward gear. Notwithstanding, the transport development officer was consulted whilst they were satisfied with the access arrangements to the site and the shared space leading into the site, they noted that they would like to see a segregated footway between the back of the public highway and the shared surface to avoid conflict with vehicles entering or leaving. Officers sought amendments from the applicant regarding this matter, however, it was detailed in an email dated 28.01.2021 that whilst the applicant understood the reasoning behind the need for this segregation, they held concerns that by having a separate pedestrian footway this would expose pedestrians to cyclist potentially travelling at speed at the section where intervisibility of pedestrians and cyclists would be significantly restricted by neighbouring properties. As such, whilst they provided amended drawings showing a 2.0-metre-wide segregated footway connection, they requested that the final decision would be subjected to the highway safety audit related to the junction redesign. Officers have taken this matter into account and note that whilst they understand the applicants concerns that having a segregated pathway at the entrance may compromise pedestrian safety at this junction, they note that this would still be the case should the shared surface extend onto the main road, however, in addition to this there would be the additional risk of pedestrian conflict with vehicles entering and leaving the site. Therefore, on balance in agreement with the transport development officer, officers consider the segregated footway to offer greater pedestrian safety as such they consider the amended drawing to be acceptable and in keeping with the development policies.
- 5.6.2 Likewise, the access strategy proposes to make use of the existing entrance on Dagenham Road and via a new private road which connects all the parking areas for each plot. The transport officer notes the existing access will require modifications to make sure it is in line with the current highway design standards for this type of residential development. In addition, the forward visibility on the bend of the private access road should be safeguarded to avoid the sightline being obscured at the rear of plot 1. The applicant confirmed in an email dated 28.01.2021 and as shown on the amended proposed block plan the landscaping to the front and rear of plot 1 will consist of low-level planting and not exceed 600 mm in height to maintain visibility. Officers believe this is acceptable to avoid sightlines being obscured, nonetheless, it would be expected that details of this landscaping are submitted to discharge the condition regarding landscaping.
- 5.6.3 Further, it is noted highway alterations to Dagenham Road will be required to safely accommodate the developments proposed access arrangements. These will go beyond the extension of the red line boundary of the application site whereby road works will include kerb, footway, and carriageway modifications, TMO's, parking restrictions and signage. The transport officer notes this will need to be secured with the applicant separately in a section 278 agreement with the Highway Authority. As such a condition will be placed on this application requiring a section 278 agreement (Highways Act 1980) to be entered into by the applicant prior to construction taking place on site.

- 5.6.4 Finally, concerns were raised by neighbouring residents regarding highway, traffic, cyclists, and pedestrian safety given the site was located adjacent to a blind bend. Officers note that the private access road into and out of the site will be a private road, however, it would be expected that speeds are kept to a minimum within the site as such there are limited concerns on the impact this will have to cyclists and pedestrians within and outside the site. Likewise, as the application will have to enter a section 278 agreement with the highway's authority suitable signage and carriageway markings will be required beyond the red line boundary as such officers are satisfied that this will allow Dagenham Road to safely accommodate the new development. In addition, the transport development officer notes that there have not been any reported incidents at this junction and given the number of houses on site the number of trips made by car are not considered to be significant. Therefore, officers consider the impact the proposal will have on the safety of the highway to be acceptable and in keeping with the development policies.
- 5.6.5 Overall, officers consider the proposal to have an acceptable impact on the highway, local parking amenity and promote the use of more sustainable modes of transport. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable and in keeping with the development policies.

6.0 Conclusions:

The proposed demolition of existing buildings and construction of 3 x 4-bedroom and 4x 3-bedroom dwelling house is considered to have an acceptable impact on the openness of the Green Belt whilst also increasing the net stock of family housing within the borough by 7 which is the type of housing in high demand. Likewise, the proposal will have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the Green Belt and the surrounding local area, neighbouring amenity, and the highway. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable and in keeping with the development policies.

Appendix 1:

<p>Development Plan Context: The Council has carefully considered the relevant provisions of the Council’s adopted development plan and of all other relevant policies and guidance. Of particular relevance to this decision were the following Framework and Development Plan policies and guidance:</p>	
<p><i>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (MHCLG, Feb 2019)</i></p>	
<p><i>The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for London (GLA, consolidated with alterations since 2011, published March 2016)</i></p>	<p>Policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply</p> <p><i>Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments</i></p> <p><i>Policy 3.8 Housing Choice</i></p> <p><i>Policy 3.14 Existing Housing</i></p> <p><i>Policy 7.1 Lifetime Neighbourhoods</i></p> <p><i>Policy 7.4 Local Character</i></p> <p><i>Policy 7.6 Architecture</i></p> <p>Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology</p> <p><i>Policy 7.15 Reducing and managing noise, improving, and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes.</i></p> <p><i>Policy 7.16 Green Belt</i></p> <p><i>Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity.</i></p> <p><i>Policy 6.9 Cycling</i></p> <p><i>Policy 6.13 Parking</i></p>
<p><i>The Mayor of London’s Draft London Plan - Intend to Publish version December 2019 is under Examination. Having regard to NPPF paragraph 48 the emerging document is a material consideration and appropriate weight will be given to its policies and suggested changes in decision-making unless other material considerations indicate that it would not be reasonable to do so.</i></p>	
<p><i>Draft London Plan - Intend to Publish version December 2019</i></p>	<p>Policy GG4 Delivering the Homes Londoners need</p> <p>Policy H1 Increasing housing supply.</p> <p>Policy H2 Small sites</p> <p>Policy D4 Delivering good design.</p> <p>Policy D5 Inclusive design</p> <p>Policy D6 Housing quality and standards</p> <p>Policy H10 Housing size mix</p> <p>Policy H9 Ensuing the best use of stock.</p>

	<p>Policy D6 Housing quality and standards</p> <p>Policy GG1 Building strong and inclusive communities.</p> <p>Policy GG3 Creating a healthy city.</p> <p>Policy D3 Optimising site capacity through design led approach.</p> <p>Policy D8 Public realm</p> <p>Policy D14 Noise</p> <p>Policy T6.1 Parking</p> <p>Policy T5 Cycling</p> <p>Policy HC1 Heritage Conservation and Growth</p> <p>Policy G2 London's Green Belt</p>
<p><i>Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy (July 2010)</i></p>	<p>Policy CM1 General Principles of Development</p> <p>Policy CM2 Managing Housing Growth</p> <p>Policy CP3 High Quality Built Environment</p> <p>Policy CP2 Protecting and Promoting our Historic Environment.</p> <p>Policy CM3 Green Belt and Public Open Space</p>
<p><i>Local Development Framework (LDF) Borough Wide Development Plan Document (DPD) (March 2011)</i></p>	<p>Policy BP5 External Amenity Space</p> <p>Policy BP6 Internal Amenity Space</p> <p>Policy BP11 Urban Design</p> <p>Policy BP8 Protecting Residential Amenity</p> <p>Policy BR9 Parking</p> <p>Policy BR10 Sustainable Transport</p> <p>Policy BR2 Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings</p>
<p><i>The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Draft Local Plan: (Regulation 19 Consultation Version, October 2020) is at an "advanced" stage of preparation. Having regard to NPPF paragraph 216 the emerging document is now a material consideration and substantial weight will be given to the emerging document in decision-making unless other material considerations indicate that it would not be reasonable to do so.</i></p>	
<p><i>The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Draft Local Plan: (Regulation 19 Consultation Version, October 2020)</i></p>	<p>Policy SPDG1 Delivering growth in Barking and Dagenham.</p> <p>Policy SP3 Delivering homes that meet peoples' needs.</p> <p>Policy DMH3 Specialist housing</p> <p>Policy DMNE1 Parks, open spaces and play space</p>

	<p>Policy DMD4 Heritage assets and archaeological remains.</p> <p>Policy SP2 Delivering a well-designed, high-quality, and resilient built environment.</p> <p>Policy SP4 Delivering social and cultural infrastructure facilities in the right locations.</p> <p>Policy DMD1 Securing high-quality design.</p> <p>Policy DMSI3 Nuisance</p> <p>Policy DMT2 Car parking</p> <p>Policy DMT3 Cycling</p> <p>Policy SP6 Green and Blue Infrastructure</p>
<p><i>Supplementary Planning Documents</i></p>	<p>DCLG Technical Housing Standards (nationally described space standard) (DCLG, March 2015) (as amended)</p> <p>Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (GLA, March 2016, Updated August 2017)</p> <p>LBBB Green Belt Review (October 2016)</p>

Additional Reference:

Human Rights Act

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report.

Equalities

In determining this planning application, BeFirst on behalf of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham has regard to its equality's obligations including its obligations under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (as amended).

For the purposes of this application there are no adverse equalities issues.

Appendix 2:

Relevant Planning History:			
<i>Application Number:</i>	19/01290/PRE	<i>Status:</i>	No decision taken
<i>Description:</i>	Pre application meeting request: Mixed use of A3, B1 and C3 comprising of 8 x 3 bed; 8 x 2 bed; and 6 x 1 bed. A basement car is proposed, and the scheme frontage is to provide 240 square metres of A3 in the basement, 410 square metres of A3 at ground floor level and 350 square metres of B1 above with 4 residential units above. The rear to be a mixture of flats and houses of a total of 22 units to include the 4 units above the commercial space.		
<i>Application Number:</i>	20/00282/FUL	<i>Status:</i>	Application Withdrawn
<i>Description:</i>	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a mixed-use scheme comprising 9 new dwellings (5 x 4-bedroom and 4 x 3-bedroom) and a 3-storey office block (Use Class B1(a)) including basement; and utilisation of existing vehicular access.		

Appendix 3:

The following consultations have been undertaken:

- Environmental Agency
- London Fire Brigade (Water Team)
- Infrastructure Deliver Manager LBBB
- Urban Design Officer
- London Fire Brigade
- TFL Planning
- TFL Underground
- Thames Water
- LBBB Inclusive Growth
- LBBB Contaminated Land
- Historic England (Archaeology)
- Historic England Buildings
- Design Out Crime Officer
- LBBB Access Officer
- Transport Development Manager
- Arboricultural Officer
- LBBB Highways
- Cllr Princess Bright (Eastbrook Ward Councillors)
- Cllr Tony Ramsay (Eastbrook Ward Councillors)
- Cllr Mick McCarthy (Eastbrook Ward Councillors)

Summary of Consultation responses:		
Consultee and date received	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments
Stephen Knell- Access Officer Email dated: 09.11.2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lovely scheme no objections 	N/A
Leslie Gipps- Designing out Crime Unit. Email dated: 17.11.2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers have not been consulted with regards to crime prevention on the project. As such it is advised that a condition is placed on the application so as to ensure the development achieves a certificate of compliance to a secure by design scheme. 	Matters have been addressed in paragraph 3.11.2 and secured by condition 7
Tracy Farrell- Environmental Protection Officer Email dated: 29.11.2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the LPA is minded granting permission the following conditions are recommended: contaminated land, construction environmental management and site waste management and scheme of acoustic protection 	Matters have been addressed in paragraphs 4.12 and 2.1.5 and secured by conditions 8, 9 and 10
Louise Davies- GLAAS Email dated: 09.12.2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of archaeological. No further assessment or conditions are therefore necessary. 	N/A
Ian Drew- Urban Design Email dated: 16.12.2020	<p>Layout, Height, Scale and Massing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opportunity to redevelop the site and replace existing industrial buildings of little design merit on what was a former skip hire depot 	Matters have been addressed in paragraphs 3.6.1, 3.7.1 and 3.9.1 and secured by condition 3, 4, 5 and 6

	<p>bounded by residential properties is acknowledged. The principle of residential development in the form of 2 storey detached and semi-detached dwellings occupying generous sized plots with an active street frontage is supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In terms of impact on the greenbelt it is noted that the site currently comprises of hardstanding to facilitate the existing industrial use. Given the proposed layout, scale and massing it is not considered that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the openness of the greenbelt. • It is important that any new development makes a positive contribution to the setting and has an appropriate relationship with neighbouring properties and the surrounding context. Bell House, a Grade II listed building, is located to the south of the site. Given the separation distance between the proposed development and the listed building, it is not considered that the proposal would harm the setting of this heritage asset. The site layout, scale and massing are considered acceptable and would not be detrimental to the existing character of the surrounding area. <p>Appearance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The architectural approach comprising of a limited palette of materials namely brickwork facing and timber cladding to reference the original agricultural barn-like structures/local Essex vernacular is accepted. Reflecting the origins of the site and its use through materiality will help to create a distinctive character and identity to the proposed development. • The quality of the materials and architectural detailing and the extent to which they derive from and reference local/site context is key. The proposed choice of brick and the use of UPVC windows indicated on the plans submitted do not reflect the level of quality 	
--	---	--

	<p>that is expected and would not be acceptable. A high-quality brick/timber cladding, aluminium/timber composite windows and high-quality architectural detailing is required. Physical samples should be provided, the quality of which should be secured by condition.</p> <p>Landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant should seek to integrate high-quality landscaping with natural sustainable drainage measures where possible. The design, maintenance and management of the proposed soft landscaping areas should be carefully considered in order to avoid neglected 'left over' spaces. • The proposed soft landscaping elements including tree planting across the site is welcomed and will contribute towards creating a <i>quality of place</i> for future residents. The Council's Arboricultural Officer should be consulted regarding the proposed removal of existing mature trees fronting Dagenham Road. Details of soft and hard landscaping including boundary treatments should be secured by condition. • Details of external lighting provision should also be secured by condition in order to ensure a safe environment for residents and visitors 	
<p>John Hunter- Transport Development Manager</p> <p>Email dated: 25.01.2021</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PTAL of the site is 1b. • The proposed residential development will change the type of vehicles movements, instead of HGV/LGV's the types of trips will be predominantly cars. The impact of car trips would be minimal and would result in a decrease in the overall number of trips when compared with the sites previous use. • There are 2 allocated off-street car parking spaces within the boundary of each plot. This does not comply with the London Plan, draft London plan or the reg 19 local plan. As such the number of spaces should be reduced to 1.5 spaces per unit. 	<p>Matters have been addressed in section 5.0 and secured by condition 12 and 16</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Transport Technical note states all car parking will be provided with passive provision for ECVP's from the outset with possibility of future occupiers choosing to have them fitted at a later stage. This does not comply with the London Plan which requires 20% active provision installed, the remainder passive with locations for both indicated on a plan. • The access strategy proposes to make use of the existing site entrance on Dagenham Road and via a new private roadway access connect to all the parking areas for each plot. The existing access will require modifications to make sure it is line with the current highway design standards expected for this type of residential development. The forward visibility on the bend of the access road should be safeguarded to avoid the sightline being obscured at the rear of plot 1. • A segregated footway within the site should be provided to give a safe walking connection between the back of the public highway with the shared surface to avoid conflict with vehicles entering or leaving. In terms of inclusive mobility ideally the width of the footway should be 2.0 meters to facilitate wheelchairs and prams to pass freely and where this width is not possible, a clear width of 1.5m should be provided. • Swept path analysis has been carried out that demonstrates the road design is suitable for access by refuse and emergency vehicles to enter and leave in a forward gear. • A Construction and Logistic Plan would be needed to ensure best practice in accordance with TfL guidance and TfL's Freight Operators Recognition Scheme is adhered and this should be secured with a condition. • To realize this proposal as submitted it will require highway alterations on Dagenham Road to 	
--	--	--

	<p>safely accommodate the developments proposed access arrangements. These will go beyond the extent of the red line boundary of the application and we will need more detail information than what has already been shown on the indicative highway scheme submitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These road works will consist of kerb, footway, and carriageway modifications, TMO's, parking restrictions and signage. This will need to be secured with the applicant separately in a section 278 agreement with the Highway Authority. We suggest in the interest of highway safety, a section 278 agreement (Highways Act 1980) is entered into by the applicant prior to construction taking place on site. 	
<p>Colin Richardson- Arboricultural Officer</p> <p>Email dates: 26.11.2020</p>	<p>I do not believe there is any significant impact with this scheme that warrants objection. No trees are being removed and, ultimately, the treescape is not altered from any notable public viewpoint. But there are some points to make that should be considered.</p> <p>Firstly, the existing trees to the south of the site that border to the Bell House: The application intends to retain them as a screen which is good. However, the application should include an impact assessment to surface changes where the car park is going. This may be in the RPA of the trees and in this case a method statement to ground preparation and re-surfacing should be supplied. Also, a tree protection plan for those trees and the country park trees to the west of the site to not get damaged during the demolition and build stages.</p> <p>Most importantly, the biggest issues that arise from properties built up against woodland land is potential boundary fouling, or damage, from the parkland trees. The trees on the west side are under the LBBB Ranger Service and are not managed for maintenance pruning. Under the site's current status, no problems will arise. However, when dwelling gardens border the site, complaints come in and costs can occur to the public purse. It will be the trees that are within crown falling distance of</p>	<p>Matters have been addressed in section 3.8 and secured by condition 11 and 17</p>

	<p>the properties that will be in question for work and they will be hard to access for any parties without some forethought.</p> <p>I would like to see a clear boundary established between the rear fences of the new dwellings and the park tree line, say a minimum of 1.5m. This area of land should be under the ownership of the dwellings so they can maintain a clearance to their fences and gardens and be able to maintain their boundaries (i.e., stopping weed growth, painting wood preservatives to fences etc.) It enables the site to be inspected and access possible for maintenance work to those trees should it be necessary. Side access and rear gates should be accessible for work at the rear of these gardens. It enables the adjacent landowner (in this case LBBB) to comfortably refer to common law with regard to boundary clearance and to not be saddled with damages claims and additional costs for maintenance not currently necessary.</p>	
<p>TFL</p> <p>Email dated 05.11.2021</p>	<p>TFL had no further comments to make regarding the application</p>	
<p>GLA</p> <p>Email Dated 04.01.2021</p>	<p>The floorspace of the proposed scheme is less than 1,000sq, as such, the proposal is not GLA referable.</p>	

Appendix 4:

Neighbour Notification:	
Date Neighbour Letters Sent:	03.11.2020
Date of Press Advertisement:	06.11.2020
Number of responses:	13
Address:	Summary of response:
120 Eastbrook Drive	The proposal will rely solely on the small roundabout to access the main road and if this were to become blocked at any time or congested due to ongoing works it could have a huge impact on our day-to-day lives. Concerns with regard to high traffic
7 Hook Hall Drive	Concerns with pedestrian and cyclist safety. Increase traffic resulting in accidents. Concerns occupiers of 3-bedroom properties will park on the pavement/cycle path outside their homes which could lead to pedestrian and cyclist safety being compromised.
68 Eastbrook Drive	The proposal is on green belt and it will intrude upon a precious amenity which would disrupt the wildlife and people's pleasure
14 Park Drive	Green Belt land previously used for agriculture and sits between 2 locally listed houses: Fels Farmhouse and Bell House. Proposal would put strain on Dagenham Road, and it is close to a blind bend. There is no shortage of brownfield sites to build houses on
3 Valentines Way	Noise from demolition and building work. Traffic congestion caused by construction and future residents. Blind bend in the road Spoil view from my house Green Belt land
Anonymous Objection	Vehicular entrance to the yard is dangerous. Only one bus route services the site Not near local shops Impact on the openness of the Green Belt and increase burden upon local infrastructure.
Anonymous Objection	Existing plan bears little or no resemblance to the current use of the yard. Overlooking and loss of privacy Impact on visual amenity- Grade II listed Bell House, Locally Listed Fels Farmhouse and Eastbrookend Country Park. Openness and harm to the Green Belt Highway Safety and Traffic Generation

Cllr Tony Ramsay	<p>1) Green Belt, all previous applications refused correctly. This should on its own warrant refusal.</p> <p>2) Effect on adjoining Country Park, proposal will spoil the visual amenity of the Park.</p> <p>3) Loss of unique barn feature, typical of feature in farming area in the not-too-distant past.</p> <p>4) Traffic, very little currently from site, but increasing if proposal is approved and affecting busy Dagenham Road adversely if approved.</p>
Cllr Princess Bright	Removal of farm outbuildings which is a symbol from our agricultural past. Dangerous as the proposal is near a dangerous bend in the road and a roundabout.
Cllr Mick McCarthy	Removal of farm outbuildings which is a symbol from our agricultural past. Dangerous as the proposal is near a dangerous bend in the road and a roundabout.
Anonymous	Frequent accidents Site is on a dangerous bend
Anonymous	Access Problems Impact on the Green Belt- set a precedence
Anonymous	Strain on schools, hospitals, and cause congestion Site on a dangerous bend prone to accidents Impact the surrounding country park. Site would have a better used as a health centre

Officer Summary:

Officers note receipt of the objections listed above. The material planning considerations are addressed within the planning assessment.

Appendix 5:

Conditions & Informative:

Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of THREE YEARS from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. The development hereby approved shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed below:

- 1684/P04 Proposed Block Plan [Revision D] Dated September 2020
- 1684/P01 Site Location Plan Dated November 2019
- 1684/P05 Proposed Layout Plots 1 and 4 Dated October 2020
- 1684/P06 Proposed Layout Plots 5 & 6 Dated October 2020
- 1684/P07 Proposed Layout Plot 7 Dated October 2020
- 1684/P08 Proposed Street Scene and Site Sections Dated January 2020
- Design and Access Statement [Revision C] Dated November 2020

No other drawings or documents apply.

Reason: To ensure that the development is undertaken in accordance with the approved drawing(s) and document(s) to ensure that the finished appearance of the development will enhance the character and visual amenities of the area and to satisfactorily protect the residential amenities of nearby occupiers.

3. No development shall commence until:

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

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

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

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

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

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.

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

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

4. 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) noise and vibration control.
 - i) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
 - j) the use of efficient construction materials;
 - k) methods to minimise waste, to encourage re-use, recovery and recycling, and sourcing of materials; and
 - l) 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, other than internal works do not audible outside the site boundary, are only to be carried out between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 and 13:00 Saturday, with no work on Sundays or public holidays without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority. Any works which are associated with the

generation of ground borne vibration are only to be carried out between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday.

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.

Once approved the Plans shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

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

5. No works shall commence unless and until a scheme for the protection of the existing on-site trees and any tree within 5 metres of the site boundary (including a method statement identifying the root protection areas of the trees and the method to avoid damage to the trees) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme will comply with the provisions of BS 5837:2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition, and construction – Recommendations) and BS 3998:2010 (Tree work – Recommendations). The approved scheme for the protection of the existing trees shall be implemented prior to the commencement of all works and be maintained in full until the development has been completed.

Reason: Arboricultural assets are present on the site. The planning authority wishes to secure the protection and future health of the Arboricultural assets. The imposition of this prior to commencement planning condition is considered necessary to prevent commencement of works until the requirements have been met because the timing of compliance is fundamental to the decision to grant planning permission.

6. Prior to commencement of the development the developer shall enter a s278 agreement to undertake highway improvements and submit to the council a detailed highway design and seeking to ensure it accords with the relevant road safety audit and the detailed design to cover the required Traffic Management Orders to be TSRGD compliant both in term of the accompanying signage and highways markings, kerb alignment and adjustment, footway resurfacing / recon. The detailed design works to be in accordance with the Design Manuel for Roads and Bridges and Manual Contract for Highway Works specifications.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and in accordance with section 278 of the Highways Act 1980

7. The development hereby permitted shall not commence (except for demolition works) unless and until a surface water drainage scheme for the site (based on sustainable drainage principles SuDS) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water drainage scheme shall include:
 - a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro-geological context of the development;
 - a demonstration that the surface water run-off generated up to and including the 100 years plus Climate Change critical storm period will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site following the corresponding rainfall event.
 - details of how the proposed surface water drainage scheme will be maintained; and
 - a drainage scheme nominating the ownership, management, and maintenance arrangements;

The surface water drainage scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation and/or use of the development and be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard the public from surface water flood risk, protect the environment and respond to climate change. The imposition of this prior to commencement planning condition is considered necessary to prevent commencement of works until the requirements have been met because the timing of compliance is fundamental to the decision to grant planning permission.

8. Prior to commencement of the development a local marketing strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The local marketing strategy shall include:
- i. details of where and how the development will be marketed;
 - ii. the timings to demonstrate 6 months of exclusive local marketing;
 - iii. the arrangements to ensure that the development is accessible to all local residents; and
 - iv. local residents is defined as residents of Barking and Dagenham. This criterion is to be used for determining the 'local market' and the means by which such criteria shall be kept to.

The dwellings hereby consented shall not be marketed beyond the local area or on wider platforms unless and until parts i – iv have been completed.

Reason: To ensure local residents have priority access to the provision of additional family sized dwellinghouses

9. 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 including details of window design 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 and enhance the character and amenity of the area in accordance with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and policy and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

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

Reason: To ensure the boundary treatment protects or enhances the character and amenity of the area in accordance with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and policy and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

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

Reason: To safeguard and improve the appearance of the area in accordance with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and policy and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

12. No above ground development shall commence until a scheme showing the provisions to be made for external lighting has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting 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, page 25 of the guide, relating to Environmental Zone E2 Low district brightness areas-Rural, small village or relatively dark urban locations. 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 security and safety, to avoid light pollution and safeguard neighbouring amenity and in accordance with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

13. No development above ground level shall take place until details of refuse enclosures showing the design; location and external appearance have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved enclosures shall be provided before the commencement of the use and thereafter permanently retained.

Reason: To provide satisfactory refuse storage provision in the interests of the appearance of the site and locality in accordance with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document

14. Prior to commencement of above ground works, full details of a scheme of acoustic protection of habitable rooms against noise shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme of acoustic protection shall be sufficient to secure internal noise levels no greater than:

- a. 35 dB LAeq in living rooms and bedrooms (07:00 hours to 23:00 hours) with windows closed; and
- b. 30 dB LAeq in bedrooms (23:00 hours to 07:00 hours) with windows closed.

The approved scheme shall be fully implemented before the first occupation of the residential unit to which it relates and shall be maintained at all times thereafter.

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

15. Prior to first occupation, details of the cycle parking facilities, as shown on drawing No. 1694/P04 (Revision D) Proposed Block Plan, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking facilities shall be designed and laid out in accordance with the London Cycle Design Standards. The development shall not be occupied until the approved details have been implemented. Thereafter, the cycle parking facilities shall be permanently retained.

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

16. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order), no development falling within Classes A, B, C, D and E in Part 1 of Schedule 2 or Class A in Part 2 of Schedule 2 to that Order shall be carried out without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent the overdevelopment of the site, maintain visibility lines within the development and preserve the openness of the green belt in accordance with the NPPF, policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

17. All boundary fences along the western boundary adjacent to Eastbrookend Country Park must be positioned 1.5 metres from any pre-existing trees.

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees and allow for the future maintenance and pruning of the trees.

18. The development shall achieve a Certificate of Compliance to a Secure by Design (silver) scheme where they exist. Or alternatively achieve secure by design standards to the satisfaction of the Metropolitan Police, details of which shall be provided in writing to the Local Planning Authority prior to first habitation or use. All security features are to be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of security and safety, to reduce the fear of crime and safeguard neighbouring amenity and in accordance with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.