Present: Cllr Sanchia Alasia (Chair), Cllr Faraaz Shaukat (Deputy Chair), Cllr Peter Chand, Cllr Faruk Choudhury, Cllr Irma Freeborn, Cllr Cameron Geddes, Cllr Syed Ghani, Cllr Rocky Gill, Cllr Kashif Haroon, Cllr Margaret Mullane, Cllr Chris Rice and Cllr Dominic Twomey

Also Present: Cllr Adegboyega Oluwole

Apologies: Cllr Abdul Aziz, Cllr Bill Turner and Cllr Jeff Wade

68. Declaration of Members' Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

69. Minutes (6 February 2017)

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2017 were confirmed as correct.

Councillor Mullane requested that consideration should be given to her name being included when referring to applications. She noted that the minutes of 6 February 2017 had named Councillors Lee and Phil Waker, however they were not Members of the Board and were recorded as public speakers on a particular item. It was noted that the Board used the same style of minutes on a consistent basis without naming individual Members. In addition, the Board will be filmed from now on and the existing practice of not naming Members is now supported by a visual and sound recording of the Members participating including the naming, which will address this concern.

70. Plots 201-203 Barking Riverside, Renwick Road, Barking- 16/01971/REM

The Development Management Manager introduced a report on the application relating to Plots 201-203 Barking Riverside, Renwick Road, Barking.

The application site formed part of the Barking Riverside development which occupied a 179.3 hectare site of brownfield land historically associated with the old Barking Power Station. Barking Riverside had had a number of outline planning permissions since 2007 and most recently, a revised outline planning application for Barking Riverside was approved by Development Control Board on 27 July 2016 (Ref: 16/00131/OUT). However this application falls under the previous outline permission (Ref: 08/00887/FUL).

This application sought reserved matters consent for the erection of 378 new homes, associated car parking, landscaping and tertiary roads on development plots 201-203 which are located within Stage 2 of the development located to
the south of Choats Road and accessed off the new Drovers Road which is currently under construction.

The Development Control Board granted planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:
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Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
The Development Management Manager introduced a report on the application relating to 37 Gordon Road, Chadwell Heath.

The proposed demolition of an existing bungalow and erection of a terrace of three 2 storey houses would optimise the use of this site for residential purposes in accordance with the development plan.

The existing building did not contribute positively to the appearance of the street scene, and the proposed development was considered to be well designed and appropriate to its context in terms of scale and massing.

The proposed dwellings would provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupiers and were designed to meet the accessibility, internal space and external amenity space standards set out within the development plan. The scheme would not cause harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

The development would result in a net gain of two houses without the provision of any off-street parking. Whilst the provision of parking within the development boundaries would have been preferable such provision was not feasible within the current scheme. It was considered that the additional on street parking demand that would result from the development would not have a significant impact on existing parking pressure, and furthermore would not have a severe impact on transport which is the relevant policy test set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

In answer to a question, it was advised that there would be garden space at the rear of the proposed development.

Members noted that the proposed development being liable for the Mayoral and Borough Community Infrastructure Levies and would result in CIL contributions of approximately £2,800 and £1,200 respectively and these bands varied across the Borough.

Neil Gaskell, representing the applicant, considered that the application showed that there was a lot of car parking space available around the site and that the effect of this on the locality was minimal.

The Transport Officer had concerns about the lack of access of public transport, which would lead to on-street car parking in the locality. It was noted that this site was not in a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). Members had particular concerns about potential parking and transport issues with this application and considered that the site was not suitable for this development.

The Development Control refused planning permission for the following reasons:

The development does not make provision for any off-street car parking and would therefore result in increased demand for on-street parking within an area
of poor public transport accessibility to the detriment of highway safety and the amenity of local residents contrary to policies BR10 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD, March 2011.

72. Town Planning Appeals

The Board noted details of the following appeals:

Appeals Lodged

The following appeals have been lodged:

a) Erection of first floor side/rear extension, conversion of garage to study, and replacement outbuilding in rear garden – 7 Oulton Crescent, Barking (Ref: 16/01229/FUL)

Application refused under delegated powers 4 October 2016 – Longbridge Ward.

b) Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.6 metres and maximum height: 3.35 metres) - 33 Standfield Road, Dagenham (Ref: 16/01101/PRIOR6)

Application refused under delegated powers 22 August 2016 – Alibon Ward.

c) Erection of two storey 2 bedroom detached house - 476 Ripple Road, Barking (Ref: 16/01309/FUL)]

Application refused under delegated powers 3 November 2016 – Eastbury Ward.

d) Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and front rooflights - 378 Heathway, Dagenham (Ref: 16/01684/CLU_P)

Application refused under delegated powers 23 December 2016 – Alibon Ward.

2. Appeals Determined

The following appeals have been determined by the Planning Inspectorate:

a) Erection of first floor extension to provide studio flat – 5 Porters Avenue, Dagenham (Ref: 16/00431/FUL – Parsloes Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 4 April 2016 for the following reasons:
1) The proposed dwelling would be within a poor quality environment, which offers a poor outlook and unsafe passage of access for future occupants of the unit. As such the site is considered to be inappropriate and unsuitable for new independent residential living accommodation, contrary to Local Plan Core Strategy Policy CP3 and Borough Wide Development Policies BP11 and BP8, which seek to secure that all new residential development should achieve the highest standards of sustainable design and layout expected for new residential dwellings. As such, the proposal fails to fulfill the social and environmental roles of sustainable development and is therefore contrary to National Planning Policy Framework Paragraphs 14 and 17.

2) The proposal would not provide a safe and secure access way to and from the proposed dwelling. Moreover, the proposal would not create a safe environment for future occupants of the proposed dwelling and would undermine their quality of life and sense of the 'home as a place of retreat', contrary to National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 58, The London Plan Policy 3.5, and Borough Wide Development Policies DPD Policy BP11. As such, the proposal fails to fulfill the social and environmental roles of sustainable development, and therefore contrary to NPPF Paragraph 14.

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 16 February 2017

b) Erection of single storey rear extension - 16 Wykeham Green, Dagenham (Ref: 16/00985/FUL – Mayesbrook Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 26 August 2016 for the following reason:

1) The development, by reason of its design and excessive scale, would result in a dominant and intrusive addition in the rear garden environment, harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposed extension would adversely affect the outlook of the occupiers of 17 Wykeham Green. The proposal is contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and the guidance contained in the Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Extensions and Alterations'.

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 2 February 2017

c) Enforcement Notice appeal – Erection of automatic gates and railings to front and side of front garden – 25 Muggeridge Road, Dagenham (Heath Ward)

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 16 February 2017

d) Enforcement Notice appeal – Change of use of shop to café bar
(Class A3) – 28 Station Parade, Barking (Abbey Ward)


e) Enforcement Notice appeal – Erection of extension to rear of property – 29 Sutton Road, Barking (Gascoigne Ward)

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

f) Enforcement Notice appeal – Erection of front fence 1.8 metres in height – 40 Goring Gardens, Dagenham (Becontree Ward)


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

Application refused under delegated powers 21 July 2016 for the following reason:

1) The proposed rear extension would project beyond a side wall as defined by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 and form a side extension which is more than half the width of original dwelling consequently the proposal would not accord with Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A.1 (j) (iii) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.


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

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

1) The proposed development will result in a double storey side extension that will sit significantly forward of the front building line of properties in Ilchester Road and as such will materially close down the view to and from Ilchester Road, detrimental to the character of the existing building and surrounding area and as such is contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011) and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012).

i) Erection of two storey side extension and single storey front extension - 30 Cornworthy Road, Dagenham (Ref: 16/01438/FUL – Mayesbrook Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 9 November 2016 for the following reason:

1) The proposed two storey side extension would partly close off an important gap within the street scene which provides relief from the built up nature of the street. The development fails to protect the character of the area and would be harmful to the street scene. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011) and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012).


j) Change of use of part of existing warehousing/storage floor space to banqueting facility with ancillary storage - 6 - 8 Thames Road, Barking (Ref: 14/00464/FUL – Thames Ward)

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

1) The proposed development is contrary to the London Riverside Opportunity Area Planning Framework Supplementary Planning Guidance 2015 which seeks to change the designation of the site to housing. The granting of permission for this proposal would embed the use on the site and make the possibility of future residential development less likely to come forward thereby compromising the long-term land use aspirations for the London Riverside area.

2) The use, by virtue of its siting and location within close proximity of land which is likely to be released for housing as identified in the Mayor of London, London Riverside Opportunity Area Planning Framework (September 2015), would be inappropriate and likely to result in noise and disturbance detrimental to the living standards and amenities enjoyed by future residential occupiers, contrary to policies BR13, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

3) The application details as submitted do not accurately reflect the full range of uses currently operating on the site and therefore the Transport Assessment does not provide accurate data for events being undertaken in relation to the banqueting facility and as such a full assessment of this application cannot be made. Notwithstanding this it is likely that the banqueting hall/function suite use has resulted in significant levels of on-street car parking with the likelihood of
inconsiderate car parking causing obstruction of the public highway to the detriment of highway safety and the inconvenience of neighbouring commercial and potentially future residential occupiers contrary to Policies BR9 and BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.


73. Delegated Decisions

The Board noted details of delegated decisions for the period 22 December 2016- 20 January 2017.