Notice of Meeting

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD

Monday, 3 July 2017 - 7:00 pm
Council Chamber, Town Hall, Barking

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

Date of publication: 22 June 2017

Chris Naylor
Chief Executive

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

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

AGENDA

Use Classes and Planning Application Procedure

1. Apologies for Absence

2. Declaration of Members' Interests

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

3. Minutes - To confirm as correct the minutes of the meeting held on 8 May 2017 (Pages 7 - 29)

4. New Planning Applications

   Ward

   4. Land at the junction of Porters Avenue and Gale Street, Dagenham-16/01990/FUL (Pages 31 - 65)
5. The Short Blue, Bastable Avenue, Barking-16/02007/FUL (Pages 67 - 95) Thames

6. 79 Lodge Avenue, Dagenham- 17/00060/FUL (Pages 97 - 111) Mayesbrook

Advertisement Applications Ward

7. Town Planning Appeals (Pages 113 - 145) Alibon; Eastbrook; Eastbury; Heath; Longbridge; Whalebone

8. Delegated Decisions (Pages 147 - 178)

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

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

Private Business

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

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

**One borough; one community; London’s growth opportunity**

Our Priorities

**Encouraging civic pride**

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

**Enabling social responsibility**

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

**Growing the borough**

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

**Well run organisation**

- A digital Council, with appropriate services delivered online
- Promote equalities in the workforce and community
- Implement a smarter working programme, making best use of accommodation and IT
- Allow Members and staff to work flexibly to support the community
- Continue to manage finances efficiently, looking for ways to make savings and generate income
- Be innovative in service delivery
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Class</th>
<th>Use/Description of Development</th>
<th>Permitted Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Shops</strong></td>
<td>Shops, retail warehouses, hairdressers, undertakers, travel and ticket agencies, post offices (but not sorting offices), pet shops, sandwich bars, showrooms, domestic hire shops, dry cleaners, funeral directors and internet cafes. State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. Some temporary uses – see footnote 4. A1 plus two flats above C3 residential use - see footnote 5 Bank, building society, credit union or friendly society (A2) but not for other purposes falling within A2 – see footnote 6 A2 A3 (up to 150 m²) see footnote 9 D2 (up to 200 m²) see footnote 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Financial and professional services</strong></td>
<td>Financial services such as banks and building societies, professional services (other than health and medical services) including estate and employment agencies. A1 (where this is a ground floor display window) plus two flats above A2 plus two flats above State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. Some temporary uses – see footnote 4. C3 residential use - see footnote 5 A3 (up to 150 m²) – see footnote 9 D2 (up to 200 m²) see footnote 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Restaurants and cafés</strong></td>
<td>For the sale of food and drink for consumption on the premises - restaurants, snack bars and cafes. A1 or A2 State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. Some temporary uses – see footnote 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Drinking establishments</strong></td>
<td>Public houses, wine bars or other drinking establishments (but not night clubs). A1, A2 or A3 unless listed as an Asset of Community Value State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. Some temporary uses – see footnote 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hot food takeaways</strong></td>
<td>For the sale of hot food for consumption off the premises. A1, A2 or A3 State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. Some temporary uses – see footnote 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Business</strong></td>
<td>a) Offices, other than a use within Class A2 (Financial Services) b) Research and development of products or processes c) Light industry appropriate in a residential area B8 (where no more than 500 sqm) B1a - C3 subject to prior approval -see footnote 1. State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. State funded school or registered nursery subject to prior approval - see footnote 3 Some temporary uses – see footnote 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2</strong></td>
<td><strong>General industrial</strong></td>
<td>General industry: use for the carrying out of an industrial process other than one falling in class B1. (excluding incineration purposes, chemical treatment or landfill or hazardous waste). B1 or B8 [B8 limited to 500 sqm] State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B8</strong></td>
<td><strong>Storage and distribution</strong></td>
<td>Storage or distribution centre. This class includes open air storage. B1 (where no more than 500 sqm) State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. C3 (where no more than 500 sqm) see footnote 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hotels</strong></td>
<td>Hotel, boarding house or guesthouse, where no significant element of care is provided. (Excludes hostels). State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. State funded school or registered nursery subject to prior approval - see footnote 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Residential institutions</strong></td>
<td>Hospital, nursing home or residential school, college or training centre where they provide residential accommodation or care to people in need of care (other than those within C3 dwelling houses). State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. State funded school or registered nursery subject to prior approval - see footnote 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Secure residential institution</strong></td>
<td>Secure residential accommodation, including use as a prison, young offenders institution, detention centre, secure training centre, custody centre, short term holding centre, secure hospital, secure local authority accommodation or use as a military barracks. State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. State funded school or registered nursery subject to prior approval - see footnote 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dwelling houses</strong></td>
<td>Use as a dwelling house by a single person or by people living together as a family or by not more than 6 residents living together as a single household Article 4 direction removes permitted development right to convert to C4 House in Multiple Occupation. State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Footnotes

1. B1a (Offices) can change use to C3 (Dwelling houses) provided development commenced before 30/06/16. Need to apply to Council for prior approval to confirm no significant transport and highway impacts, contamination risks and flood risks.

2. State funded schools can open without planning permission for a single academic year without planning permission from any existing use within the Use Classes Order. School must be approved by Secretary of State and school must notify Council before they open. School must revert to its previous use at end of year. Does not apply to listed buildings.

3. B1 (business), C1 (hotel), C2 (residential institution), C2A (secured residential institution) and D2 (assembly and leisure) can convert to a state funded school or registered nursery providing early years childcare without planning permission. Need to apply to Council for prior approval to confirm no significant transport and highways impact, noise impacts and contamination risks. D2 uses that have changed use from A1 or A2 using permitted development right (see footnote 10) cannot then change use to state funded school or registered nursery under this permitted development right.

4. A1 (shops), A2 (financial and professional services), A3 (restaurants and cafes), A4 (pubs), A5 (takeaways), B1a (offices), B1b (light industry), B1c (R&D), D1 (non-residential institutions) and D2 (assembly and leisure) can change to A1, A2, A3, B1a, b & c without planning permission. Change of use must be less than or equal to 150 square metres. Applies for single continuous period of two years. Can change to other permitted use within two year period. Must revert to original use at end of two year period and notify Council before use begins.

5. A1 (shops) and A2 (financial and professional services) can change to C3 (residential). Building operations and partial demolition works that are “reasonable necessary” are also permitted. Prior approval required for transport and highways impact, contamination, flooding, the design and external appearance of the building and undesirable impacts on shopping facilities. This right only applies to buildings of 150 square metres or less and does not apply in Conservation Area or to listed buildings.

6. Does apply in Conservation Areas but not to listed buildings.

7. B8 (storage of distribution) to C3 (residential). Prior approval required for transport and highways impact, air quality impacts on intended occupiers, noise impacts of the developments, risks of contamination, flooding and the impact the changer of use would have on existing industrial uses and or storage or distribution uses. Right only applies to buildings in B8 use on or before 19 March 2015 and development must be begun before 15 April 2018. Building must have been in B8 use for four years.

8. Prior approval required for transport and highways impact, flooding, contamination and where building works are to be carried out under the permitted development right, design.

9. A1 (shops), A2 (financial and professional services) and betting offices and pay day loans to A3 (restaurants and cafes). Prior approval required for noise, smell/odours, transport and highways, hours of opening as well as siting and design in relation to extraction, ventilation, waste management, storage and undesirable impacts on shopping facilities.

10. A1 (shops) and A2 (financial and professional services) can change to D2. Applies to premises in A1 or A2 use on 5 December 2013. Prior approval required for transport and highways impact, hours of opening, noise impacts of the development and undesirable impacts on shopping facilities. Does not apply to listed buildings.
Planning Application Procedure

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Monday, 8 May 2017
(7:00 - 8:15 pm)

Present: Cllr Faraaz Shaukat (Deputy Chair in the Chair), Cllr Peter Chand,
Cllr Faruk Choudhury, Cllr Edna Fergus, Cllr Irma Freeborn, Cllr Cameron
Geddes, Cllr Syed Ghani, Cllr Kashif Haroon, Cllr Giasuddin Miah, Cllr Chris
Rice, Cllr Liam Smith, Cllr Bill Turner and Cllr Dominic Twomey

Apologies: Cllr Sanchia Alasia, Cllr Rocky Gill, Cllr Margaret Mullane and Cllr
Jeff Wade

74. Declaration of Members’ Interests

Councillor Miah declared a pecuniary interest in agenda item 8 (102 North
Street, Barking) as he is the applicant.

75. Minutes (6 March 2017)

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

76. 15 Foxlands Road, Dagenham- 17/00073/FUL

The Development Management Manager (DMM) introduced a report on the
application relating to 15 Foxlands Road, Dagenham.

The application site comprises a 2-storey detached house located on the
southern side of Foxlands Road, Dagenham. The application seeks permission
for the construction of side and rear extensions in order to convert the existing
3-bedroom house into a 1 bedroom house and a 3-bedroom house.

The proposed development includes ground floor and first floor rear extensions
and a two-storey side extension. The impact on the amenity of adjacent
properties is considered to be acceptable and the external design of the
development would be consistent with the character of the local area.

The proposed internal design is broadly consistent with Policy 3.5 (quality and
design) of the London Plan (March 2016) and each house would comply with
the applicable minimum gross internal space standards.

The proposed outdoor amenity spaces for each house are sufficiently sized to
meet the needs of future occupants and are considered consistent with Policy
BP5 (external amenity space) of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD.

The site has ‘moderate’ accessibility to public transport and Dagenham East
Station is a 3-minute walk from the site. The proposed development would not
materially impact upon on-street parking availability in the local area because
the one bedroom house would be ‘car-free’. The three-bedroom house would
be allocated one off-street car parking space.
The Chair invited David Coppleston, an objector to the application, to address the Board. He felt that the gap between his house and 15 Foxlands Road was not 3 metres but was 2.4m. There was a narrow gap of only 7 metres down the alley. If the application was agreed he would have very little light into his house, particularly in his bedroom. There had been a long history of planning applications with this property. Mr Coppleston hoped that the lack of light into his property would be considered in this matter and felt that the development would not be suitable. He asked the Board to reject the application, which he felt was causing distress and upset to residents in Foxlands Road.

The Chair invited Ann Simpson, an objector to the application, to address the Board. She was attending the Board to support Mr Coppleston and her main concern about the application was that Foxlands Road was very narrow and in particular in relation to car parking, where weekends were very bad with no enforcement. There would also be a lot of disruption with building works and concluded by stating that the application, if approved, would have a very negative effect on those residents living in Foxlands Road.

The Chair invited Amardip Dhani, the applicant, to address the Board. He referred to the officers’ report and stated that the application referred to an area that had been under-utilised for ten years. He was seeking a more efficient use for this and he stated that the application complied with all relevant planning policies. He re-iterated that the space was not 2.4 m but was 3 m for the first floor rear extension as contained in the officers report. He added that as a result of previous application refusals, plans had been suitably redesigned with larger bedrooms and bathroom. He re-iterated that the application was in line with external design standards and in accordance with all planning policies.

Members were concerned about light into Mr Coppleston’s property. In response, The DMM stated that there were no grounds for refusal and officers were satisfied that there would not be any light impediment. In addition, windows on either side were to be obscurely glazed. The application complied with all planning policies and procedures.

The Board granted planning permission subject to the following conditions:

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

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

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

   MMFR-16-EP (rev. A) dated Oct 16; and

   Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.

Reason: To ensure the development respects the appearance of the existing property and to maintain the amenity of the area in accordance with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

4) All proposed windows in the west and east elevations of the proposed dwellings must be fitted with obscure glazed windows to a minimum privacy level 3 which are not be capable of opening to an angle of more than 20 degrees. The windows must thereafter permanently be maintained as such.

Reason: To avoid overlooking of adjoining properties and in accordance with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.

5) The residential occupiers of the proposed house labelled ‘Flat 1’ on the approved plans shall not be eligible for a parking permit within any adjoining Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ).

Reason: To prevent residential occupiers of the proposed development from taking up parking spaces in adjoining CPZs which are already in high demand by existing local residents in accordance with Policies BR9 and BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

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

This item was deferred until the next meeting of the Board.

78. Becontree Heath regeneration sites: Wood Lane, Gosfield Road, Stour Road and Althorne Way, Dagenham- 16/01975/FUL

The Development Management Manager introduced a report on the application relating to Becontree Heath regeneration sites in Wood Lane, Gosfield Road, Stour Road and Althorne Way, Dagenham.

The proposed development sought to provide 170 residential units and a replacement pharmacy across 5 development parcels in Becontree Heath in an area centred on Wood Lane between the Civic Centre and the Becontree Heath Leisure Centre.

The land is owned by the Council and the applicant is Countryside Properties, with whom the Council has entered into a development partnership. The architect is Stitch Architects and Urban Designers.

Key objectives of the development are to contribute to the physical and economic regeneration of the area, to provide additional housing, and to diversify the tenure mix of the area.
The sites include vacant land at Stour Road previously occupied by a Council office, a vacant site formerly occupied by a block of flats in Althorne Way that had been demolished as part of the Council’s estate regeneration programme, the Wood Lane bus terminus and adjacent car park, and under used amenity land fronting the north side of Wood Lane and to the south of Butler Court. The bus terminus would be re-located into the public car park adjacent to the Becontree Heath Leisure Centre and replacement drivers’ facilities provided.

The development would provide 46 shared ownership flats, and 124 private for sale flats and houses. This equates to the provision of 27% sub-market housing (affordable housing). The intention is that the shared ownership housing will be owned and managed by ‘Reside’; if not, then by a reputable affordable housing provider.

A development viability appraisal had been submitted in support of the application and this had been independently assessed by the Council. The findings were that the 27% sub-market housing provision is the maximum proportion that is viable for this development. This represents a net increase in affordable housing of 14 units, taking into account the flat block that was previously demolished.

The proposed development comprised of two blocks of flats of between 4 and 6 storeys, and five terraces of 3 storey houses. The developments would front onto Wood Lane, Althorne Way, and Rainham Road North. It was considered that the flats and houses would help to define the edges of Wood Lane and create a more attractive and interesting street scene.

The architecture and urban design was considered to be of good quality, and would not detract in any way from the setting of the listed Civic Centre.

The scheme would provide a good standard of accommodation that meets the relevant policy standards for internal and external space and accessibility and makes adequate provision for parking. The development would not harm the residential amenity of the existing neighbouring residents.

The terraced houses would have 1-to-1 parking to the rear of the properties. 36-37 car parking spaces would be taken away in the Becontree Heath Leisure Centre car park to accommodate the relocation of the bus depot.

Parking Services had no objections to the application. Additional on-street parking facilities would be created, parking provision was acceptable and the site was very well served by bus routes.

The Development Management Manager mentioned the need for an additional condition that related to the timely provision of the relocated bus stand and terminus.

It was also proposed to additionally include in the Section 106 the requirement for a marketing strategy restricting the sale of more than one unit for the first six months (to help avoid buy to let). After six months, anyone buying properties for the purpose of renting will need to ensure the units are managed by an agent registered with the Association of Residential Letting Agents or the
National Association of Estate Agents and shall provide the Council with the name, address and contact details of the managing agent for its approval. It will also include a commitment to sign up to the London Rental Standard or equivalent standards. The GLA have also requested that a review mechanism is included to ensure that any uplift in value is captured for additional affordable housing.

Members were concerned about potential traffic issues which might arise as a result of the application. Currently there are barriers installed on Wood Lane which prevent traffic travelling eastwards turning right onto Althorne Way, and similarly traffic turning right out of Althorne Way onto Wood Lane. Members raised the point that buses may need to make both these manoeuvres to access the new terminus on Althorne Way. The Regeneration Officer responded that TfL have confirmed that it requires the ability to make both of these bus movements and that this would be a condition of their relocation to the new terminus. The junction in questions falls outside the applicant’s development boundary, however, the Council has agreed to remove the existing barrier and replace it with ‘Bus Only’ right-hand turn markings on Wood Lane and Althorne Way. A yellow box junction and an enforcement camera would also be installed to prevent other vehicles from making these same movements.

Members were concerned about the lack of affordable housing and it was noted that the former social rent flats in Althorne Way would be replaced with shared ownership units. The Development Management Manager highlighted that the scheme would create a net increase of 14 additional affordable units and that one of the aims of the council’s development brief was to diverse the housing tenure offer in Heath Ward, with 43% of properties in the ward social rent and just 0.8% shared ownership.

Members were concerned that some of the flats were to be built close to a busy road that there was a need to ensure theses were protected from noise in this busy location. Members were also concerned about private sale properties. They enquired whether the Council could legally enforce ‘non-buy to let.’ The Development Management Manager confirmed that for a six-month period, no one would be able buy more than one unit. The Managing Agents must be vetted through the Council and officers were doing as much as they could to regulate this matter. The Acting Head of Regeneration and Planning (Planning) added that the S106 required the Council to approve the managing agent. Mahbub Khandoker from Countryside Properties, explained that their primary target market for this scheme was families and first-time buyers benefitting from the ‘Help to Buy’ programme who intended to live in the properties.

Members were concerned that the applicant has not completed a “flood plan” which had been requested. In terms of the flood risk, Mahbub Khandoker from Countryside Properties stated that work had already been done on this and that the site was not in an area at high risk from flooding.

Members referred to the proposed new bus terminus and whether public toilets could also be installed. The Regeneration Officer stated that this was a valid point, but realistically TfL would not want the management and maintenance responsibilities for public toilets on its site and that the busy leisure centre car park might not be the best location for such a facility given the high volume of
car and bus movements in the area.

Members were keen to look at the siting of the blocks near Wood Lane again. Sally Lewis from Stitch Architects responded that all of the flats have a dual aspect to the courtyard and homes have dual aspect so residents would have an outlook away from the busy road.

Members asked whether bollards and railings could be added to make the road and pavement area safer. Sally Lewis said that this could be looked at but this may not be necessary. David Archibald, Transport Consultant (RPS) added that the scheme did not alter pedestrian movement nor did it reduce or make any changes to the width of the existing footway and therefore was not considered necessary. The Acting Head of Regeneration and Planning (Planning) added that officers could look at the need for some form of protection to pedestrians at the Wood Lane/Althorne Way junction as part of a wider transport review planned in Heath Ward, but that current thinking is to remove street furniture where possible to reduce clutter.

It was also noted that the applicant would be subject to a Section 106 Agreement to secure the following planning obligations:

S106 Legal Fees

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

The Board granted planning permission subject to any direction by the Mayor of London; the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement securing the shared ownership sub-market housing, the marketing strategy, the need to undertake a review of development viability and a local labour and business agreement and the following conditions (subject to any minor amendments or GLA additions):

Time limit

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

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

Plan numbers

2. Subject to any variation pursuant to condition no. 4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

P-001; P-002; P-030; P-040; P-041; P-AB210B; P-AB-211; P-AB-215; P-AB-219; P-AB-220B; P-AB-220B; P-AB-221; P-AB-222; P-AB-223; P-AB-224; P-AB-225; P-AB-226B; P-AB-227; P-AB-250; P-EF-210B; P-EF-211; P-EF-214; P-EF-215; P-EF-219; P-EF-220B; P-EF-221B; P-EF-222; P-EF-223; P-EF-250; P-TA-311; P-TA-312; P-TA-213; P-TB-310; P-TB-311; P-T-320; P-T-321; P-T-322; P-T-330; P-TAB-350; P-410; 6477_LD_ PLN_002D; 6477_LD_ PLN_003B; 6477_LD_ PLN_004C.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Energy Strategy

3. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Energy Report ref. HLES35971/003Rv5 and shall achieve a minimum total regulated carbon dioxide emissions reduction of 37% over 2013 Building Regulations and a minimum regulated carbon dioxide emissions reduction through the use of on-site renewables of 27% over 2013 Building Regulations.

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

Energy if no DHN completion

4. Notwithstanding condition nos. 2 and 3 in the event that the proposed Becontree Heath District Heat Network (DHN) is not complete to the stage where the approved development can be connected to the DHN (in accordance with the approved energy strategy) prior to first occupation of any residential unit hereby approved, temporary energy plant units within Block A/B and Block E/F as shown on drawing nos. P-AB-210A; P-AB-220A; P-AB-226A; P-EF-210A; P-EF-220A; P-EF-221A; 6477_LD_PLN_022A; 6477_LD_PLN_024B shall be fully implemented in order to meet the energy needs of the development in accordance with the energy strategy.

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

Energy post DHN completion

5. Within 1 month of the DHN becoming operational, a programme for the implementation of approved plans P-AB-210B; P-AB-220B; P-AB-226B; P-EF-210B; P-EF-220B; P-EF-221B; P-410;6477_LD_PLN_002D; PLN_003B; 6477_LD_PLN_004C for the removal of the plant rooms and conversion to two wheelchair units shall be submitted to and approved by the Council. The scheme shall be delivered in accordance with the approved programme.

Reason: To ensure compliance with the proposed energy strategy and to maximise the number of residential units provided in accordance with Policies 3.4 and 5.2 of the London Plan and Policy BR2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

Levels

6. No development within any Phase (Phasing consistent with section 7.4 of the submitted Design and Access Statement or any subsequent update agreed) shall take place until details of existing and finished site levels, finished floor, and ridge levels of the buildings to be erected, and finished external surface levels for that Phase have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: The proposed levels of the development are required prior to commencement in order to ensure that any works in connection with the development hereby permitted respect the height of adjacent properties and in accordance with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

Materials

7. No development above ground level within any Phase (Phasing consistent with section 7.4 of the submitted Design and Access Statement or any subsequent update agreed) shall take place until details/samples of all materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of that Phase of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved materials.

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

Boundary details

8. No development above ground level within any Phase (Phasing consistent with section 7.4 of the submitted Design and Access Statement or any subsequent update agreed) shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the position, design, materials, and type of boundary treatment to be erected for that Phase. Garden fences shall incorporate a 150mm gap at the bottom to allow the passage of hedgehogs. No part of the development shall be occupied until the approved boundary treatment for that part has been provided. The approved boundary treatment shall be retained unless the Local Planning Authority gives prior written approval for its removal.

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

Hard landscaping

9. No development above ground level within any Phase (Phasing consistent with section 7.4 of the submitted Design and Access Statement or any subsequent update agreed) shall take place until a scheme showing those areas of that Phase to be hard landscaped and the details of that hard landscaping has 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 relevant Phase and thereafter permanently retained.

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

Soft landscaping
10. No development above ground level within any Phase (Phasing consistent with section 7.4 of the submitted Design and Access Statement or any subsequent update agreed) shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping for that Phase which shall give special consideration to planting that absorbs or suppresses pollutants; and which shall make provision for the planting of street trees where feasible to be secured under condition no. 37, and which shall include indications of all existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows on the site and details of those to be retained.

Reason: To safeguard and improve the appearance of the area and to contribute to improved air quality and in accordance with policies BR14 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Soft landscaping implementation

11. The landscaping scheme for each Phase (Phasing consistent with section 7.4 of the submitted Design and Access Statement or any subsequent update agreed) as approved in accordance with condition No. 6 shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation or completion of the relevant Phase, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

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

Nesting bird protection

12. Where development is to commence within a Phase between the months of March to September inclusive a nesting bird survey of any trees or shrubs that are to be removed within that Phase in association with the planning permission shall be carried out by a suitably qualified ecologist no more than 2 days prior to the works to carry out the tree or shrub removal in question. The results of the survey should be submitted to the Local Planning Authority before works within the relevant Phase commence. If nesting birds are found i) works should be delayed until the nesting season is over and the fledglings have left the area and ii) a strategy should be agreed with the Local Planning Authority to ensure the nesting birds are not disturbed by any other works taking place on the site.

Reason: The survey is required to protect the ecology of the area as nesting birds may be present on the site and in accordance with policy CR2 of the Core Strategy, policy BR3 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 7.19 of the London Plan.

Refuse enclosures
13. The refuse enclosures indicated on the approved drawings shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of the part of the development they serve and thereafter permanently retained for the use of the occupiers of the premises.

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

Crime Prevention

14. No development above ground level within any Phase (Phasing consistent with section 7.4 of the submitted Design and Access Statement or any subsequent update agreed) shall take place until a scheme showing the provisions to be made for CCTV coverage, access control, and/or any other measures to reduce the risk of crime for that Phase, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The relevant Phase of the development shall not be occupied until the approved scheme for that Phase has been implemented. Thereafter the approved measures shall be permanently retained unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

M4(2)

15. 90% of the dwellings hereby approved shall comply with Building Regulations Optional Requirement Approved Document M4(2) Category 2: Accessible and adaptable dwellings (2015 edition). Evidence of compliance shall be notified to the building control body appointed for the development in the appropriate Full Plans Application, or Building Notice, or Initial Notice to enable the building control body to check compliance.

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

M4(3)

16. The 17 wheelchair units identified on the approved drawings shall be constructed to, or capable of easy adaptation to, Building Regulations Optional Requirement Approved Document M4(3) Category 3: (Wheelchair user dwellings) (2015 edition). Evidence of compliance shall be notified to the building control body appointed for the development in the appropriate Full Plans Application, or Building Notice, or Initial Notice to enable the building control body to check compliance.

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

17. The car parking spaces indicated on Drawing Nos. 6477_LD_PLN_002D; 6477_LD_PLN_003B; 6477_LD_PLN_004C shall be constructed and marked out prior to the occupation of the part of the development served, and shall include Electric Vehicle Charging Point bays (20% active and 20% passive) to be located in accordance with details that shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The parking spaces and charging points shall be retained permanently for the use of occupiers and visitors to the development and not used for any other purposes.

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

Car parking allocation/management

18. No above ground development shall take place until the submission to and approval by the Local Planning Authority of a car parking management and allocation strategy for the development that shall secure the provision of allocated wheelchair accessible parking bays for the use of any initial or future registered disabled occupiers of the development.

Reason: In order to make optimum use of the parking spaces provided and to ensure and promote easier access for disabled persons to the development in accordance with policies BR9 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 6.13 of the London Plan.

Cycle parking

19. Cycle parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of the part of the development they serve and thereafter shall be maintained for the use of residents and visitors to the site.

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

BREEAM

20. The part of Block A that will accommodate the hereby permitted (Use Class A1) pharmacy shall be constructed in accordance with the submitted BREEAM pre-assessment report (ref. HLES35971/004Rv3) and shall achieve a minimum BREEAM rating of 'Very Good'.

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

SUDS
21. The development shall not commence until the submission to and approval by the Local Planning Authority of a drainage strategy for the site designed to minimise the rate of surface water run-off, that shall encompass the following:

- Soakaway test
- Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)
- Micro-drainage output
- Details on storage tank

Reason: Details are required prior to commencement in order to minimise surface water drainage in the interest of reducing flood risk and in accordance with policies BR14 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 5.13 of the London Plan.

**Noise**

22. A scheme of noise mitigation measures in accordance with the report “Noise Assessment for Proposed Residential Development at Becontree Heath, Wood Lane, Dagenham, for Countryside Properties (UK) Limited”, reference JAE8716, dated 12th December 2016 is to be implemented before the first occupation of that part of the development to which it relates.

Reason: To maintain reasonable levels of protection for the occupiers of the development from external noise and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

**Plant noise**

23. The combined rating level of the noise from any plant installed pursuant to the hereby permitted development shall not exceed the existing background noise level outside the window to any noise sensitive room. Any assessment of compliance with this condition shall be made according to the methodology and procedures presented in BS4142:2014.

Reason: To maintain reasonable levels of protection for the occupiers of the development from external noise and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

**Lighting**

24. The lighting of the development hereby permitted, is to be designed, installed, and maintained so as to fully comply with The Association of Chief Police Officers - Secured by Design publication “Lighting Against Crime – A Guide for Crime Reduction Professionals”, ACPO SPD, January 2011. The design shall satisfy criteria to limit obtrusive light presented in Table 1, p25 of the guide, relating to Environmental Zone E3 – Medium district brightness areas - small town centre or urban locations.

Reason: In the interests of crime prevention and the amenity of future occupiers and in accordance with policies BC7 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

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

(a) a survey of the extent, scale, and nature of contamination;
(b) an assessment of the potential risks to:
   i. human health,
   ii. property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines, and pipes,
   iii. adjoining land,
   iv. groundwaters and surface waters,
   v. ecological systems,
   vi. archaeological sites and ancient monuments;
(c) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).
(d) This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency’s ‘Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11’.

Contamination b.

26. A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include 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.

Contamination c.

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

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

Contamination d.

28. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the
approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of condition 25, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of condition 26, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

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

Reason for Conditions 25 to 28: 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.

Construction hours

29. No deliveries, external running of plant and equipment or construction works, other than internal works not audible outside the site boundary, shall take place on the site other than between the hours of 0800 to 1800 on Monday to Friday and 0800 to 1300 on Saturday and not at all on Sundays, Public or Bank Holidays 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, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

Noise/ vibration control

30. Demolition and construction work and associated activities are to be carried out in accordance with the recommendations contained within British Standard 5228:2009, “Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites”. Parts 1 and 2.

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

Construction Management Plan

31. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted ‘Becontree Heath Construction Method Statement and Construction Management Plan Rev. C’ and piling will be way of a Continuous Flight Auger, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: 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.

**Construction Logistics Plan**

32. Prior to the commencement of the development a Construction Logistics Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall be designed to minimise deliveries of materials and export of any waste materials within the times of peak traffic congestion on the local road network. The Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained.

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

**Satellite dish restrictions**

33. With the exception of any roof mounted antennae or satellite dish designed for communal use by the occupiers of each development block, no antennae or satellite dishes shall be placed on any elevation of the hereby approved flat blocks, or on the front elevation of any of the hereby approved houses, unless previously approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the external appearance of the buildings in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

**Bird and bat boxes**

34. The development shall not be occupied until bird nesting and bat roosting boxes have been installed on the building or in any trees on the site in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall accord with the advice set out in "Biodiversity for Low and Zero Carbon Buildings: A Technical Guide for New Build" (Published by RIBA, March 2010) or similar advice from the RSPB and the Bat Conservation Trust.

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

**Travel Plan**

35. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted RPS Draft Residential Travel Plan.

Reason: In order to encourage the use of sustainable transport and in

Highways Agreement

36. No above ground works shall commence until the completion of a highways agreement for the development that secures the replacement on street car parking in front of Blocks G1 and G2 (as shown on drawing no. 6477_LD-PLN_022 Rev. D) and suitable vehicular access to each development parcel, and which subject to feasibility makes provision for the planting of street trees within the vicinity of the development. Each part of the approved scheme shall be completed prior to the occupation of the part of the development it serves.

Reason: To ensure the provision of a satisfactory access and parking in the interests of highway safety, and to make provision for the planting of specimen trees with growth potential and in accordance with policies BR3 and BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

Althorne Way parking bays

37. Block G2 of the development shall not be occupied until the completion of the on street car parking bays shown on drawing no. 6477_LD-PLN_022 Rev. D.

Reason: In order to secure the above works and to ensure adequate parking provision to serve the needs of the development and to address likely additional demand for on street parking resulting from the development and in accordance with policy BR9 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

Bus Stand and Terminus

38. The development of Blocks A and B of the hereby approved development (as shown on drawing no. P-030) shall not commence until the replacement bus terminus and associated drivers’ facilities as shown on drawing nos. P-410 and 6477-LD-PLN-022 Rev. A have been constructed and are ready or occupation.

Reason: The replacement facilities are required before construction takes place on the site of the existing bus terminus in order to ensure the continuation of adequate transport facilities and to prevent road congestion, and in accordance with policy BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

79. 539 Rainham Road South, Dagenham- 17/00274/FUL

The Development Management Manager introduced a report on the application relating to 539 Rainham Road South, Dagenham.

The application site is a community/cultural centre/place of worship operating at the former Post Office along Rainham Road South.

The application site has a very detailed planning history relating to applications
for changes of use to various community/cultural centre/place of worship type
uses (Use Class D1). Of most relevance, in July 2015, planning permission
was refused for the change of use of the ground floor of the application site to a
community/cultural centre/place of worship (Use Class D1) (Ref:
15/00472/FUL). The decision was appealed to the Planning Inspectorate who
subsequently allowed the appeal in July 2016 and granted planning permission
(Ref: APP/Z5060/W/16/3143341) subject to a number of conditions. Condition
3 of the planning permission stated that:

“The use hereby permitted shall not take place other than between the hours of
09.00 to 23:00, Monday to Sunday”.

This application sought to vary that condition to amend the hours to allow
extended use until 00:45 during the month of Ramadan for those years when
devotions cannot be completed in time due to a later sunset (for up to 29
consecutive days a year). Essentially, this means that there would be
extended evening hours until 00:45 for up to 29 consecutive days once a year.
The applicant advises that due to the nature of the timing of Ramadan, which
shifts by around 10 days each year, this application will only effect the use
when Ramadan occurs during peak summer months which are in the region of
a few years during any 36-year cycle.

It was noted that the centre is now open and had operated without complaint.
The applicant advised that there have been changes to the management of the
centre along with the introduction of new highway controls (in the form of
double yellow lines) along Reede Road at the junction with Rainham Road
South.

This application solely focussed on the extended hours of opening. The
applicant has advised that at the busiest times (typically Friday lunchtimes), the
centre caters for up to 60 people (the total membership is less than 100).
However, the applicant has confirmed they are willing to cap this figure at 40
people during the proposed extended hours. In addition, the applicant will
install CCTV to monitor member numbers and will keep a record of those
members who need to travel to the centre by car (such as the elderly or
disabled). The applicant has also advised that they are willing to accept a
temporary planning permission of 3 months to trial the impact of the proposed
extended hours.

Mr Bateman, on behalf of the applicant, advised that there would be no more
than forty attending at any one time. He stated that the applicant would be
preparing a list of those declaring their intention to join the late evening
readings during Ramadan, over the next week or two, with the intention of
allowing only those that have effectively 'pre-booked' with them to attend

Members asked how the number of forty attendees could be capped. Mr
Bateman advised that those attending would have pre-booked already and
there was also CCTV at the front and back of the premises and they accepted
the temporary conditions which would expire at the end of June 2017.

Subject to the conditions identified above, it was recommended that the
extended hours be approved for a temporary period expiring at the end of June
after Ramadan has finished to allow a trial period to assess the impact of the
extended hours.

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

1) The extended hours until 00:45 hereby permitted shall be discontinued on or before 30 June 2017.

Reason: To give the use a trial run, so as to assess its effect on amenity and in accordance with Policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

2) The use hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 539 Rainham Road South, RM10 7XJ Proposed Ground Floor Plan Drafted 04/2012; 539 Rainham Road South, RM10 7XJ Proposed First Floor Plan Drafted 04/2012 and 539 Rainham Road South, RM10 7XJ Proposed Top Floor Plan Drafted 04/2012.

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

3) Following expiration of the extended hours period, the use hereby permitted shall not take place other than between the hours of 09.00 to 23:00, Monday to Sunday.

Reason: To prevent the use causing any undue disturbance to occupants of neighbouring properties at unreasonable hours and in accordance with Policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

4) No music or amplified sound shall be played in the premises hereby permitted at any time.

Reason: To prevent the use causing any undue disturbance to occupants of neighbouring properties at unreasonable hours and in accordance with Policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

5) Access and egress to the premises must only be taken from the main shop frontage along Rainham Road South. No access or egress shall be taken from Reede Road.

Reason: To prevent the use causing any undue disturbance to occupants of neighbouring properties at unreasonable hours and in accordance with Policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

6) The applicant shall ensure that CCTV records of numbers of members using the centre and vehicular trip generation associated with the extended hours shall be kept as may be required to permit the Local Planning Authority to monitor membership levels and vehicular movements. Those records shall be made available to the Local Planning Authority on request.

Reason: To prevent the use causing any undue disturbance to occupants of neighbouring properties at unreasonable hours and in order to minimise the impact of the development on the local highway network and traffic congestion in accordance with Policies BP8 and BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).
7) The maximum number of people using the centre during the extended hours hereby permitted shall not exceed 40.

Reason: To prevent the use causing any undue disturbance to occupants of neighbouring properties at unreasonable hours and in accordance with Policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

80. 102 North Street, Barking- 17/00176/FUL

As he had declared a pecuniary interest as the applicant, Councillor Miah left the meeting during consideration of this item.

The Development Management Manager introduced a report on the application relating to 102 North Street, Barking.

The application site is a 2-storey detached building located on the eastern side of North Street, Barking. The application seeks permission for a proposed change of use from office accommodation (Class B1) to a tuition centre (Class D1).

The proposed tuition centre will offer private tuition to students from age 5 years to 18 years (Year 1 to A Level). It is stated that the centre would offer 8 hours free education per month to students. The proposed facility also seeks to offer free online assessment tests for Year 2 and Year 6 SAT exam practice, and learning material for GCSE and A Level exam practice. The opening hours will be between 9.00am – 9.00pm Monday to Sunday. No car parking is provided within the site for staff or visitors.

The building has been vacant since 2015 and previously comprised the constituency office for Margaret Hodge. The premises are small providing a gross internal floor space of approximately 82sqm. Such a small office has only limited commercial appeal. It is considered that the proposed development would contribute to the wider regeneration initiatives of the Borough by providing social infrastructure, addressing qualification levels and providing accessible education opportunities for local young people.

The application site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 6a on a scale of 1-6 (where 6 is excellent). The premises are located within close proximity to Barking Town Centre and within easy reach of bus and tube networks. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be suitably sited for access by foot, bicycle or public transport. As such the lack of car parking for staff and visitors is considered to be acceptable.

The proposed development would result in a beneficial community facility that will contribute towards educating young people ultimately helping them into jobs and reducing unemployment rates. The beneficial nature of the development for the local community is considered to outweigh the loss of office space in this case.

Members queried whether the site would be better incorporated into the adjacent school but officers were not aware that the school had expressed an
interest in the site and that they could only deal with the application put before them.

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

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

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

2) The premises shall be used as a tuition centre; and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class D1; of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order).

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

81. **Town Planning Appeals**

The Board noted details of the following appeals:

**Appeals Lodged**

The following appeals have been lodged:

a) **Conversion of outbuilding into two bedroom bungalow (retrospective)** – Annexe to 1 Gay Gardens, Dagenham (Ref: 16/01306/FUL)

   Application refused under delegated powers 13 October 2016 – Eastbrook Ward.

b) **Erection of single storey detached dwelling - Land To Rear Of 82 Saville Road, Chadwell Heath** (Ref: 16/00948/FUL)

   Application refused under delegated powers 8 September 2016 – Whalebone Ward.

c) **Change of use from production and storage of cullet to production and storage of secondary aggregates - Land adjoining Gulf House Lane, Perry Road, Dagenham** (Ref:16/01295/CTY)

   Application refused under delegated powers 17 November 2016 – River Ward.
d) Erection of first floor side/rear extension – 45 Clare Gardens, Barking (Ref: 16/01717/FUL)

Application refused under delegated powers 23 January 2017 – Longbridge Ward.

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

Application refused under delegated powers 8 September 2016 – Whalebone Ward.

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


Appeals Determined

The following appeal has been determined by the Planning Inspectorate:

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 – Longbridge Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 4 October 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 and would have a gable end roof which is out of character with the prevailing roof design in the area and would therefore fail to maintain 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).

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal allowed 14 March 2017

b) Enforcement appeal – Change of use of single dwellinghouse to house in multiple occupation – 79 Oulton Crescent, Barking (Longbridge Ward)


c) Erection of two bedroom bungalow in garden – 44 Rugby Gardens, Dagenham (Ref: 16/00727/FUL – Mayesbrook Ward)
Application refused under delegated powers 19 August 2016 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed bungalow would be out of scale and character with the surrounding development, with a cramped and awkward siting, that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the rear garden environment and street scene, and would create a narrow and oppressive approach to the front doors of the adjacent maisonettes and could create a precedent for future similar developments, contrary to policy CM1 of the Core Strategy, and policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD.

2. Due to inadequate gross internal area, a lack of storage space and inadequate door widths the proposed bungalow would not provide an acceptable standard of accommodation contrary to the requirements of policies 3.5 and 3.8 of the Minor Alterations to the London Plan.

3. The proposed dwelling would provide no off street parking and would contribute to existing high levels of on street parking demand within Rugby Gardens, that has the potential to harm the amenities of existing residents and be harmful to highway safety, contrary to policies BR9 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD.


d) 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 – Alibon Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 22 August 2016 for the following reason:

1. The proposed extension would have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers by virtue of its excessive depth which would result in a loss of light and outlook and would be detrimental to the amenities of and living standards enjoyed by adjoining occupiers at No.31 Standfield Road contrary to Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Polices DPD and the guidance within the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.


e) Enforcement appeal – Erection of single storey side extension – 12 Felhurst Crescent, Dagenham (Eastbrook Ward)

f) Enforcement appeal – Conversion of single dwelling into 2 flats – 19 Temple Avenue, Dagenham (Whalebone Ward)


g) Enforcement appeals – Change of use of single dwelling to house in multiple occupation – 21 Somerby Road, Barking (Abbey Ward)


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

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

1. The proposed development, by reason of its design and appearance, would result in an intrusive and dominant addition to the street scene, harmful to the character of the area and visual amenities of existing residential occupiers and contrary to Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy (July 2010) and Policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

2. The proposed development would, by reason of its siting and proximity to residential properties in Durham Road, result in a loss of outlook, harmful to the living standards and visual amenities of existing and future occupiers of Durham Road and contrary to Policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

3. The proposed energy strategy fails to achieve sufficient carbon dioxide emissions savings contrary to the Mayor’s Energy Hierarchy and Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (March 2016).


82. Delegated Decisions

The Board noted details of delegated decisions for the period 23 January-24 February 2017.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barking and Dagenham Council Development Control Board</th>
<th>Date: 3 July 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>16/01990/FUL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ward:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mayesbrook</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for Referral to DCB as set out in Part 2, Chapter 9 of the Council Constitution:</strong></td>
<td>10 letters objecting to the proposed development have been received and the application is recommended for approval. The proposed building also comprises inappropriate development on Metropolitan Open Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address:</strong></td>
<td>Land at the junction of Porters Avenue and Gale Street, Dagenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development:</strong></td>
<td>Erection of two storey Youth Zone facility including sports hall, skate park, floodlit kick pitch, service yard, plant, minibus and blue badge parking and associated landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>Onside Youth Zones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Summary:** | The application site is located in Parsloes Park on land at the junction of Porters Avenue and Gale Street, Dagenham. The site is bounded to the west by Gale Street and to the north by Porters Avenue. Parsloes Park is designated as ‘Metropolitan Open Land’ (MOL).

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

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

OnSide Youth Zones is a registered charity providing young people with access to a wide range of sports and learning activities to encourage social interaction and youth development in a safe and positive way. Youth Zones operate 365 days a year outside of school hours. During term time, the facility is likely to be open Monday-Friday 3.30/4.00pm to 10pm, during school holidays, Monday to Friday 8am to 10pm and at weekends 9am to 10pm. The Youth Zone will cater for young people aged 8-19 (or up to 25 years for those with a disability).

The proposed development has the potential to address obesity and poor health of young people living in the Borough which is currently a priority issue for the Council. Similarly, the unemployment and low skill levels of young residents could also be addressed by the Youth Zone Employability Programmes which are targeted towards the needs of young people.

The sports hall wraps around the Porters Avenue and park elevations and would be the highest part of the building at 9.65 metres. The external kick pitch and skate park are located on the south east park side of the building, a 2.6m high natural stone wall will mask the skate park, whilst a 4 metre high fence would surround the kick pitch.
The proposed materials and external finishes are sympathetic to the location and suitably respond to the local context, with timber cladding responding to the park and a glazed facade responding to the street frontage.

In addition to the retention of existing trees, the development will be integrated into the park with sloping mounds on the north and east sides, planted with additional trees alongside a wildflower meadow wrapped around the building.

The kick pitch would be located 70 metres away from the nearest residential property and the skate park 45 metres away which is considered to be sufficient separation to avoid noise adversely affecting residential amenity. The external lighting design has been specified in order to minimise the impact on the amenity of local residents and the potential impact on local wildlife.

No car parking is provided within the site for staff or visitors. There will be on-site parking for one minibus and one blue badge space for staff use located in the service yard area, and one blue badge space for visitors which will be accessed from a proposed service access fronting Gale Street. 16 Cycle parking spaces will be provided with a further 12 cycle spaces for staff.

The proposed development lies within metropolitan open land (MOL) and therefore is subject to the same policies as would apply within the green belt. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that such development is ‘inappropriate’ by definition. The guidance states that such inappropriate development should be refused unless there are very special circumstances that clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm caused by the proposed development.

The land to be occupied by the proposed Youth Zone equates to 0.65 of a hectare. Parsloes Park is one of eight strategic parks in the borough and the overall size of the park is 58 hectares. The land to be occupied by the proposed Youth Zone equates to just (1.1%) of the park. It is envisaged that the siting of the facility on a prominent corner at the junction with well-used streets will attract users who will be also be encouraged to take advantage of the adjacent open space.

The proposal will have an impact on MOL openness because of its size, however, a significant part of the site will be occupied by outdoor facilities that would generally be acceptable in a park/public open space setting.

Although located on a visible corner, the presence of Porters Avenue Health Centre opposite the site on the north west side provides an urban context for the building. Distant views across the park from the north and east are respected by positioning the main mass of the development opposite existing built form. The site is edged on both streets by mature and semi mature parkland trees which will be retained to provide an effective screen.

The successful operation of Onside’s existing Youth Zones is based on the core principles of neutrality, accessibility, and prominence. Parsloes Park is located in the centre of the borough and therefore represents neutral ground for young people using the facility. Alternative development sites considered were not as accessible as Parsloes Park with low public transport accessibility levels or situated to the south of the A13 restricting access for communities to the north.
The chosen site occupies an underutilised area of the park, the development would not result in the loss of sports playing fields or displace existing park activity. Officers consider that the proposal would result in a high quality well designed facility and surrounding environment.

In conclusion, it is considered that any impact on the openness of the MOL is outweighed by the nature and scale of the positive benefits which would be delivered to users of the facility, with the potential to make an important contribution to the health, well-being and employment prospects of young people in the local community together with an associated fall in anti-social behaviour.

For the reasons above, and expanded upon below, it is considered that ‘very special circumstances’ have been demonstrated which outweigh the harm to the openness of the MOL and justify the proposed development.

**Recommendation:**

That planning permission be granted subject to any direction from the Mayor of London and/or the Secretary of State, and the conditions listed in this report (with any amendments that might be necessary up to the issue of the decision, including any other conditions that may be required as a result of referral to the Mayor of London and the Secretary of State).

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

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

3) No development above ground level shall take place until details/samples of all materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved materials.
   
   **Reason:** To protect or enhance the character and amenity of the area in accordance with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

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

   **Reason:** To safeguard and improve the appearance of the area in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>The landscaping scheme as approved in accordance with condition No 4 shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the building or completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason:</td>
<td>To secure the provision and retention of the landscaping in the interests of the visual amenity of the area in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>No development above ground level shall take place until a scheme showing those areas to be hard landscaped, including all skate park ramps, and the details of that hard landscaping have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The scheme as approve shall be carried out prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter permanently retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason:</td>
<td>To safeguard and improve the appearance of the area and to provide safe movement throughout the site in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>No development above ground level shall take place 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 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason:</td>
<td>In the interests of enhancing security and safety, to avoid light pollution and safeguard neighbouring amenity and in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>No development above ground level shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the position, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The approved boundary treatment shall be retained unless the Local Planning Authority gives prior written approval for its removal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason:</td>
<td>To ensure the boundary treatment protects or enhances the character and amenity of the area in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>No external construction works, deliveries, external running of plant and equipment or internal works audible outside the site boundary shall take place on the site other than between the hours of 0800 to 1800 on Monday to Friday and 0800 to 1300 on Saturday and not at all on Sundays, Public or Bank Holidays without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason:</td>
<td>To ensure that the proposed construction work does not cause undue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
nuisance and disturbance to neighbouring properties at unreasonable hours and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

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

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

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

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

*WAN Without activity noise

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

12) The combined rating level of the noise from any plant installed pursuant to this permission shall not exceed the existing background noise level outside the window to any noise sensitive room. Any assessment of compliance with this condition shall be made according to the methodology and procedures presented in BS4142:2014.

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

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

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

14) Demolition and construction work and associated activities are to be carried out in accordance with the recommendations contained within British Standard 5228:2009, “Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites”. Parts 1 and 2.
Reason: To ensure that the proposed construction work does not cause undue nuisance and disturbance to neighbouring properties at unreasonable hours and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

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

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

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

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

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

17) The building shall not be occupied by users except between 0800 and 2200 Monday to Friday, and 0900 and 2200 at weekends.
Reason: To protect the amenities of neighbouring residents in accordance with policies BR13 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

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

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

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

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

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

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

20) The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a Travel Plan for the site which shall include proposals for minimising car-borne travel and encouraging walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The Travel Plan shall include details of funding, implementation, monitoring and review. The approved Travel Plan shall be implemented and monitored in accordance with the approved scheme.

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

21) Prior to the commencement of the permitted use a Delivery and Servicing Plan to incorporate details of deliveries to the site, including size of vehicle, routing of deliveries, and times of deliveries shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall be adhered to thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In order to minimise the impact of the development on the local highway network and traffic congestion and in accordance with policy BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document

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

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

23) No above ground new development shall take place until details of the surface of the sports hall and kick pitch have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development thereby permitted shall not be constructed other than in accordance with the approved details.

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

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


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

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

26) The development hereby permitted shall achieve as a minimum a 35% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions over Part L of the Building Regulations (2013).
Reason: To ensure compliance with the proposed energy strategy in accordance with Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (March 2015) and Policy BR2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

27) No above ground development shall take place until full details including annotated plans of the photo voltaic panels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The renewable energy technologies shall be installed in accordance with the approved detail and thereafter permanently retained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Title: Development Management Officer</th>
<th>Contact Details: Tel: 020 8227 3067 E-mail: <a href="mailto:Ian.Drew@lbld.gov.uk">Ian.Drew@lbld.gov.uk</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. **Introduction and Description of Development**

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

1.2 On the north-west side of Porters Avenue is a 3-storey health centre with ancillary offices at 230-234 Porters Avenue. On the west side of Gale Street are 2-storey semi-detached residential dwellings which form part of the Becontree Estate. The site is within 700 metres of Becontree Station and is well served by bus routes via Gale Street and Porters Avenue.

1.3 The site is generally level. To the east of the site is the Squatts local nature reserve (approximately 140 metres away from the skate park/kick pitch).

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

1.5 OnSide Youth Zones is a registered charity which aims to build a network of 21st Century youth clubs, giving young people, safe, affordable and inspiring places to go in their leisure time. OnSide Youth Zones are designed to provide young people with access to a wide range of sports and learning activities to encourage social interaction and youth development in a safe and positive way. There are currently 10 OnSide Youth Zones in operation in the UK, if approved this would be the first facility of its kind to operate in London.

1.6 Youth Zones operate 365 days a year outside of school hours. During term time, the facility is likely to be open Monday-Friday 3.30/4.00pm to 10pm, during school holidays, Monday to Friday 8am to 10pm and at weekends 9am to 10pm. The Youth Zone will cater for young people aged 8-19 (or up to 25 years for those with a disability). Users will pay a joining fee of £5 and then 50p per visit. A subsidised hot
meal is also provided each day with the kitchens providing members with a chance to learn how to cook their own food.

1.7 Typically a Youth Zone offers a minimum of 20 different activities that include; a 4-court sports hall, climbing wall, fitness gym, performing arts studio, music suite, boxing gym, art and craft rooms, media suite, café, and an outdoor kick pitch. Employability/skills workshops are also provided.

1.8 The funding strategy is based on Council owned land being leased to OnSide for a nominal rent. The council is investing £3m towards the development costs, the Queen’s Trust is investing £2.1m and the Jack Petchey Foundation investing £1.5m.

2. Background

2.1 The site has been identified as a suitable location for a youth facility in the Arup Parsloes Park Masterplan (March 2016). The LBBD Parks and Open Spaces Strategy (including the Arup Masterplan) is scheduled to be adopted by Cabinet on 11 July 2017.

2.2 The Parsloes Park Masterplan was commissioned by LBBD in response to new funding opportunities which present an opportunity to re-imagine and reinvigorate the park in a financially sustainable way. Reviving Parsloes Park has the potential to address a number of the borough’s challenges including improving health and wellbeing, inclusive access and recreation, active and sustainable travel, adapting to climate change, and conserving and enhancing its biodiversity and heritage. Importantly the regeneration of the park also has the potential to deliver upon the three key aspects of the borough’s strategic vision and priorities which are: Encouraging civic pride, enabling social responsibility and growing the borough.

3. Consultations

3.1 250 neighbouring occupiers were consulted. 6 site notices were displayed and a press notice placed. 10 responses were received (2 from the same address) objecting to the proposal on the following grounds;

- Concern regarding continued encroachment on the open space of Parsloes Park
- An existing youth area already exists in Parsloes Park
- Traffic generation and parking congestion
- Noise and disturbance to nearby residents
- Precedent for future residential developments in Parsloes Park
- Insufficient parking provided
- Litter generation
- Overlooking
- Entrance to proposed development is directly opposite a busy roundabout
- Increase in air pollution from traffic
- Light pollution from proposed floodlights
- Impact on local wildlife
- Groups of youths would cause anxiety for elderly residents
- Proposed building will obstruct the view of traffic approaching from Porters Avenue
- Inappropriate commercial facility in a residential setting
- No designated drop-off / pick-up point for parents
- A good project proposed for an unsuitable location
- Parsloes Park is an important recreation facility and should not be built on
- Sightlines for drivers will be obscured by the proposed development
- Potential for anti-social behaviour to occur

The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) have objected to the proposal on the grounds of the loss of parkland for public use, and on financial issues relating to Council subsidy and long term viability.

3.2 Greater London Authority (GLA)

London Plan policies on Green Belt/MOL, health, equalities, urban design, sustainable development, biodiversity and transport are relevant to this application. Whilst the scheme is strongly supported in strategic planning terms, the application does not fully comply with the London Plan. Accordingly, the issues below should be addressed prior to the Mayor’s decision making stage:

- **Principle of development**: The principle of the youth facility is strongly supported in strategic terms and accords fully with London Plan policies on health inequalities. The very special circumstances could justify the development of this MOL site. However, fundamental to this assessment is the long-term financial viability of the proposal, which the applicant and Council is required to address. Further, verification of this provision contributing to the loss of a playing pitch is also required from Sport England.

- **Community use**: To ensure the wider community benefits are secured in perpetuity, the intended level of access should be secured by condition by the Council.

- **Energy**: The applicant has broadly followed the energy hierarchy; however further information is needed before the proposals can be considered acceptable and the carbon dioxide savings verified.

- **Drainage/biodiversity**: The applicant should consider additional SuDs measures to accord with London Plan Policy 5.13 and also give consideration to biodiversity concerns through adequate mitigation on site.

- **Transport**: Clarification of Blue Badge carparking and the provision of adequate drop off bays is required. A travel plan, DSP and CLP should be secured by way of condition.

3.3 Access Officer

The Access Officer has been involved with the scheme from an early stage and raises no objections.

3.4 Transport Development Management Team

Following consultation with the applicant the Transport Development Management Team are satisfied with the provision of accessible parking and cycle parking. Transport Officers have confirmed that a designated drop-off zone along Porters
Avenue is not viable or necessary as there are adequate places in the vicinity that can absorb drop-off/pick up of users of the facility.

3.5 Arboricultural Officer
The Arboricultural Officer has been involved with the scheme from an early stage and raises no objections.

3.6 Environmental Health Officer
No objections subject to conditions regarding amplified music, plant noise, external lighting, hours of working and noise and dust suppression during the construction phase.

3.7 Refuse and Waste Management
Initial comments raised regarding bin storage capacity have been addressed.

3.8 London Fire Brigade – Water Team
No objections.

3.9 London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
No objections.

3.10 Historic England (Archaeology)
No objections.

3.11 Crime Prevention Officer
Initial comments made regarding gabion walls and CCTV provision have been addressed.

3.12 Sport England
This application needs to be considered against exception E5 of Sport England’s policy on planning applications affecting playing fields ‘A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England’.

E5 – The proposed development is for an indoor or outdoor sports facility, the provision of which would be of sufficient benefit to the development of sport as to outweigh the detriment caused by the loss of the playing field or playing fields.

The proposed development would be situated on an area of Parsloes Park that has had a football pitch marked on it in the past but not recently. Although the proposed facility would not be aimed at the wider community, there is a need for a sport hall within the Borough and the supporting documentation articulates a particular need for a youth aimed facility. Having regard to all these factors, and that the FA have no objection to the proposal, then provided that the sports facilities are constructed in line with Sport England’s design guidance (particularly with regard to the
surfacing), the proposal, in this instance, is considered to be of benefit to sport to outweigh the detriment caused by the partial playing field loss.

Given the above assessment, Sport England does not wish to raise an objection to this application as it is considered to broadly meet exception E5 of the above policy subject to a condition being imposed requiring the submission of surface details for the proposed sports hall and kick pitch.

4. Local Finance Considerations

4.1 The scheme is liable for charitable exemption from the Mayoral and Local Community Infrastructure Levy.

5. Equalities Considerations

5.1 The proposed development would help to minimise disadvantages experienced by young people in the borough by providing a facility which will help them to maximise their life chances and to live positive and healthy lives. The Youth Zone also positively caters for disabled people as it allows access to the facility for disabled people up to 25 years of age whereas otherwise it only caters for people up to 19 years. It is not considered that there are any specific negative impacts of the development on the groups identified in section 149 (7) of the Equality Act 2010.

6. Analysis

6.1 Principle of Development

6.1.1 The proposed development lies within metropolitan open land (MOL) and therefore is subject to the same policies as would apply within the green belt. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that ‘inappropriate’ development within the Green Belt should not be approved except in very special circumstances; local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, ‘very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

6.1.2 The NPPF also states that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt such as, amongst other things, to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. The NPPF goes on to state that access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities.

6.1.3 The NPPF contains twelve core principles, those that are particularly relevant to this application include:

- Planning should take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the green belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it; and
• Planning should take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs.

6.1.4 Policy 7.17 of the London Plan 2016 states that the strongest protection should be given to London’s Metropolitan Open Land and inappropriate development refused, except in very special circumstances.

6.1.5 Policy 3.19 of the London Plan states that development proposals that increase or enhance the provision of sports and recreation facilities will be supported. Proposals that result in a net loss of sports and recreation facilities, including playing fields should be resisted. Wherever possible, multi-use public facilities for sport and recreational activity should be encouraged. The provision of sports lighting should be supported in areas where there is an identified need for sports facilities to increase sports participation opportunities. Where sports facility developments are proposed on existing open space, they will need to be considered carefully in light of policies on Green Belt and protecting open space as well as the borough’s own assessment of needs and opportunities for both sports facilities and for green multifunctional open space.

6.1.6 Policy CM3 of the Local Plan Core Strategy 2010 states that Barking and Dagenham’s Green Belt will be protected and maintained in accordance with national policy. Construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the green belt, but an exception is made for the provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and recreation as long as the openness of the green belt is preserved.

6.1.7 Parsloes Park is one of eight strategic parks in the borough, the overall size of the park is 58 hectares, the land to be occupied by the proposed Youth Zone equates to 0.65 of a hectare. This represents a very small (1.1%) amount of the park.

6.1.8 The proposal will have an impact on MOL openness because of its size, which in turn is driven by the inclusion of a sports hall which represents the largest element, although a significant part of the site will be occupied by outdoor facilities that would generally be acceptable in a park/public open space setting.

6.1.9 Although located on a visible corner, the presence of a three storey health centre opposite the site to the north west provides an urban context for the building and a backdrop against which the building will be viewed from the eastern approach in Gale Street. Distant views across the park from the north and east are respected by positioning the main mass of the development opposite existing built form.

6.1.10 The site is edged on both streets by mature and semi mature parkland trees, which provide an effective screen, especially on the Gale Street approaches. The development is set back a minimum of 18 metres from the park/road boundary to allow for the safe retention of all of the trees on site.

6.1.11 It is considered that the proposed Youth Zone has the potential to channel access to Parsloes Park by new users and encourage greater use of the park. It is envisaged that the siting of the facility on a prominent corner at the junction with well-used streets will attract members who will be also be encouraged to take advantage of the adjacent open space.
6.1.12 The scheme includes direct access to the park from the north-east side of the building. This is considered to be a significant benefit as this part of the park is not readily accessible as it is bounded by a fence along Gale Street and away from the formal paths within the park. The development will open up this part of the park and provide a new entrance at this busy road intersection. Examples of activities which could potentially be integrated into the wider park include; informal play for younger age groups, recreational sport, sports coaching, cross country fun runs, orienteering, and environmental projects linked to the Squatts nature reserve. Such activities would help to create a synergy between the proposed new development and the wider context of Parsloes Park.

6.1.13 Section 8 of the NPPF seeks to promote healthy communities, noting that the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction, health and inclusivity. It is considered that this proposal will facilitate access to high quality opportunities for sport and recreation and thus make an important contribution to the health and wellbeing of the local community.

6.1.14 London Plan policy 3.2 directly addresses the improvement of health and health inequalities; the proposed development seeks to improve health and to promote healthy lifestyles in a borough with clearly identified issues relating to excess weight, inactivity and life expectancy. In terms of inclusivity, all young people who wish to join the Youth Zone and pay 50p per visit will have access to high quality facilities irrespective of faith, gender, ability, sexual orientation or cultural background.

6.1.15 Recent data states that Barking and Dagenham is the 3rd most deprived borough in London and the 12th most deprived in England. There is a strong correlation between deprivation and poor health. In Barking and Dagenham more than two in five (43%) children aged 10-11 (Year 6) are overweight or obese, the highest proportion in England.

6.1.16 Obesity and poor health are priority issues for the Council, the Council’s Healthy Weight Strategy 2016-2020 states that 39% of adults in the Borough do no sport or active recreation. The overall cost of inactivity per hundred thousand people to the Borough is estimated to be over £23 million. Borough maps (2011-2014) show the amount of 10-11 year old children who are overweight in Mayesbrook and Parsloes Wards, which are the closest wards to the Youth Zone, as being 42.4% - 43.1%.

6.1.17 Youth Zones focus on teaching young people how to lead a healthy active lifestyle, the proposed park side location is considered to be an advantage in encouraging young people to engage in sport and activity. Overall it is considered that the Youth Zone facility has the potential to provide an opportunity to directly address many of the issues identified above.

6.1.18 The 2011 Census shows that 28% of 16 year olds and above were recorded as having no qualifications (Barking and Dagenham’s Community Strategy 2013-2016). Barking and Dagenham has a lower percentage of people aged 16-64 in employment than London, 65.9% in the Borough versus 73% for London (LBBD Health Impact Assessment – March 2017).

6.1.19 The Youth Zone Employability Programmes are targeted towards the needs of young people. It is considered that issues relating to young people who are not in
employment, education or training (NEET) can be helped by involvement in a youth zone.

6.1.20 A number of alternative sites were considered and discounted by Council Officers. The sequential site assessment was confined to Council owned sites as the Council is gifting the land for this project. The project is not viable if the applicant has to fund the land purchase.

6.1.21 The successful operation of Onside’s existing Youth Zones is based on the core principles of neutrality, accessibility, and prominence. Parsloes Park is located in the centre of the borough and therefore represents neutral ground for young people using the facility. Alternative development sites were not as accessible as Parsloes Park with low PTAL ratings or situated to the south of the A13 restricting access for communities to the north.

6.1.22 The chosen site occupies an underutilised area of the park, the development would not result in the loss of sports playing fields and as outlined in the ‘Consultation’ section of this report, Sport England is satisfied with the proposal subject to the imposition of a condition. The proposed development would not displace existing park activities.

6.1.23 It is considered that the Youth Zone facility has the potential to revitalise and energise this part of the park. Officers consider that the proposal would result in a high quality well designed facility and surrounding environment.

6.1.24 In conclusion it is considered that the impact of the building on the openness of the MOL is outweighed by the nature and scale of the positive benefits which would be delivered to users of the facility, with the potential to make an important contribution to the health and well-being of young people in the local community. The applicant has demonstrated ‘very special circumstances’ for the inappropriate development of Green Belt.

6.2 Design and Layout

6.2.1 The facility has been designed to be as compact as possible, making the most efficient use of the land donated by the Council and minimising the impact on the MOL. Access to the facility will be via a ‘pedestrian plaza’ located on the corner of Porters Avenue and Gale Street. This junction provides key existing access arrangements, including a pelican crossing and pedestrian routes which converge at this location. As well as providing a legible entrance, a key requirement is for a single access point to the building which can be supervised and controlled at all times.

6.2.2 The external kick pitch and skate park are located on the south east park side of the building, a 2.6m high split stone natural stone wall will mask the skate park, whilst a 4 metre high fence would surround the kick pitch. Following consultation, the relationship between the facility and the park has been improved by incorporating pathways into the design to create walkways linking the perimeter footpaths and the facility entrance with the grounds of the park.

6.2.3 The volumes and uses within the building are reflected in its external form. The sports hall wraps around the Porters Avenue and park elevations and would be the
highest part of the building at 9.65 metres. The building itself has a width of 34.5m, a maximum depth of 51.5m, and (other than the sports hall) a height of 8.6m. The kick pitch and skate park are co-located to facilitate easy movement from one to the other. As floodlights are required, these are to be located the maximum distance from residential properties.

6.2.4 The entrance to the building from Porters Avenue and Gale Street comprises a double height glazed facade providing an active elevation addressing the street. The roof will be cantilevered over an external ‘colonnade’ creating a covered area, sheltering the building users and providing extra public space on the corner.

6.2.5 The architectural design features two distinct sections; the first encompasses the main facility, including the main entrance and general facilities and the second is the sports hall. For the main facility; the roof projection will be supported by brightly coloured columns. The main facilities area will have a masonry base to provide a robust easily maintained public interface. A timber clad first floor is proposed, sympathetic to the park context. In respect of the sports hall element; following consultation, the design of the sports hall cladding has evolved and comprises varied sections of vertical timber boarding to break up the mass of this element. This is envisaged to better respond to the local environment allowing the building to sit sympathetically within the natural park setting.

6.2.6 Whilst an active and translucent facade at ground level would be preferred in the context of the streetscene, it is acknowledged that there are conflicting requirements from the use of the internal spaces, namely the need to protect the privacy and safeguarding of young people using the facility. It is considered that the proposed materials and external finishes are sympathetic to the location and suitably respond to the local context, i.e. timber (responding to the park) and glass and masonry (responding to the urban edge).

6.3 Internal Design

6.3.1 Internally, at ground floor level, the main reception area will contain pool tables, table tennis tables, an informal arts area and seating adjacent to a kitchen and server. Male and female changing rooms will be located adjacent to a climbing wall and fitness suite, with access to the skate park and kick pitch. Other small specialist and meeting rooms are arranged around the main recreational area. The sports hall will accommodate four marked courts and is of a size broadly in accordance with Sport England’s specifications. At first floor level is office accommodation, a boxing/martial arts gym, a performing arts studio in addition to a music room and associated sound studio. These will be arranged around a landing that overlooks the void over the main recreational area.

6.4 Landscaping

6.4.1 The proposed Youth Zone building, kick pitch and skate park will be set back a minimum of 18m from the park/street boundary edge and away from the existing trees, to allow for their safe retention. All structures will therefore be significantly outside the root protection areas. The areas under the existing trees will remain grassed and the existing railings will be retained along the street frontage, with the exception of the Youth Zone entrance where bollards will be employed.
6.4.2 In addition to the retention of the existing trees, supplementary landscape proposals have been developed using the Arup Parsloes Park Masterplan as a guide. The proposals centre on integrating the development into the park with sloping mounds on the north and east sides, formed from construction spoil. The mounding will be up to 1.2m high and will typically have slopes of 1 in 6 to 1 in 7. Informal groups of parkland style trees will be planted on the mounds, together with generous areas of wildflower meadow which will be planted around the building helping to increase biodiversity and integrate the built form into its setting. The trees will be planted as a mix of Heavy standard and Extra Heavy Standard size to resist vandalism and create a strong initial impact.

6.4.3 Other landscape elements include the creation of a paved plaza at the entrance to the site and a new park entrance from Gale Street with a linking pathway in between, this is intended to improve connectivity to the park from the south side and from the Youth Zone building. It is considered that the combined effect of the mounding, tree planting and meadow would serve to soften the impact of the development and filter views of the Youth Zone from inside and outside the park.

6.5 External Flood Lighting

6.5.1 The external spaces of the Youth Zone including the kick pitch and skate park will be floodlit in order to maximise the use of these areas. The lighting design has been specified in order to minimise the impact on the amenity of local residents and the potential impact on local wildlife. The luminaires will be controlled via an internal time clock maintaining a ‘light out’ curfew between the hours of 22:00 and 07:00.

6.5.2 Following consultation, the lighting scheme has been redesigned to omit the flood lamps originally proposed, these will be replaced with LED lamps in order to minimise UV output. The overall lux has been reduced to circa 120 lux. Existing street lighting is present along Gale Street and Porters Avenue. Light levels at ground level beneath a modern street lamp would be expected to be between 10 and 20 lux. The lux levels of the proposed lighting are calculated to depreciate to less 2 lux toward properties on Gale Street. The Environmental Health Officer has confirmed that the design should avoid obtrusive light affecting nearby homes and will not cause detriment to amenity subject to the imposition of a condition ensuring that the floodlights are switched off between the hours of 22:00 and 06:00.

6.6 Sustainable Design

6.6.1 Policy 5.2 of the London Plan requires each major development proposal to submit a detailed energy assessment in order to demonstrate that climate change mitigation measures are integral to the scheme’s design and evolution, and that they are appropriate to the context of the development. An emission reduction target of 35% below Part L 2013 for commercial development is sought.

6.6.2 The development aims to follow the London plan energy hierarchy of Lean, Clean and Green measures. Energy consumption of the building will be reduced through measures including optimising building fabric to achieve improved thermal efficiency, increasing airtightness, low energy lighting combined with effective controls and energy management systems. The Youth Zone is estimated to achieve
a 16% reduction in regulated carbon emissions over the 2013 baseline Target Emission Rate (TER) by passive design and energy efficiency measures alone in accordance with the energy hierarchy.

6.6.3 The development proposes the use of advanced natural ventilation by way of windcatchers to the sports hall and mechanical ventilation with heat recovery in other areas. A combination of high efficiency gas fired boilers and heat pump technology is intended to ensure that the space heating and cooling demands are met with minimal carbon emissions.

6.6.4 To further reduce carbon emissions, it is proposed that on-site renewable energy in the form of roof mounted solar PV panels are installed. The installation of 90m2 of Solar PV is estimated to reduce carbon emissions by a further 19%. The proposed development will achieve an overall 35% reduction in regulated carbon emissions through a suitable combination of lean and green measures.

6.6.5 The development will be assessed against the BREEAM 2014 Other Buildings: Assembly and Leisure criteria, to achieve a BREEAM Rating of 'Excellent'.

6.66 The drainage strategy has taken into account the principles of sustainable drainage, with the incorporation of an attenuation tank that allows surface water to percolate into the soil, and the incorporation of porous materials in the MUGA and maintenance areas to reduce discharge to sewers. In terms of rainwater harvesting and green roof systems, the enhanced capital cost and ongoing maintenance liability for the charity is outside its budget allowances and would not therefore be feasible.

6.7 Impact on Residential Amenity

6.7.1 The proposed building will be set back 18m from the site boundary and the nearest residential properties would be approximately 35m away on the southern side of Gale Street. Given the intervening road and mature tree screening, it is not considered that there will be any issues relating to overlooking. The kick pitch would be located 70 metres away from the nearest residential property and the skate park 45 metres away which is considered to be sufficient separation to avoid noise adversely affecting residential amenity.

6.7.2 The external lighting report accompanying this application calculates that artificial light spill beyond the site boundary will have a negligible impact on surrounding residents in terms of nuisance lighting.

6.8 Parking and Transport

5.8.1 London Plan policy 6.13 sets out maximum car parking standards for development. Whilst there are no prescribed parking standards for a proposal of this type, the London Plan parking addendum is considered relevant for the proposed development. The following extract relates to ‘hotel and leisure’ developments;

*In locations with a PTAL of 4-6, on-site provision should be limited to operational needs, parking for disabled people and that required for taxis, coaches and deliveries/servicing. In locations with a PTAL of 1-3, provision should be consistent*
with objectives to reduce congestion and traffic levels and to avoid undermining walking, cycling or public transport.

6.8.2 The application site has a PTAL rating of level 2 on a scale of 1-6 where 6 is excellent. In keeping with the OnSide philosophy that on-site parking is discouraged, no formal car parking is provided within the curtilage for staff or visitors to use. There will be on-site parking for one minibus, one blue badge space for staff, and one blue badge space for users of the facility which will be accessed from the proposed service access fronting Gale Street.

6.8.3 16 Cycle parking spaces are proposed, provided by 8 Sheffield stands fronting the entrance lobby of the building. A further 12 cycle spaces will be provided for staff situated in the service area.

6.8.4 Due to the scheme’s very nature young people using the facility are unlikely to be either eligible by age to drive to the facility or have access to a car to do so. It is considered that if car parking were to be provided for the site this would encourage both visitors and staff working at the facility to travel by car.

6.8.5 The absence of parking provision is expected to encourage both staff and visitors to travel to the site using more sustainable modes of transport. If staff and visitors do choose to use a car to travel to and from the facility they would need to park off-site. The lack of on-street parking would be expected to deter them from doing so on a regular basis. Furthermore it is noted that the site is only a few minutes’ walk from Becontree Station and is well served by bus routes via Gale Street and Porters Avenue.

6.8.6 In terms of the use of unrestricted parking bays fronting Porters Avenue, it should be noted that unlike conventional sports centres, the operational model of Onside Youth Zones does not allow parents to enter the facility to watch their children partake in the activities offered, as such the need for on-street parking is significantly reduced and is limited to a simple drop-off and pick-up process.

7. Conclusion

7.1 The proposed development will provide a high quality, highly accessible and inclusive facility offering a wide range of sport and recreation activities for young people in the Borough. It is considered that the impact on the openness of the MOL is outweighed by the nature and scale of the positive benefits which would be delivered to users of the facility, with the potential to make an important contribution to the health, well being and employment prospects of young people in the local community together with an associated fall in anti-social behaviour. The applicant has demonstrated ‘very special circumstances’ for the inappropriate development of Green Belt.
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AGENDA ITEM 5

Location of Site

Former Short Blue PH, Bastable Avenue, Barking
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Barking and Dagenham Council  
Development Control Board  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No:</th>
<th>16/02007/FUL</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>3 July 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward:</td>
<td>Thames</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reason for Referral to DCB as set out in Part 2, Chapter 9 of the Council Constitution:**
The application because of its scale, impact upon the environment and the level of likely Councillor interest should, in the opinion of the Acting Head of Planning be determined by the Development Control Board.

**Address:**
The Short Blue, Bastable Avenue, Barking

**Development:**
Construction of a part 3/4/5 storey building comprising 9 one bedroom and 14 two bedroom flats with associated 17 car parking spaces and landscaping

**Applicant:**
Estuary Housing Association

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

**Summary:**
The application site is a vacant plot located on the north side of Bastable Avenue adjacent to the junction with Endeavour Way in Barking, that was formerly occupied by a public house called the ‘Short Blue’ that has since been demolished.

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a 3 to 5 storey building providing 9 one-bedroom flats and 14 two bedroom flats incorporating car parking and landscaping.

Several neighbour objections have been raised expressing concern about the height of the proposed building and the impact on the availability of on street parking.

Despite the objections raised which are addressed below, the scheme is acceptable in terms of the principle of the development, external appearance, internal design, amenity space, accessibility, sustainability, and parking provision.

**Recommendation:**
That the Development Control Board grant planning permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure the shared ownership sub-market housing, a Marketing Strategy that gives priority to Borough residents to acquire the shared ownership units and which includes a restriction on sales to any non-Borough residents within the first 3 months of marketing, and a clause that will prevent residents of the development from obtaining a parking permit for on street parking in the event that a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) is in future introduced within the vicinity of the site, and the following conditions (subject to any minor amendments):
1. The development permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

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

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: D001; D002; D003; D004; D005; D006; D101; D102; D103; D301; D401 (Bastable); D401 (Endeavour); D403; D404; D501; D701; D201; D202; D203; D204; D205; D206; D207; D208; D209; D210; D211; D212; D213; D214; D215; D216; D217; D218; D219; D220; D221; D222; D223; D601; D602; D604; L(9-030).

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

3. The landscaping scheme shown on drawing No. L(9-)030 shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

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

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

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

5. The car parking areas indicated on drawing No. D002 shall be constructed and marked out prior to the occupation of the development, and thereafter retained permanently for the accommodation of vehicles of occupiers and visitors to the premises and not used for any other purpose.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient off-street parking areas are provided and not to prejudice the free flow of traffic or conditions of general safety along the adjoining highway in accordance with policy BR9 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

6. No deliveries, external running of plant and equipment or construction works, other than internal works not audible outside the site boundary, shall take place on the site other than between the hours of 0800 to 1800 on Monday to Friday and 0800 to 1300 on Saturday and not at all on Sundays, Public or Bank Holidays without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure that the proposed construction work does not cause undue nuisance and disturbance to neighbouring properties at unreasonable hours and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

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

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

8. The refuse enclosures indicated on drawing No. D101 shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved and thereafter permanently retained for the use of the occupiers of the premises.

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

9. The boundaries of the site shall be secured in accordance with the details indicated on drawing No. 701 and thereafter permanently retained. No part of the development shall be occupied until the approved boundary treatment for that part has been provided.

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

10. No above ground new 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 E3 – Medium district brightness areas - small town centre or urban locations. The relevant part of the development shall not be occupied until the approved scheme for that part of the development 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 policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

11. Before occupation 90% (21 no.) of the dwellings shall comply with Building Regulations Optional Requirement Approved Document M4(2) Category 2: Accessible and adaptable dwellings (2015 edition). Evidence of compliance shall be notified to the building control body appointed for the development in the appropriate Full Plans Application, or Building Notice, or Initial Notice to enable the building control body to check compliance.

Reason: To ensure that accessible housing is provided in accordance with policy 3.8 of
12. A minimum of 10% (2 no.) of the residential units provided shall be constructed to, or capable of easy adaptation to, Building Regulations Optional Requirement Approved Document M4(3) Category 3: (Wheelchair user dwellings) (2015 edition). Evidence of compliance shall be notified to the building control body appointed for the development in the appropriate Full Plans Application, or Building Notice, or Initial Notice to enable the building control body to check compliance.

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

13. The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the submitted Bastable Avenue Energy Statement and shall achieve as a minimum a 35% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions over Part L of the Building Regulations (2013).

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

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

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

15. Cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the details shown on drawing No. 101 prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter maintained for the use of residents and visitors to the site.

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

16. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy Assessment recommendations ref. 112893 – 101, and the approved attenuation tanks shall thereafter be maintained.

Reason: In order to reduce the risk of flooding on and off site and in accordance with policy BR4 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

17. No demolition or development shall take place until a stage 1 written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. No demolition or development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, and the programme and methodology of site evaluation and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works.

If heritage assets of archaeological interest are identified by stage 1, then for those parts of the site which have archaeological interest a stage 2 WSI shall be submitted to
and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the
stage 2 WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the
agreed stage 2 WSI which shall include:

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

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

Reason: To safeguard the heritage of the Borough by providing an adequate opportunity
to investigate and excavate archaeological remains on the site prior to the commencement
of the development in accordance with policies BP2 and BP3 of the Borough Wide
Development Policies Development Plan Document and section 12 of the National
Planning Policy Framework.

18. The remediation works approved by application reference 13/00831/CDN shall be
carried out in full on site under a quality assurance scheme to demonstrate compliance
with the proposed methodology and best practice guidance. If during the works
contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified then the additional
contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme agreed with
the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Contamination must be remediated 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.

19. Construction work and associated activities are to be carried out in accordance with
noise and vibration control on construction and open sites”. Parts 1 and 2.

Reason: In order to reduce the environmental impact of the construction and the impact
on the amenities of neighbouring residents in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reason: In order to ensure the protection of sub surface infrastructure in the interest of residential amenity and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Document.

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

Reason: In order to contribute to the local economy and local residents in need of employment and in accordance with the principles within policy CC3 of the Core Strategy, details are required prior to commencement in order to ensure that any demolition and groundworks are included within the approved Strategy.

24. No above ground development shall commence until the submission to and approval by the Local Planning Authority of details of privacy screening to prevent overlooking of rear gardens of the adjacent maisonettes from the roof terraces of Plots 16 and 23 (floor plans as shown on drawing nos. D102 and D103). In each case, the approved screen shall be installed prior to the occupation of the flat it serves.

Reason: In order to protect the privacy and amenities of neighbouring residents and in accordance with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Policies Development Plan Document.

1. Introduction and Description of Development

1.1 The 0.15 hectare site is at the junction of Bastable Avenue and Endeavour Way.

1.2 The proposed development is the construction of a 3/4/5 storey block of 23 flats comprising 9 one bedroom flats, and 14 two bedroom flats. The ground floor flats would be duplex, with living spaces on the ground floor and bedrooms on the first floor of the building. Lift access would be provided to the upper floors.

1.3 Car parking for 17 spaces and a communal garden area would be provided to the rear, accessed in approximately the same position as the existing Endeavour Way vehicular access and via a proposed undercroft beneath the upper floors of the proposed building.

1.4 The proposed tenure is 100% shared ownership.

1.5 The site is identified as being within Flood Zone 3.

1.6 The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character although a number of community uses including a school and a doctor’s surgery are located on the opposite side of Bastable Avenue. The residential uses are comprised of a mixture of blocks of maisonettes of 3-4 storeys and two storey houses.

2. Background

2.1 Planning permission was granted in 2011 (11/00407/FUL) for a 14 unit scheme within a 3/4 storey building. Subsequently the site was acquired by the current applicant and a Section 73 variation (14/00130/FUL) to this scheme was permitted enabling an additional height of 2.2m to accommodate increased floor to ceiling heights.

2.2 This approved scheme was commenced but the construction company in question went out of business and the development stalled. The applicant then reconsidered the proposals and following pre-application advice submitted the current application.
3. Consultations

Adjoining occupiers

3.1 Letters were sent to 107 neighbouring residents, a press notice was published, and a site notice displayed. In response 18 letters of representation were received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The building would be two storeys higher than the adjacent maisonettes which will be overpowering on this small junction with two storey houses opposite
- Endeavour Way is narrow and congested with existing car parking, the area cannot sustain any additional parking
- Site traffic during construction will cause nuisance
- A resident living opposite the site has health problems and cannot walk, it is therefore important to be able to park outside the house which is already a problem at times

Access Officer

3.2 No response received.

Arboricultural Officer

3.3 No response received.

Designing Out Crime Officer

3.4 On the whole the design would seem to be relatively straightforward and from a designing out crime perspective looks adequate. The access via an undercroft to the parking and amenity space at the rear is proposed to be gated, which I strongly support as a means to greatly reduce the opportunity for ASB common in open courtyard access sites.

3.5 With regards to perimeter security I do have a few observations and recommendations.

3.6 The south west corner fronting Bastable Avenue has what appears to be a side access or at least a gap between this build and its neighbour. These gaps can often be overlooked and if not adequately fenced or gated let down the overall site security. The developers should look at providing an adequate height (2.0 metre minimum) metal gate with access control or key. If this is to be a locked off gap then a very robust 2.4m infill, be it metal fence or wood (is required).

3.7 Section 6 Layout of the DAS (design and access statement) makes mention of a 1.8m wood fence for the rear courtyard and parking. This would I suggest need to be 2.0 m to provide a somewhat more effective barrier.

3.8 Section 8 Materials and Appearance of the DAS looks at recessed brick panels to improve the appearance of the outer walls. I have no issue with texture changes to
brickwork, but the developer should design any feature with a mind to its potential for climbing up to upper level windows or balconies.

3.9 I was unable to determine the access control strategy regards post, but as always I recommend a through the wall or secure lobby method with outer and inner access controlled doors.

Planning officer note: Crime prevention and boundary details conditions are proposed that will enable the above details to be secured.

Environment Agency

3.10 No objections subject to the development being carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment.

Environmental Health

3.11 To safeguard the situation with regard to land quality and possible construction phase impacts I recommend that any permission that might be granted be subject to the following conditions in respect of the following matters:

- Land contamination remediation
- Construction hours
- Construction noise and vibration controls
- Construction management plan

Essex and Suffolk Water

3.12 No objections.

Historic England

3.13 The site lies within an area of archaeological interest and therefore a condition to secure an archaeological investigation of the site should be imposed.

Housing Strategy

3.14 No response received.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

3.15 No objections.

Thames Water

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

3.17 It is requested that a condition is imposed such that no piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to
prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Transport Development Management

3.18 No objections.

Waste and Recycling Policy Manager

3.19 No response received.

4. Local Finance Considerations

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

4.2 However, given that the scheme is 100% sub-market housing the applicant is entitled to apply for CIL Social Housing Relief and this would result in a nil contribution.

5. Equalities Considerations

5.1 The Equality Act 2010 requires the Council to advance equality of opportunity in the exercise of its functions. In this respect, as elaborated upon below, conditions are proposed to ensure that all units are accessible and adaptable, with 2 units having a layout and size specifically enabling ease of use by a wheelchair user.

6. Analysis

Principle of Development

6.1 The site is located within the Thames View Estate which is predominantly a residential area. In this respect, the site is considered to be appropriate for residential purposes and this is established by the previous planning permissions. The proposal would add to the overall housing stock within the Borough.

6.2 The proposed tenure is 100% shared ownership. Thames View currently has a high proportion of social rent properties and the proposed development would therefore help to diversify the local tenure mix in accordance with policy 3.9 of the London Plan.

6.3 This provision has the potential to contribute to regeneration, and may help to enable local residents who wish to buy a property to stay in the area. It results in a 100% sub-market (affordable) housing development and therefore maximises the provision of sub-market housing on the site in accordance with policy 3.12 of the London Plan.
6.4 The scheme would provide one and two bedroom flats only, whilst normally policy CC1 of the Core Strategy requires that 40% of new dwellings are family sized of 3 bedrooms plus. It is acknowledged that there is limited demand for family sized dwellings in shared ownership tenure. Also flatted accommodation tends to be less suited to providing family accommodation in comparison with houses, and therefore in the circumstances the scheme of 1 and 2 bedroom flats is considered acceptable as an exception to the policy.

6.5 The proposed density would be 153 units/hectare whereas policy 3.4 of the London Plan indicates an appropriate density of 35 – 95 units/hectare for an urban character location with a Public Transport Accessibility Level of 1b.

6.6 The proposed density is higher than this guidance but the explanatory text to the policy states that the London Plan density matrix is not intended to be prescriptive and account must be taken of the individual site and the proposed design. It is considered that the scheme would provide a good quality design and living environment with adequate external space, and whilst the resulting density is higher than the policy guidance it is not considered that it is excessively so. The proposed density is therefore considered acceptable.

Design

6.8 The building would occupy an approximately ‘L’-shaped footprint and would continue the established building line along Bastable Avenue and Endeavour Way from the shared boundaries of the site.

6.9 In terms of height the building would be predominantly 4 and 5 storeys with a small element that would drop to 3 storeys adjacent to the neighbouring 3 storey maisonettes in Endeavour Way. The Bastable Avenue elevation would be mainly 5 storeys, dropping to 4 storeys adjacent to the neighbouring 3 storey maisonette block, and the 5 storey element forming a corner feature to the building would turn the corner onto Endeavour Way after which it would drop to 4 storeys.

6.10 The building would have flat roofs to allow for the provision of solar panelling and the creation of roof terraces.

6.11 It is considered that the proposed elevation for Endeavour Way quite successfully steps up from the existing neighbouring 3 storey building to provide greater height on the corner. In respect of Bastable Avenue the building would be 4 storeys adjacent to the existing 3 storey building. This change in height is more prominent but the gap between the buildings at 4m would be greater than the 2m on Endeavour Way. Also, this elevation faces onto a wider more open street scene. Taking account of this the scale and massing and relationship to the neighbouring development is considered acceptable.

6.12 The proposed building would also be situated opposite a terrace of 4 two storey houses in Endeavour Way. The difference in scale between the houses and the proposed flats is more significant but given the width of the road between the houses and the proposed block it is not considered that this would result in a jarring relationship or harm to the street scene, and variety in heights is not atypical of the area which in addition to 2 storey houses includes several taller blocks.
6.13 The additional height at the corner of the building would help to create a feature to the building which would also be enhanced by the provision of inset balconies on this corner. Elsewhere on the street elevations of the building projecting balconies are proposed.

6.14 The design is uncluttered and contemporary with large window opening, and the elevations are considered to be well proportioned. There are some small steps in the street elevations which help to break up the bulk of the building. The proposed external material is brick which is appropriate to its context, and the balcony screens are proposed as glass.

Amenity

6.15 Two of the ground floor flats are designed to wheelchair adaptable standards (Building Regulation M4(3) which equates to 10%, with the remaining 90% of units (21 flats) having been designed to M4(2) standards in accordance with the London Plan.

6.16 All units meet the floorspace and layout requirements of the London Plan and ‘nationally described space standard’, and private amenity space is provided in excess of the standards set out within the London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG).

6.17 In addition to each unit having a private terrace or balcony, two of the flats would have a large private roof terrace of one of 16 m² and one of 35 m², and a communal roof terrace of 215 m² would be provided.

6.18 10 of the proposed flats are single aspect though none are single aspect and north facing. It is difficult given the shape of the site and resulting building to reduce the number of single aspect flats, and all would have good standards of daylighting, and therefore the scheme is considered acceptable.

6.19 The relationship of the proposed development with neighbouring dwellings is considered acceptable and is not judged to cause harm to residential amenity. However, it is considered that the two private roof terrace should be designed with a screen or parapet that prevents overlooking of adjacent gardens and this can be conditioned. The communal roof terrace is sufficiently set back from the site boundaries that this would not be required.

Transport

6.20 The site has a low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 2 where 1 is lowest and 6 is highest though it is linked to Barking station and town centre via the East London Transit bus service.

6.21 The proposed parking provision of 17 spaces to serve 23 flats would result in a parking to flats ratio of 0.74. This is a similar ratio to that of the previously approved scheme of 11 spaces for 14 flats resulting in a ratio of 0.79.

6.22 The parking provision would be in accordance with the London Plan which sets a maximum parking standard of 1 space per unit. Whilst there may be some additional on street parking demand from the development it is not considered that
this would be significant and the Transport Officer has no objections to the proposed level of parking provision.

6.23 At present on street parking within the adjacent streets is unrestricted, there being no residents’ Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). In the event that a CPZ is subsequently introduced, in order to prevent excessive on street parking and protect the amenities of existing residents, the applicant has agreed to a Section 106 obligation whereby future residents of the block will, in perpetuity, not be entitled to obtain parking permits within any such CPZ.

6.24 Vehicular access to the site would be via Endeavour Way and would require slight modifications to an existing crossover. The Transport Development Management Team is satisfied with these arrangements in principle.

6.25 Cycle parking is provided in accordance with London Plan standards.

Environmental Sustainability

6.26 The submitted energy report demonstrates that the scheme would achieve a 35% reduction in carbon emissions relative to Building Regulations requirements through improved building fabric, the installation of a Mechanical Ventilation Heat Recovery (MVHR) system to each flat, and a 65m2 array of photovoltaic panels mounted on the roof.

6.27 Policy 5.2 of the London Plan sets a zero carbon target for new residential development from 2016. Guidance contained within the London Plan: ‘Sustainable Design and Construction’ Supplementary Planning Guidance, states that where it is not possible to achieve zero carbon on site a financial contribution should be provided in order to secure carbon savings elsewhere. The policy also requires that at least 35% of the carbon savings are achieved on site and this is achieved by the proposed energy strategy.

6.28 The Guidance recommends a price for carbon off-setting based either on local conditions or a nationally recognised carbon price such as the ‘Zero Carbon Hub’ price of £60 per tonne of carbon over 30 years. It states that account should be taken of the impact of such contributions upon development viability and that the price should not be set at a level where development becomes unviable.

6.29 The applicant states that the provision of further carbon saving measures, or the imposition on the scheme of a carbon off-set payment would result in the development becoming financially unviable. The applicant has provided a development viability statement that demonstrates that the inclusion of additional development costs would make the development unviable.

6.30 In the circumstances the proposed energy strategy is considered to be acceptable as it appears to provide the maximum carbon saving that this 100% sub-market housing scheme can sustain.

6.31 The implementation of the submitted Flood Risk Assessment that includes a drainage strategy incorporating the provision of surface water attenuation tanks beneath the parking area, can be secured by condition.
Conclusion

6.32 Matters relating to the principle of the development, external appearance, internal design, amenity space provision, sustainability and parking provision are all in compliance with planning policy.

6.33 The proposed development would make use of a long-vacant site and it is contended that it would provide a positive addition to the surrounding area. The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions and the completion of a S.106 agreement.

Background Papers

- Planning Application File: [http://paplan.lbbd.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=OIN02IBLMN300](http://paplan.lbbd.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=OIN02IBLMN300)

- Local Plan Policy:
  - Policy CM1 General Principles for Development
  - Policy CC1 Family Housing
  - Policy CM2 Managing Housing Growth
  - Policy CR4 Flood Management
  - Policy CC1 Family Housing
  - Policy CC3 Achieving Community Benefits through Developer Contributions
  - Policy CP3 High Quality Built Environment
  - Policy BR1 Environmental Building Standards
  - Policy BR2 Energy and On-Site Renewables
  - Policy BR9 Parking
  - Policy BR10 Sustainable Transport
  - Policy BR11 Walking and Cycling
  - Policy BC1 Delivering Affordable Housing
  - Policy BC2 Accessible and Adaptable Housing
  - Policy BC7 Crime Prevention
  - Policy BP8 Protecting Residential Amenity
  - Policy BP10 Housing Density
  - Policy BP11 Urban Design

- London Plan Policy
  - Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential
  - Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
  - Policy 3.8 Housing choice
  - Policy 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities
  - Policy 3.12 Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes
  - Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
  - Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
  - Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
  - Policy 5.7 Renewable energy
  - Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
  - Policy 6.5 Funding Crossrail and other strategically important infrastructure
  - Policy 6.9 Cycling
Policy 6.13 Parking
Policy 7.3 Designing out crime
Policy 7.6 Architecture

- **National Policy**
  
  National Planning Policy Framework
  National Planning Practice Guidance
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Barking and Dagenham Council  
Development Control Board  

Date: 3 July 2017

Application No: 17/00060/FUL  
Ward: Mayesbrook

Reason for Referral to DCB as set out in Part 2, Chapter 9 of the Council Constitution:  
The application involves the creation of two 3 bedroom dwellings without off-street car parking and is recommended for approval.

Address: 79 Lodge Avenue, Dagenham

Development: Erection of two 2 storey, 3 bedroom semi-detached houses.

Applicant: Mr R Nash

Summary:

The application site comprises a two storey end of terrace house located on the eastern side of Lodge Avenue, Dagenham. The proposal seeks to erect two 2 storey semi-detached houses on land to the side of No.79 Lodge Avenue.

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

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

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

Each proposed new dwelling provides a private amenity space of approximately 63sqm with a depth of 9 metres. The depth corresponds with the rear private amenity area of the donor property and that of the rear gardens of the neighbouring terrace and is considered to be acceptable.

No off-street parking provision is proposed for this development. The site has a PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) of 2 on a scale of 1-6 where 6 is excellent. However, it is not considered that the absence of off-street parking provision will materially increase parking pressure within the immediate locality. Officers share the view of the Transport Development Management Team that there are an adequate number of on-street parking bays fronting Lodge Avenue to satisfactorily accommodate the parking requirements of an additional 2 properties.

Recommendation:

That the Development Control Board grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:
1) The development permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

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

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: LA/04, LA/05, LA/06, LA/07.

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

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

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

4) No development above ground level shall take place until a scheme showing the provisions to be made for external street lighting has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the approved scheme has been implemented. Thereafter the approved measures shall be permanently retained unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of enhancing security and safety, and safeguarding neighbouring amenity in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

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

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

**Contact Officer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title: Development Management Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ian Drew</td>
<td>Tel: 020 8227 3067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Introduction and Description of Development

1.1 The application site comprises a two storey end of terrace house located on the eastern side of Lodge Avenue, Dagenham. The proposal seeks to erect two 2 storey semi-detached houses on land to the side of No.79 Lodge Avenue.
2. **Background**

2.1 No planning history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 10 Neighbouring occupiers were consulted. No responses were received.

3.2 **Transport Development Management Team**

The current Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating has been determined at a level 2, on a scale of 1 to 6 where 6 is excellent. This house at no.79 is the last in a block of 4 houses facing an amenity green, which are only accessible via an un-adopted footway ending at this house. These houses are restricted by their location to have vehicular crossovers. However, there are adequate parking spaces available on-street in Lodge Avenue and Ilchester Road. We have no objections in principle for works to be carried out to extend the existing footpath up to the proposed development. The works are to be carried out by the developer at their own cost and the following conditions should be met;

- Confirmation is received from our refuse collection services that they are serviceable (the pedestrian access is at present 26m)
- Adequate street lighting is provided that covers both proposed houses and approved by our street lighting department.

3.3 **Waste Management**

No objections raised. Waste services will supply each property with a 140 litre grey wheeled bin for general waste and a 240 litre brown bin for dry mixed recycling materials.

3.4 **Street Lighting**

Confirmation that one additional 5 metre high street lighting column will be required outside the new properties.

3.5 **Housing Management**

No response received.

*Officer note: An informative will be attached requiring the applicant to obtain separate consent from the Council’s Housing Management Team with regard to the proposed footpath extension.*

3.6 **Access Officer**

Comments and recommendations have been made with regards to corridor/stair widths, and door openings to comply with Part M of Building Regulations.
Officer note: The Access Officer recommendations have been forwarded to the applicant for implementation, these largely relate to Building Regulations conformity.

4. Local Finance Considerations

4.1 The application is subject to both the Mayor of London and Council’s Community Infrastructure Levy and would generate a Mayoral CIL contribution of £4173.39 and an LBBD CIL contribution of £1906.66.

5. Equalities Considerations

5.1 The proposed new dwellings will provide suitable accessibility provision in accordance with Buildings Regulations M4(2) and would enable future occupiers to remain living in the properties regardless of age and/or disability.

6. Analysis

6.1 External Design

6.1.1 Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy and Policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Polices DPD set out the principles which should be applied to the design and layout of new development in order to achieve a good standard of design. Policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Polices DPD requires all developments to protect residential amenity by having regard to the local character of the area.

6.1.2 The proposed semi-detached pair will have a combined width of 11.4 metres, a depth of 8.5 metres, and a maximum height of 8.7 metres with a hipped roof design. The proposed new dwellings would have a white external rendered finish, featuring UPVC windows and doors and red clay tiled roofs. However, it is considered that a brickwork finish would be more appropriate in this location, this can be secured by condition.

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

6.2 Residential Amenity

6.2.1 The proposed development will extend to within 1.5 metres of the southern boundary with shared with No.79 Lodge Avenue, projecting 1 metre beyond the rear wall of the donor property.

6.2.2 It is noted that a 45 degree angle would be maintained from the corner of the donor property to the proposed new dwellings. Given the separation distance and orientation of the properties, which are to the north of the donor house, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in unacceptable loss of daylight/sunlight or levels of overlooking or loss of privacy. Consequently the
proposals comply with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD 2011 which seek to maintain residential amenity.

6.3 Internal Design

6.3.1 In accordance with the Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard, 4 person 3 bedroom 2 storey dwellings require a minimum gross internal floor area of 84sqm.

6.3.2 Each of the proposed new dwellings has a gross internal floor area of approximately 85sqm. Whilst no dedicated storage space is indicated it is not considered that this materially affects the overall functionality of the dwellings which would still provide sufficient space for daily living.

6.4 External Amenity Space

6.4.1 Policy BP5 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD seeks to ensure that new dwellings provide appropriate levels of external private and/or communal amenity space. In this instance, the minimum standard for a 3 bed house is 60sqm. In addition, Policy BP5 requires rear gardens of houses to have a minimum depth of 12 metres.

6.4.2 Each proposed new dwelling provides a private amenity space of approximately 63sqm with a depth of 9 metres. The depth corresponds with the rear private amenity area of the donor property and that of the rear gardens of the neighbouring terrace and provides an acceptable level of garden space for future residents.

6.5 Parking

6.5.1 The application site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 2 which represents a low level of access to public transport links. Policy BR9 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD states that car parking standards set out in the London Plan will be used as maximum parking standards for new developments. The London Plan advises that for units of 3 bedrooms, up to 1.5 car parking space per unit may be provided. The footnote to table 6.2 advises that developments in areas of good public transport accessibility should aim for significantly less than 1 space per unit.

6.5.2 The proposed development faces directly onto a large amenity green and therefore it would not be reasonably practicable to provide a vehicular access onto Lodge Avenue. As such it is likely that the occupiers of the proposed development would rely upon on-street parking.

6.5.3 Officers share the view of the Transport Development Management Team that there are an adequate number of marked parking bays in the area, particularly fronting Lodge Avenue to satisfactorily accommodate the parking requirements of an additional 2 properties. Members are advised that paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. It is not considered that the proposed development would have such an impact.

7. Conclusion
7.1 In taking all matters into account the proposal is considered acceptable and accords with the aims and objectives of the relevant policies of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011) and is therefore recommended for approval.

Background Papers

- Planning Application File http://paplan.lbbd.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=OJOF9ZBLMH300

- Local Plan Policy

  Core Strategy Policies:

  Policy CP3 – High Quality Built Environment

  Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document:

  Policy BP5 – External Amenity Space
  Policy BP8 – Residential Amenity
  Policy BP11 – Urban Design
  Policy BR9 – Parking

  The London Plan 2016

  Policy 3.5 - Quality and design of housing developments
  Policy 3.8 – Housing Choice
  Policy 6.13 – Parking

  Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard
Boundary

Kitchen
Diner
Lounge

Boundary

Ground Floor Plan

Note typical Life Time Home Conversion

First Floor Plan

Bed 2
Bed 3
Bed 4
Bed 2

Bed 1

Bed 1

Technical Housing Standards
1. 3 bedroom (4 person) Houses
   86.5m²
2. Bedroom 1 - 12.0m²
3. 3m wide
3i. Bedroom 2 - 8.4m²
4. Bedroom 3 - 7.6m²
Each single bedroom exceeds 2.16m wide.
Storage area more than 2.5m².

Note: Life Time Home Provisions

Mr R. Nash

Land adjacent to: 79 Lodge Avenue

Proposed Plans
2 No. 3 bedroom Semi detached houses.
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DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD

3 July 2017

**Title:** Town Planning Appeals

**Report of the Development Management Manager, Regeneration Division**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Report</th>
<th>For Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wards Affected:</strong> Abbey, Alibon, Eastbrook, Eastbury, Heath, Longbridge, Whalebone</td>
<td><strong>Key Decision:</strong> No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Author:** Dave Mansfield, Development Management Manager

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

**Accountable Director:** John East, Growth and Homes

**Summary:**

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

**Recommendation(s)**

The Development Control Board is asked to note this report.

1. **Appeals Lodged**

   The following appeals have been lodged:

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

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

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

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

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

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

   d) **Subdivision of house into 2 one bedroom flats – 69 Salisbury Avenue, Barking (Ref: 16/01871/FUL)**
Application refused under delegated powers 25 January 2017 – Abbey Ward

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

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

2. Appeals Determined

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

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

Planning Inspectorate's Decision: Appeal dismissed 26 April 2017 (see attached)

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

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

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

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

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

Planning Inspectorate's Decision: Appeal dismissed 5 May 2017 (see attached)

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

Application refused under delegated powers 23 January 2017 for the following reason:
1. The first floor side/rear extension would partly close an important gap within the street scene which provides relief from the built up nature of the street. The proposed roof of the first floor side/rear extension would appear incongruous and out of keeping with the design of other terraces in Clare Gardens disrupting the appearance of the roofscape and resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene, and would therefore fail to maintain the character of the area and be harmful to the street scene and surrounding area. The proposed development is contrary to paragraph 56 of the NPPF, policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011) and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012).

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal allowed 16 May 2017 (see attached)

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

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 22 May 2017 (see attached)

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

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

1. The proposed side extension and roof design, including a combination of pitched and flat roofs, would be unsympathetic to that of the existing house. The side extension would also close off an important gap within the street scene which positively contributes to the spaciousness of the local area. The first floor of the proposed two storey side extension would not be sufficiently set back from the front wall of the house and would therefore not be subservient to the host semi-detached house and would harm the symmetry of the house and its adjacent twin. The proposed development would therefore fail to maintain the character of the area and would be harmful to the street scene, and is therefore contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011) and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012).

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 26 May 2017 (see attached)

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

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

1. The proposed bungalow, by reason of its siting and design constitutes an unacceptable form of backland development that is harmful to the character of
the area and out of keeping with the prevailing built form, contrary to Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy (July 2010), Policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011) and policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

3. The development cannot provide any off-street parking spaces and as such has resulted in an increase in existing parking pressures harmful to highway safety and contrary to Policies BR9 and BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and Policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2016.

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 26 May 2017 (see attached)

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

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

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

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 30 May 2017 (see attached)

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

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

1. The proposed development by virtue of its siting, layout and location would constitute an unacceptable form of backland development which would be accessed via an undesirable narrow footpath and represent inappropriate development of a residential garden that would materially reduce the open and spacious character of the garden of the application property and would be harmful to the character of the area and out of keeping with the prevailing built form, contrary to Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy (July 2010), Policies BP8 and

2. The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its proximity to the northern site boundary with number 76 Saville Road and the north facing orientation of the bedroom windows, would result in these rooms having a poor outlook and receiving limited sunlight detrimental to the living standards and amenities enjoyed by occupiers of the development, contrary to Policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011).

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

4. The proposed development would fail to provide any off-street parking for the dwelling and as such would result in an increase in existing parking pressures in Saville Road and access for emergency and refuse vehicles would be restricted by the increase in additional on-street parking and as such the proposal would be harmful and hazardous to pedestrian and highway safety and contrary to Policies BR9 and BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and Policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2015.

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 9 June 2017 (see attached)
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 Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2017

by Elaine Gray  MA(Hons) MSc IHBC
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/16/3165476
Annex to 1 Gay Gardens, Dagenham RM10 7TT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs F A Adeya against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 16/01306/FUL, dated 17 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2016.
- The development is conversion of existing outbuilding into two bedroom bungalow.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are: the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; the effect of the development on the living conditions of occupants, with particular regard to the provision of adequate internal space, and; the effect of the development on parking provision and highway safety in the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is located within the rear garden associated with the dwelling at 1 Gay Gardens. No 1 is an end-of-terrace dwelling with a footpath running to the south. On the southern boundary of the property is a tall concrete panelled wall which hides from view the majority of the appeal building, except for its low roof. To that extent, the visual impact of the development on the public realm is limited.

4. The Council’s first reason for refusal refers to the siting and design of the building as being harmful and out of keeping. However, it appears that the appeal building had already been constructed as an outbuilding under planning permission Ref 12/01004/FUL. The details of that scheme are not before me, and so I am unable to determine the extent to which the appeal scheme differs from the siting and design of the approved development, if at all.

5. Nonetheless, the prevailing pattern of development in the area is of terraced dwellings whose principle elevations face the road. They have small front garden areas, and larger private ancillary garden spaces to the rear. By dividing the rear plot of No 1 and forming a separate dwelling unit, with access...
from the side lane rather than the street, the appeal scheme is significantly at odds with the prevailing pattern of residential development within Gay Gardens. The residential use has undoubtedly intensified the use of the outbuilding, which no longer functions as an ancillary structure to the house. This change may be seen from the rear of No 1, and is likely to be perceptible from neighbouring properties in the close vicinity of the site. As a result, the development is uncharacteristic, incongruous, and out of keeping with its surroundings.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of other outbuildings in the vicinity of the appeal site. However, the details of these cases are not before me, and it is not clear if they are directly comparable. Moreover, there is no evidence to show that backland residences such as the appeal scheme are characteristic of the area. I can therefore afford little weight to this matter, and in any event, each case must be decided on its own merits.

7. I therefore conclude that the development is unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It thus conflicts with Policy BP11 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (DPD, March 2011) which amongst other things, requires that new development should protect or enhance the character and amenity of the area. It also conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which seeks to avoid the inappropriate development of residential gardens.

Living conditions

8. The Council has assessed the development on the basis that it is a two bedroom three person (2b3p) single storey unit. For such a development, Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (LP, March 2016) requires a minimum Gross Internal Area (GIA) of 61sqm. The appeal building provides a GIA of 59sqm, and so falls short of the minimum standard. It also lacks the 2sqm of built-in storage space required by the LP.

9. In addition, the Technical House Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS, March 2015) requires that a dwelling with two or more bedspaces should have at least one double (or twin) bedroom, which should have a floor area of at least 11.5sqm. However, neither of the two bedrooms within the development meet this requirement.

10. In falling short of these standards, the development fails to provide adequate internal space, thus unacceptably harming the living conditions of its occupants. I therefore conclude that it conflicts with DPD Policy BP11, insofar as it seeks to maintain residential amenity, and fails to accord with the relevant provisions of the LP and the NDSS.

Provision of parking space

11. Due to the constraints of the site, no off-street parking is provided for the new dwelling. It is therefore likely that occupants with cars will park their vehicles on the street on Gay Gardens, where parking appears to be unrestricted.

12. I accept that the development may lead to some increase, however modest, in the volume of cars parking on the street. However, it seems to me from my observations during my visit that the flow of traffic on the road is not particularly heavy. Also, it is likely that vehicles will be travelling at low speeds
as they approach the southern end of Gay Gardens, where there is no through route.

13. I am mindful of the provisions of the NPPF, which states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts are severe. I therefore find that whilst there may be some effect on parking conditions, there is no evidence to show that the overall effect on highway safety is so harmful as to warrant the withholding of permission. The proposal therefore accords with DPD Policy BR9, which amongst other things, sets out requirements to manage the impact of street parking. There is no conflict with DPD Policy BR10, which seeks to encourage sustainable transport.

Other Matters

14. I have had regard to the revised plans submitted by the appellant, which propose internal alterations to the dwelling to make it into a one bedroom unit. I accept that such a change would bring the GIA of the dwelling within the requirements of the LP. I note that no internal storage space is shown on the plans. Nonetheless, the revisions to the scheme would not overcome or outweigh the harm I have identified above.

15. The appellant argues that the main property at No 1 is in use as a small-scale HMO, and that the appeal scheme is therefore in keeping with the character of the main house. There is no evidence before me relating to the tenure of No 1, and in any case, this circumstance would not justify the harm I have identified. Furthermore, the aim of making efficient use of the land would not strike an acceptable balance with that harm.

Conclusion

16. Whilst I have found no evidence to show that the development compromises highway safety, I have concluded that it unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the area, and the living conditions of its occupants. For those reasons, and taking all other matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Gray

INSPECTOR
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2017

by Richard McCoy BSc MSc DipTP MRTP IHBC
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 30 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3171988
36 Stratton Drive, Barking IG11 9HJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Sultan Ahmed & Aneesa Hoque against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 16/01796/FUL, dated 14 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 10th January 2017.
- The development proposed is the erection of a second storey side extension and part double, part single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site contains a two storey end-of-terrace house on the western side of Stratton Drive, within the Leftley Estate. Proposed is the erection of a part first floor/part two storey side extension and a part single/part two storey rear extension.

4. I note the Council considered that the proposal would not harmfully change the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent dwellings in respect of overlooking, overshadowing and loss of outlook, and from my assessment I have no reason to disagree. However, the Council raised concerns that the proposed side extension would partially close off an important gap that provides relief from the built up nature of the street thereby failing to maintain the character of the area to the detriment of the street-scene.

5. I observed that there is a gap at 1st floor level of around 5 metres between nos. 36 and 38 which creates a visible break between the terraces, allowing a degree of openness into the street-scene and providing punctuation between the built form of the neighbouring terraces. The proposed side extension would be around 2.5 metres wide and would replace a single storey garage, extending the 1st floor and the hipped roof of the dwelling into the gap.
6. The Council’s adopted *Residential Extensions and Alterations* Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) advises that where gaps between buildings contribute positively to the character of the area it will be expected that the first floor side extensions are set off the boundary of the site. In my judgement, the proposed side extension would partially close the existing gap, detracting from the visual relief in the built form in a way that would be harmful to the spatial qualities of the street.

7. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policy BP11 of the adopted Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document which seeks to protect or enhance the character and amenity of the area, and the guidance in the SPD which advises that extensions should be designed so as to reflect the positive elements of the character of the area in which they are located.

8. While there are examples nearby of similar side extensions to that proposed, I observed that no. 36 and its neighbour beyond the gap at no.38 retain much of their original appearance to their front elevations. In my judgement, the addition of a side extension at no. 36 would close the break in development that defines the character of the estate as that of short terraces separated by small gaps. This would remove an attractive feature of the area, harming its character and appearance and would not be compensated for by gaps in the estate layout provided by intersecting roads.

9. Although neither party has invited me to consider a split decision, I note that the Council has not raised any objections in respect of the proposed rear extension. However, from the submitted details I am unable to be sure that the 2 parts of the proposal (the side and rear extensions) are clearly severable, both physically and functionally in terms of the rear part being capable of being built and then used for its intended purpose without the other part. For that reason I have not issued a split decision.

**Conclusion**

10. While I find that the proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, in my view this is outweighed by the harm the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the area. For the reasons given above, and noting the appellants’ claim that the proposal would serve to meet the need for larger family dwellings in the Borough and their frustration with the Council’s handling of the application, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Richard McCoy*

INSPECTOR
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2017

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTP
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 16 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3171057
45 Clare Gardens, Barking, IG11 9JH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Sayeed Zamil against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
- The application Ref 16/01717/FUL, dated 1 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2017.
- The development proposed is the construction of a first floor side and part rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a first floor side and part rear extension at 45 Clare Gardens, Barking, IG11 9JH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/01717/FUL, dated 1 November 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
   1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
   2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Block Plan, Drawing No KL/1016-1.
   3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area around Clare Gardens.

Reasons

3. No 45 is an end-terraced house situated on the eastern side of Clare Gardens. It currently has a single-storey, attached garage to the side which apparently has approval for conversion to living accommodation, in conjunction with a single-storey rear extension. There is a large rear dormer extension in place, which has involved a hip to gable roof conversion. The proposal would involve the construction of a first floor above the side extension and part of the rear extension. It would have a hipped roof to both the front and rear which would reflect the front slope of the existing roof.
4. The Council contends that the extension would partly close an important gap within the street scene which provides relief from the built up nature of the street. Policy BP8 of the Council’s Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) indicates that development should have regard to the local character of the area, while Policy BP11 of the DPD indicates that development should protect or enhance such character. The Council’s Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Extensions and Alterations, (SPD) notes that, in the case of end-terraced houses, where it is considered that the gaps between buildings contribute positively to the character of the area it will be expected that the first floor of proposed side extensions is set off the side boundary of the site.

5. In this case, Clare Gardens is characterised by long rows of terraces and there is only a small number of gaps between them. Whilst Nos 42 and 44, almost opposite the appeal property, have only single-storey side extensions, it would appear that almost all of the other gaps along the road are partly or completely filled with two-storey side extensions to one or both of the end houses. I do not consider, therefore, that the generally narrow gaps that still exist between certain buildings contribute positively to the character of this particular road. The most important gaps occur at the ends of the road and around the junction with The Drive, where houses are sited at 45 degrees around the bends in the road and a generally more open feel is thereby created.

6. The SPD also requires that a side extension should be designed so that the front elevation is parallel with the front elevation of the existing house, thus helping to maintain the built form of the terrace of which the house is a part. In this case the first-floor extension would be set in from the side boundary by around 0.4 metres, and it would continue the line of the front elevation of the house. On this basis, I consider that the proposed extension complies with the requirements of the SPD.

7. The Council also contends that the proposed roof of the extension would appear incongruous and out of keeping with the design of other terraces in Clare Gardens resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. However, the existing gable end with a large, highly visible dormer cheek, appears somewhat strident in the street scene, and the hipped nature of the proposed extension would help to moderate this effect somewhat, to the benefit of the appearance of the house in the context of its surroundings. It would also respect the generally hipped roof character of the houses along the road.

8. Finally, the Council makes note of a number of planning appeal decisions where the protection of gaps along a road has been a determining feature in dismissing appeals. In these examples, however, it would appear that wide gaps were a significant feature in the street scene and were, moreover, more numerous than is the case along Clare Gardens.

Conclusion

9. In conclusion, I find that the proposed extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area around Clare Gardens. The gaps between rows of terraces do not, in this case, contribute positively in establishing the character of the area. It would not, therefore, conflict with Policies BP8 or BP11 of the DPD, or with guidance in the SPD.
Conditions

10. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook
INSPECTOR
This page is intentionally left blank
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2017

by Diane Fleming  BA (Hons) MRTPi

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

Decision date: 22 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/C/16/3162284

63 Salisbury Avenue, Barking, Essex IG11 9XQ

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal is made by Mr Richard Schwartz against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The enforcement notice was issued on 4 October 2016.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the unauthorised erection of an independent residential unit at the rear of the property.
- The requirements of the notice are:
  - Remove the unauthorised independent residential unit at the rear of the property;
  - Remove all alterations and fixtures related to the independent residential unit at the rear of the property; and
  - Remove all subsequent waste material from the independent unit at the rear of the property.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is three months.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

Decision

1. It is directed that the enforcement notice is corrected by: the deletion of the third reason for refusal, the deletion of the reference to Policy 3.8 in the fifth reason for refusal and its replacement with Policy 3.5; and varied by the insertion of ‘arising’ after ‘material’ and ‘demolition of the’ after ‘the’ in the third step. Subject to these corrections and variations the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld, and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

Procedural Matter

2. A site visit was arranged for 12.40am on Tuesday 21 February 2017. The appellant’s agent was informed about this on 12 January 2017 and the letter setting out the details of the site visit was sent by email, as the agent had indicated on the appeal form that this was her preferred method of contact. The letter set out that it was important that the agent make arrangements for the Inspector to be met at the site to enable the inspection to be made. If the agent could not attend then she was to arrange for someone else to take her place and if that was not possible she was to inform the Planning Inspectorate.

3. On the day of the site visit neither the agent nor another representative met the Inspector at the site and the Inspector had not been advised of any other arrangements. The Inspector had been met at the site by a representative
from the Council who knocked at the front door of the premises and spoke to a
tenant. He advised that there were tenants in the building at the bottom of the
garden and that it was possible to knock at the door of the building by walking
along the pathway that ran along the rear of the properties in the terrace.
Both tenants opened the door, in turn, after being roused, but knew nothing
about the visit. The Council officer telephoned the agent but it appeared she
was unable to contact the tenants who declined to permit the Inspector to
enter the building. The visit was then aborted.

4. Paragraph B.9 onwards of the Procedural Guide: Enforcement Notice Appeals,
England\(^1\) states that visits to the appeal site are normally carried out to enable
the Inspector to assess the impact of the development on its surroundings. In
this case the appeal has been made solely on ground (a) and the Procedural
Regulations\(^2\) permit a decision being made taking into account only such
written representations as have been submitted within the time limits. Having
looked at the building and its surroundings from the public domain, I am
satisfied that it is not necessary to arrange a second visit and I am content that
I have all of the evidence to enable me to make a decision taking into account
only the written representations.

The Notice

5. An enforcement notice must enable every person who receives a copy to know
what constitutes the breach of planning control, the reasons for issuing it and
what they must do to put it right. In this case the third reason for issuing the
notice refers to the negative impact of the ‘industrial’ use on present and future
occupants of the property. As the allegation relates to the erection of a
detached building used for residential purposes it appears this reason is at
variance with the other stated reasons.

6. It is open to me to correct the notice, in the interests of clarity, but this can
only be done provided there is no injustice to either party. I believe this would
not occur for the following reasons. Reference to noise and disturbance in the
third reason is covered in the second reason for issuing the notice and so the
Council’s case is not diminished. The appellant’s grounds address all the
relevant matters raised in the reasons for issuing the notice, including the
matter of noise and disturbance. I will therefore direct that the notice be
corrected by the deletion of the third reason.

7. The notice refers to Policy 3.8, Housing Choice, of The London Plan (TLP).
However, it is apparent from the Council’ Statement of Case (SoC) that they
are relying on Policy 3.5, Quality and Design of Housing Developments. This is
because Policy 3.5 is quoted in their SoC and they refer to minimum space
standards from the table accompanying the policy. As the appellant is also
aware of the minimum space standards and refers to TLP there would be no
injustice caused if I were to direct that the notice be corrected accordingly.

8. The requirements of the notice are not clear as the third step is ambiguous. I
will therefore vary the notice to remove this ambiguity. There would be no
injustice or prejudice to either party if I were to do this as the requirement
remains and it is no more onerous for the appellant.

---

\(^1\) Published 23 March 2016
The ground (a) appeal and the deemed planning application

Main Issues

9. The main issues are the effect of the development on i) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area; ii) the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, having regard to noise and disturbance; and iii) the living conditions of occupiers of the building, having regard to the standard of accommodation provided.

Reasons

Character and appearance

10. The appeal concerns a two storey, mid terrace, Victorian house which is situated in a residential area. Salisbury Avenue and surrounding roads are laid out in a grid pattern and contain similar properties. Rear gardens are shallow in depth and some are accessed from narrow pathways found at the end of each terrace of houses. Properties situated on the corner of a road often have a garage erected in the rear garden accessed from the adjacent road. Otherwise detached buildings, as has been built at the appeal site, are not generally prevalent in the area. Many of the houses have undergone changes over time with the replacement of doors and windows and the erection of small extensions. The homogeneity of the area though largely remains and this contributes towards the agreeable appearance of the surroundings.

11. The Council allege that the appellant has erected a detached outbuilding at the rear of the garden which is used as an independent residential unit. The appellant however states that a certificate of lawfulness was first granted for the erection of the outbuilding and the plans show that this was to be for a gym/studio with a shower, basin and toilet. This had a doorway opening on to the rear access path and a doorway and windows opening onto the garden. After it was built the appellant states that it was converted into residential use with a kitchen/living/dining area, one bedroom and a bathroom and includes a plan of the layout with his appeal. As no appeals have been submitted on any other grounds I will determine the ground (a) appeal and the deemed planning application based on the description of development as set out in the notice.

12. The outbuilding is finished in brick and has a flat roof. It occupies the full width of the plot and a significant proportion of the rear garden, leaving 45 sq m for use as a garden as agreed between the parties. The appellant states that the footprint of the outbuilding is 31.9 sq m and that it has a height of 2.5m. The Council do not disagree. The PVCu doorway opening onto the narrow, rear access path is half glazed with obscure glass and the adjacent PVCu windows either side of it, of which one serves a bathroom, are also obscure glazed. The outbuilding has no street frontage and is sited towards the end of the rear access path that skirts alongside No 1 Rosslyn Road and which serves a number of other properties.

13. I find the siting of the appellant’s development causes harm as it is at odds with the surrounding residential layout. This is because there is a clear distinction between main elevations overlooking the public realm and secondary elevations enclosing a private realm. As well as intruding into the private realm, the building also occupies a significant proportion of the rear...
garden, due to its size. This results in a loss of openness along the rear of this particular row of properties where gardens are already restricted in size due to the layout of the houses. Whilst some nearby properties also have outbuildings, such as those at Nos 67 and 69 Salisbury Avenue, which are each on the corner of Rosslyn Road, they generally do not occupy the same depth of garden and they appear to have smaller footprints.

14. The development also results in an over intensive use of the site which is out of scale and character with the prevailing pattern of development in the area. This is because outbuildings, where they exist, seem to be used for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house.

15. For these reasons I conclude that the development has an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The development therefore does not accord with Policy BP8 of the Council’s Boroughwide Development Policies Development Plan Document, adopted March 2011 (DPD). This policy expects all development to have regard to the local character of the area and I give it weight as it is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework’s (the Framework) requirement for good design.

Living conditions, noise and disturbance

16. The Council are concerned that, having regard to the siting of the building, the residential use causes unacceptable levels of disturbance. This has an adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the main dwelling and neighbouring properties, which are in close proximity. Residents access the building from the rear access path, passing along the rear of a number of properties. I find that there is a difference in the character of the occupation of the building when it is used on a permanent residential basis, which is far more intense, especially in a small garden, from that when used for incidental purposes. This has not gone unnoticed, even though the appellant states that there has been no noise disturbance, and has resulted in the issue of the notice.

17. For these reasons I conclude that the development has an adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, having regard to noise and disturbance. The development therefore does not accord with Policy BP8 of the DPD which expects existing occupiers not to be exposed to unacceptable levels of noise and general disturbance. This element of the policy is consistent with the Framework’s requirement for a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Living conditions, standards of accommodation

18. I consider the main limitations on the suitability of the building for residential use are its size, layout and access to any private outdoor space. It appears that the outbuilding is rented out to two people. Based on the size of the bedroom, the Council state that the minimum gross internal area (GIA) should be at least 50 sq m for a one bedroom self-contained unit. The appellant does not disagree but suggests the accommodation could be improved by converting it into a studio.
19. TLP was updated\(^3\) prior to the issue of the notice. The relevant required living space standard is either 39 sq m for a one person/one bedroom dwelling or 50 sq m for a two person/two bedroom dwelling. There is no standard for studio housing. The supporting text to Policy 3.5 of TLP sets out that these are minimum standards which developers are encouraged to exceed. In this case I find that there is a significant shortfall between what is provided and the relevant minimum standard which is aimed at ensuring that new residential development is designed and built to provide a suitable environment that will promote healthy living.

20. In particular, the layout is extremely cramped with all rooms being accessed from the narrow kitchen and there is no dedicated internal storage space as required by Policy 3.5. Ceiling heights are low as the overall height of the building is 2.5m and the table accompanying Policy 3.5 states that a minimum ceiling height of 2.5m is encouraged for at least 75% of the GIA. This is so that new housing is of adequate quality, especially in terms of light, ventilation and sense of space. Obscure glazing is used to light one habitable room from which the outlook towards the narrow rear access path is onto a high garden wall where there is little privacy due to there being no set back from the boundary of the property. The other habitable room is directly overlooked by the occupiers of the main house due to the shallow depth of the remaining garden.

21. The poor level of internal accommodation in the building is compounded by the seemingly total lack of private outdoor space for activities such as drying washing, storage of refuse and relaxing outside in good weather. The appellant suggests that this could be remedied by subdividing the remaining garden but the Council state that the proposed 10 sq m space for the outbuilding shown on the appellant's plan would be inadequate. I agree as the space would amount to little more than a yard and would be insufficient to enable outdoor activities to take place. Furthermore the area left as a garden for the main dwelling on the site would be seriously diminished, adversely affecting the space needed for the activities carried out by the occupiers of that building. The appellant submits that there is a need for residential accommodation in the borough but I consider that this does not outweigh the provision of such a low standard of accommodation.

22. The Council are also concerned that the quality of the construction does not meet a high standard of sustainable design, lifetime home standards or the future changing needs of occupiers. The appellant states that the outbuilding not only has cavity walls, double glazing and achieves the U-values required by building regulations but it also has a completion certificate. The appellant could also obtain a sustainability report to demonstrate its sustainability credentials.

23. However, the Council state that the completion certificate is for an outbuilding for non habitable use and the design of the outbuilding shown on the plans deposited with building control was not considered to be fit for human habitation. I have also not been provided with a copy of a sustainability report. Whilst the property could possibly be adapted internally to meet the future changing needs of occupiers, this would not overcome the other identified serious shortfalls in the overall standard of the accommodation.

---

\(^3\) Housing Standards Minor Alterations to the London Plan March 2016, these reflect the adoption of the Technical Housing Standards: National described space standard, introduced by DCLG in 2015
24. In their SoC the Council also refer to the increased demand for on street parking created by the development but as this was not stated as being a reason for issuing the notice I am unable to consider it without causing injustice to the appellant.

25. For the reasons given I conclude that the standard of accommodation provided is severely inadequate and thereby harmful for occupiers of the building. The development therefore does not accord with Policies BR1 and BC2 of the DPD and Policy 3.5 of TLP. These require, amongst other matters, that all developments are expected to meet high standards of sustainable design and that homes should be accessible and adaptable.

26. The Council also submit that the appellant sought to conceal his development. They allege he deliberately applied for a certificate of lawfulness and subsequent building regulation approval for the general erection of a building when his intention was to use it for something else. They also state his agent confirmed that he knew planning permission would be required for the development if it was to be used for residential purposes. However, in order to succeed in this respect the Council would need to demonstrate that the appellant had acted in such a way as to positively deceive the Council. Based on the evidence I consider his behaviour appears to have been deceitful and he may have taken a calculated risk but he did not attempt to hide the building from public view. As such, I consider his actions cannot be described as resulting in 'intentional unauthorised development'.

27. It follows from my conclusions on the main issues that the appeal on ground (a) fails and that planning permission will not be granted.

Conclusion

28. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice with corrections and variations and refuse to grant planning permission on the deemed application.

D Fleming

INSPECTOR
Appeal Decision
Site visit made on 2 June 2017
by Elaine Gray  MA(Hons) MSc IHBC
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government
Decision date: 09 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/17/3171573
82 Saville Road, Chadwell Heath RM6 6DT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Ms Saira Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 16/00948/FUL, dated 20 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2016.
- The development proposed is new single storey dwelling.

Decision
1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters
2. Plans 1517-02 (proposed ground floor plan) and 1517-03 (proposed elevations) were submitted with the planning application, and so have formed the basis of my consideration of the appeal. Subsequently, the appellant has submitted amended plans 1517-02a (proposed ground floor plan) and 1517-03a (proposed elevations) to address some of the issues raised, and I have also taken these into consideration.

Main Issues
3. The main issues are: the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; whether the proposal would provide adequate living conditions for future occupants, with particular regard to outlook, sunlight, internal floorspace and layout, and; the effect of the proposal on parking provision and highway safety in the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance
4. The appeal site is located within a predominantly residential area, and forms part of the garden of 82 Saville Road. Within the area, the pattern of development is informal, and the houses in the vicinity comprise semi-detached pairs, terraces, and detached dwellings. There is a mixture of sizes and styles of dwellings.

5. The site itself is within a large L-shaped garden, and is generally screened from public view. The size of the existing plot at No 82 reflects the characteristic openness and spaciousness of the gardens in the area. The development
would result in the subdivision of the plot, and the construction of the new dwelling within its own garden, to the rear of No 82.

6. I accept that the proposed materials of the elevations would reflect those used nearby. However, the prevailing pattern of development in the area is of dwellings whose principle elevations face the road. By dividing the garden plot of No 82 and forming a separate dwelling unit, the appeal scheme would be significantly at odds with the characteristic form of residential development. I saw no other properties in the surroundings that lack a significant road frontage. The development as proposed would not reflect or respect the grain of development and would appear as a form of backland development, wholly out of keeping with the established character.

7. The tight, long access path and the backland siting of the dwelling would appear as a cramped form of residential infilling that would be unacceptably harmful to the character of the area. It would also reduce the openness of the land to the rear of the frontage dwellings. In terms of design, the development would be single storey in order to avoid harm to the amenity of neighbours. However, such a roof form would not be typical of the area, which is characterised primarily by pitched or hipped roofs.

8. I therefore conclude that the development would harmfully fail to preserve the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and so would conflict with Policy CP3 of the Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy (CS, July 2010), insofar as it requires that development should respect and strengthen local character.

9. The appellant argues that the new building would be subordinate to the built form of the locality, and would reflect the introspective nature of the site. However, the need to restrict the height of the new dwelling highlights the awkwardness of the site layout, and the incompatibility of the design with the character of the neighbouring dwellings. I accept that the garden plot of the development would provide sufficient amenity space, and scope for hard and soft landscaping. However, these factors have not led me to a different conclusion.

**Living conditions**

10. The Technical House Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS, March 2015) requires a minimum area of 117sqm for a single storey building of four bedrooms accommodating eight people. The new dwelling would provide a gross internal floor area of 114sqm, and would thus fall short of this requirement. The development would therefore be overly confined in terms of internal living space, which would be deleterious to the living conditions of future occupants.

11. The new dwelling would be sited with its main elevations facing north and south. All four bedrooms would be located to the rear, and so their aspect would be northwards. The separation distance between the bedroom windows and the area boundary of the plot would be approximately 4.1m. I accept that the relevant policies do not give specific guidance on separation distances to boundaries. However, the sole outlook from the bedroom windows would be overly constrained by the close proximity of the boundary fence at just over 4m from the north elevation. As a result, there would be an unacceptable sense of enclosure and confinement for future occupants whilst using the bedrooms.
12. Drawing these factors together, I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably fail to provide adequate living conditions for future occupants. It would thus conflict with Policy BP11 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (DPD, March 2011), insofar as it seeks to maintain residential amenity, and Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (LP, March 2016), which amongst other things requires housing development to be of the highest quality internally, and requires adherence to the relevant standards of the NDSS.

13. The Council is also concerned about the lack of sunlight to the proposed bedrooms. These north-facing rooms would experience very little direct sunlight during the day. However, the main aspect of the dwelling would be to the south, and the living areas and front garden would receive good amounts of sunlight during the day. Therefore, the overall levels of sunlight experienced by the occupants would be adequate. That being the case, in my view, the lack of sunlight to the bedrooms would not in itself be so harmful as to warrant the refusal of planning permission. The appellant contends that the bedrooms would receive sufficient natural daylight, and I agree with that position.

14. In response to the Council’s concerns regarding the lack of internal storage within the original scheme, a revised floor plan has been submitted which shows incorporated internal storage. Similarly, access to the toilet room adjacent to proposed bedroom four would be taken from the living area, which would overcome concerns about access to those facilities for visitors. I am therefore satisfied that these two specific issues could be satisfactorily addressed, in the event that the scheme were to be found otherwise acceptable.

Parking provision and highway safety

15. Policy BR9 provides that the car parking standards set out in the London Plan will be used as maximum requirements for new development. The appeal site is located in an area which achieves a PTAL rating of 2, which is regarded as ‘poor’. For a new dwelling of four bedrooms or more, a maximum of two car parking spaces would be required. Due to the proposed layout, there would be no scope for dedicated parking within the appeal site, and so occupants with cars would be obliged to park their vehicles on the street within the surrounding area.

16. I accept that the development would lead to some increase in the volume of cars parking on the street. However, there is no substantive evidence before me to show that the additional demand from this modest development would be so harmful as to warrant the withholding of planning permission.

17. However, the Council’s Development Management Team has raised concerns in terms of access to the site for emergency vehicles, particularly fire appliances. They highlight the need for vehicle access for a pump appliance to within 45m of all points of a dwellinghouse. The appellant has not demonstrated how the development would meet that stipulation. I am further concerned that, with no vehicle access to the new dwelling, it would be difficult for an ambulance to attend the property in a medical emergency, which would be hazardous for future occupants.

18. Amongst other things, Policy BR10 requires the provision of waste facilities in appropriate locations with appropriate access for site servicing. In this case,
there is no indication within the submissions of where waste and recycling bins would be stored, and how they would be accessed for collection. It is likely that the narrow access path would pose difficulties, obliging occupants to bring bins a significant distance to the footpath for collection. In the absence of detailed evidence, I am unable to be certain that suitable provision could be made in this regard.

19. Furthermore, failure to provide adequate access for emergency vehicles, or to provide refuse storage facilities within a reasonable distance of the road, could be unacceptably harmful to highway safety. Taking these factors together, I conclude that the development would harmfully conflict with Policy BR10, insofar as it relates to health, highway safety, accessibility, and the provision of waste facilities.

Other matters

20. I note that the new dwelling would include sustainable features, for example, an air source heat pump, underfloor heating, and triple glazing. There would also be the possibility of incorporating a green sedum roof. However, these measures would not be sufficient to overcome my concerns regarding the overall acceptability of the scheme.

21. I agree that the proposal would make a contribution, albeit modest, to the housing supply. However, the weight of this small benefit would not be sufficient to justify the harm I have identified above. I acknowledge the appellant’s contention that the large garden plot is largely unused and difficult to maintain. However, this circumstance has not led me to a different conclusion on the main issues of the case.

Conclusion

22. I have found in the appellant’s favour in terms of parking provision, sunlight and internal layout, which could be satisfactorily addressed with revisions to the submitted scheme. However, I have concluded that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and to highway safety and the living conditions and wellbeing of future occupants. For those reasons, and taking all other matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Gray

INSPECTOR
The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.

The appeal is made by Mr Michael Hegarty against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.

The application Ref 16/01510/FUL, dated 24 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2016.

The development proposed is erection of two storey side and rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site at 83 Meadow Road is located within a predominantly residential area. It forms one of a pair of two storey semi-detached dwellings which are located in a prominent position facing the junction between Meadow Road and Merton Road. The development would result in the construction of a two storey side and rear extension to No 83.

4. The Council’s document entitled 'Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document' (SPD, February 2012) sets out guidelines for extensions to residential properties. It states that, in the case of semi-detached houses, the gap with the neighbouring property can contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area. Side extensions should therefore be set off from the side boundary of the site.

5. The character of the area is informed by the distinctive layout whereby longer runs of terraces are interspersed by pairs of semi-detached dwellings which occupy corner plots, and are set at an angle to the neighbouring terraces. The gaps between the groups of dwellings are an important element of the layout of the area. In particular, the corner plots tend to be more generous, adding to the spacious, suburban quality of the surroundings.

6. In this case, a separation distance of only around 0.1m would remain between the new extension and the north-west site boundary of the garden, nearest to the neighbouring 81 Meadow Road. By largely infilling the plot, the
development would appear bulky and cramped within the site, and would substantially reduce the existing openness at the side of No 83.

7. The SPD also states that extensions should be subordinate to the existing building, and should be set in by 1m at first floor level. Whilst the roof line of the development would be set down by a small distance from the existing roof height, the front elevation would be set in by only 0.5m. The extension would thus fall short of the SPD recommendation, and would fail to achieve a sufficient degree of visual subordination to No 83. Furthermore, it would disrupt the established building line which runs along the front elevations of 71-81 Meadow Road and meets the west corner of No 83. As a result, it would appear overly prominent in relation to the adjoining terrace.

8. Drawing these factors together, I find that the proposed development would be unacceptably harmful to the street scene, and would fail to maintain the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy BP8 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (DPD, March 2011), insofar as it requires all development to have regard to the local character of the area, and DPD Policy BP11, which amongst other things seeks to protect the character and amenity of the area. It would also be at odds with the guidelines set out in the SPD.

9. I accept that the design of the new extension would be in keeping with that of No 83, and that the roof form of the proposed extension would reflect that of the existing roof. The proposed materials of bricks or blocks, as described on the application form, would differ, but this could be controlled by way of a suitably worded condition, were the scheme to be found otherwise acceptable. I acknowledge that the extension would provide much needed living space for the occupants of No 83, but this would amount to a private benefit. None of these matters would outweigh the harm I have identified. Whilst No 83 is not listed, and is not located within a conservation area, the proposal must still be considered against the relevant development plan policies, which clearly apply to all new development.

10. For those reasons, and taking all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

_Elaine Gray_

INSPECTOR
**Appeal Decision**

Site visit made on 18 April 2017

by K R Saward  Solicitor

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

**Decision date:** 26 April 2017

**Appeal Ref:** APP/Z5060/C/16/3164876

116 Blake Avenue, Barking, Essex IG11 9SF

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal is made by Mr S A Hoque against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The enforcement notice was issued on 11 November 2016.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is the unauthorised construction of a loft conversion to the rear and side of the property.
- The requirements of the notice are:
  - Remove the unauthorised loft conversion.
  - Remove all waste material from the site.
  - Remove all fixtures and fittings to the unauthorised loft conversion.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is 3 months.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(f)&(g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

**Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

**Preliminary Matters**

2. The box was ticked on the original Appeal Form to indicate that an appeal was being made on ground (e) which is where a copy of the enforcement notice was not properly served as required by section 172(2) of the 1990 Act. No facts were submitted in support and so an appeal on that ground is bound to fail.

3. The appellant suggested that the development is permitted development thereby indicating a case was being brought on ground (c). This ground applies where the matters alleged in the notice do not constitute a breach of planning control. Householders do have permitted development rights to add to or alter the roof of a dwellinghouse as set out in Classes B and C of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015. In a ground (c) appeal the onus is on the appellant to demonstrate that the development is permitted. No evidence has been produced to show that it is. In addition, at least one limitation is not met because the highest part of the roof addition is higher than the highest part of the original roof. Therefore, it cannot be permitted development and a ground (c) appeal must fail.

4. The appellant also submits that the “development is older than 4 years” which would be an argument under ground (d) if it was too late to take enforcement
action. The appellant has not elaborated further to discharge the burden of proof upon him. A ground (d) appeal fails in consequence.

5. The appeal proceeds on grounds (f) and (g) only.

**Reasons**

**The appeal on ground (f)**

6. The ground of appeal is that the steps required by the notice to be taken are excessive.

7. The appeal property is an end of terrace house with a two storey side gable. The property has been extended in a variety of ways, but it is the ‘loft conversion’ which is the subject of the notice. This comprises a large flat roofed addition to the gabled roof.

8. The appellant says he accepts that the development has not been carried out in accordance with the approved plans which can easily be rectified by alterations to the side to form a gable roof. However, no details are provided of any planning permission with plans to illustrate the proposed alterations. In the absence of any supporting information I am unable to establish whether there is an obvious alternative to complete removal of the roof addition.

9. Although the Council suggests that if the works were brought within the tolerances of permitted development then it could be made acceptable, there is no indication of how that might be achieved. That being so, I cannot be satisfied that there are lesser steps capable of remedying the breach.

10. The appeal on ground (f) fails.

**The appeal on ground (g)**

11. No arguments have been made to explain why the appellant considers that the period of 3 months given to comply with the requirements of the notice falls short of what should reasonably be allowed.

12. Three months appears to be a reasonable timescale for the works to be arranged and undertaken. Without any submissions to justify a longer period the ground (g) appeal fails.

**Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

---

KR Saward

INSPECTOR
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2017

by Jameson Bridgwater PGDipTP MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 5 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/16/3164632
Land adjacent 476 Ripple Road, Barking, Essex IG11 9RY
- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Michael Ward against the decision of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
- The application Ref 16/01309/FUL, dated 18 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2016.
- The development proposed is described as ‘new detached two storey house’.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues in the appeal are:
   - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
   - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of adjoining residential properties, with particular regard to outlook and light; and
   - the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on a prominent corner at the junction of Ripple Road and Tudor Road. The proposal is to erect a detached dwelling in the side garden of No 476 Ripple Road (No 476), a semi-detached house. Further, the scheme includes the provision of off-street parking accessed from Tudor Road for both the proposed new dwelling and No 476.

Character and appearance

4. I accept that the layout, design and siting of the dwelling seeks to minimise the effect of the proposal on the adjoining properties and would contribute to meeting local housing demand. However, the proposal would project significantly beyond the established building line of Tudor Road at the prominent junction with Ripple Road and would therefore appear unduly dominant by reason of its siting and bulk. Consequently, the proposed dwelling would be at odds with the established linear layout of the road and would appear incongruous when compared to the existing pattern of development in the street scene.
5. Having reached the conclusions above, the proposal would result in material harm to character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it follows that the proposal would be in conflict with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan and Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies DPD. These amongst other things seek to ensure that development reflects and respects the character, setting and local context area including those features that contribute to local distinctiveness.

**Living conditions**

6. I have carefully considered the appellant’s representations with regard to outlook and light. I accept that there would be adequate separation from other properties in Tudor Road and in that respect the proposal would not appear overbearing or lead to a material loss of outlook or light. However, the introduction of the proposed dwelling approximately 1m from the flank wall of No 476 would result in a proposal that would be overbearing and result in a material loss of light to the windows on that elevation due to the limited separation and orientation. In reaching this conclusion I have taken account of the secondary nature of these windows, however, this does not overcome the harm that I have identified.

7. Having reached the conclusions above the proposal would result in material harm to living conditions of the occupants of No 476, with particular regard to outlook and light. It therefore follows that the proposal would be in conflict with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies DPD. These seek amongst other things to ensure that development safeguards the future amenity of residents.

**Highway safety**

8. The appellant has argued that the proposal would have a neutral effect on parking provision of vehicular parking in the area. However, even in this urban location with access to public transport, the introduction of a new dwelling would be likely to lead to a material increase in parking demand. Further, the layout and arrangement of the proposed off-road car parking spaces would be likely to result in the loss of existing dedicated on-street parking in an area that has high demand. Consequently, the scheme would be likely to increase parking demand overall, rather than simply displacing existing on-street parking, on to the proposed dedicated parking area, and therefore would result in material harm to the safety of pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

9. I accept that it is not uncommon to have off-street parking provision with limited sightlines and space for manoeuvring in urban areas. However, it has not been demonstrated that adequate visibility could be achieved for vehicles leaving the appeal site given the proximity to the junction of Ripple Road and Tudor Road. In the absence of such evidence I conclude that visibility could not be attained and the proposal would result in material harm to the safety of pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

10. The appellant has suggested that they are prepared to amend their scheme removing the off-street parking provision. However, I am mindful of the principles contained in the Wheatcroft decision and consider that the amendment is of a scale that the development would be so changed that if I was minded to allow the appeal and grant planning permission it would deprive
those who should have been consulted on the changed development of the opportunity of such consultation.

11. Having reached the conclusions above, the proposed development would be in conflict with Policy BR10 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies DPD which seeks amongst other things to ensure that development does not materially harm highway safety.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and having carefully considered all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jameson Bridgwater

INSPECTOR
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/00442/CDN</td>
<td>Permitted on 27 February 2017</td>
<td>LBBD</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 18 (hard and soft landscaping) and 27 (bird and bat bricks/boxes) in respect of Planning Permission 13/00229/FUL (Phase 1 only). Leys Redevelopment Site Wellington Drive Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00662/CDN</td>
<td>Permitted on 27 February 2017</td>
<td>Mr H Singh</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 3 (external materials), 4 (boundary treatment) and 8 (site investigation) in respect of planning permission 14/00326/FUL. 1146A Green Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 1BP</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01538/CDN</td>
<td>Permitted on 27 February 2017</td>
<td>Estuary Housing Association</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 4 (soft landscaping), 6 (hard landscaping) and 8 (boundary treatment) in respect of planning permission 13/01087/FUL. Land Adjacent To 50 Blake Avenue Barking Essex</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01730/CDN</td>
<td>Permitted on 27 February 2017</td>
<td>Semilarhus Development Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 3 (external materials) in respect of planning permission 15/00362/FUL. New Enterprise House High Road Chadwell Heath Essex</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00136/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>PRIOR6</td>
<td>Mr M Butcher</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extensions (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 19 Saville Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6DS</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00138/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>PRIOR6</td>
<td>Mr R Singh</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.7 metres and maximum height: 2.8 metres). 42 Farrance Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6EB</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00105/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>PRIOR6</td>
<td>Mr M F Sethi</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 4.0 metres). 119 Wilmington Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9TR</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 February 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01080/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Fenlock Investments Limited</td>
<td>Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 2 two storey three bedroom houses and 3 two storey two bedroom houses. Rear Of 5 - 7 Reede Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8DP</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01828/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Mr F Ahmed</td>
<td>Conversion of garage to habitable accommodation and erection of single storey rear/side extension and first floor side extension. 17 Westrow Drive Barking Essex IG11 9BH</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01945/ FUL</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Mr A Ali</td>
<td>Erection of single storey front/side/rear extension. 64 Lambourne Road Barking Essex IG11 9PT</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00001/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued</td>
<td>Mr B Nuhiallarii</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development. Loft conversion involving, construction of gable end roof and rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 76 Stamford Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4EU</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00002/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Andoh</td>
<td>Erection of single storey side and rear extension. 261 Porters Avenue Dagenham Essex RM9 4LX</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00003/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Mr B Nuhiallari</td>
<td>Erection of single storey front and two storey side extension. 76 Stamford Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4EU</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00135/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required</td>
<td>Mr A Basit</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 4.0 metres). 142 Heath Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6LD</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 March 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01962/ FUL</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Mr N Vasile</td>
<td>Erection of first floor side extension incorporating rear dormer window and single storey side/rear extension. 113 Hunters Hall Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8LH</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00004/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Orton</td>
<td>Erection of single storey side and rear extension. 28 Sandown Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 8XD</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00027/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 March 2017</td>
<td>Resco Investments</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 17 (acoustic protection scheme) and 18 (noise insulation to party walls) of planning permission granted by Planning Inspectorate (Ref: APP/Z5060/W/15/3140439 dated 7 April 2016) and 16/01482/FUL. 4 - 6 Ripple Road Barking Essex IG11 7PE</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00106/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 1 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr P Allet</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.5 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.1 metres). 34 Surrey Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8ES</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00118/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 1 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr K Singh</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.85 metres and maximum height: 3.3 metres). 34 Tenterden Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1PX</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00120/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 1 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr K Singh</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.85 metres and maximum height: 3.3 metres). 36 Tenterden Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1PX</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00137/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 2 March 2017</td>
<td>Ms M Sumah</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves 2.75 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 14 Joan Gardens Dagenham Essex RM8 1QX</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00129/ NMA</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 2 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr L Gaxha</td>
<td>Application for non-material amendment following grant of planning permission 16/01551/FUL to alter the pitched roof of the rear extension to a flat roof. 31 Western Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 8UD</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00503/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 3 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Junaid</td>
<td>Demolition of part of single storey rear extension and erection of conservatory. 29 Sutton Road Barking Essex IG11 7YD</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01881/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 3 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr T Mehmood</td>
<td>Demolition of side addition and erection of two storey side/rear extension. 60 Curzon Crescent Barking Essex IG11 0LA</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01893/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 3 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr E Pitt</td>
<td>Loft conversion involving alterations to side extension roof and erection of rear dormer window. 1 Ventnor Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9JY</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/00023/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 3 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr G Tanner</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 34 Bluebell Close Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0XN</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00025/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 3 March 2017</td>
<td>Dagenham Police And Community Boxing Club</td>
<td>Extension of single storey extension on roof to provide changing room. Dagenham Police And Community Boxing Club 220A Heathway Dagenham Essex RM10 8QS</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00028/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 3 March 2017</td>
<td>Mrs N Dey</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof and rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 68 Oglethorpe Road Dagenham Essex RM10 7RX</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00029/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 3 March 2017</td>
<td>Mrs N Dey</td>
<td>Erection of single storey front and rear extensions. 68 Oglethorpe Road Dagenham Essex RM10 7RX</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00148/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 3 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr B Zaman</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 3 Thicket Grove Dagenham Essex RM9 4NR</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00156/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 3 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr L Cunha</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.5 metres; height to eaves: 2.8 metres and maximum height: 2.9 metres). 11 Fitzstephen Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2YP</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

#### Regeneration and Economic Development

#### Development Control Board

**Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/00144/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 3 March 2017</td>
<td>Hema Patel</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.5 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 8 Melford Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9HT</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6 March 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01522/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 6 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Khyar</td>
<td>Erection of part single/part two storey side extension. 92 Upney Lane Barking Essex IG11 9LR</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01704/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 6 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr Okeke</td>
<td>Erection of two storey rear extension. 142 Heath Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6LD</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01970/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 6 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr P Fensome</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed use: Erection of single storey rear extension 36 Ivyhouse Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5RJ</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00034/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 6 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Pazdrazdis</td>
<td>Erection of single storey front extension, part single/part two storey side and rear extension and first floor rear extension. 100 Sterry Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8NT</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00035/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 6 March 2017</td>
<td>Sasa Homes Ltd</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed use: Use of single dwellinghouse as home for up to 6 people receiving care. 1 Stern Close Barking Essex IG11 0XW</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/00149/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>PRIOR6</td>
<td>Dilara Ali</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.1 metres). 52 Edgefield Avenue, Barking, Essex IG11 9JN</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00165/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>PRIOR6</td>
<td>Mr N Alom</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.25 metres). 20 Thornhill Gardens, Barking, Essex IG11 9TX</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00166/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>PRIOR6</td>
<td>Mr R Stoev</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.85 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 68 Waterbeach Road, Dagenham, Essex RM9 4AA</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01973/ FUL</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Pellumbi</td>
<td>Erection of single storey side and rear extension. 65 Eldred Road, Barking, Essex IG11 7YH</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01981/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued</td>
<td>Mr R Schwartz</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof with side window, rear dormer window and front rooflights. 361 Wood Lane, Dagenham, Essex RM8 3NR</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7 March 2017**
LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING AND DAGENHAM
REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD
Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/00020/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr J Singh</td>
<td>Demolition of rear projection and erection of single storey rear extension. 16 Dunkeld Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2PR</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00036/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Uddin</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 9 Whalebone Avenue Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6DA</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00140/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 7 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Hughes</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 3.23 metres; height to eaves: 2.7 metres and maximum height: 2.92 metres). 274 Rugby Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4AT</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 March 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01379/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 8 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr B Rogers</td>
<td>Erection of extension to warehouse building in rear yard. 4 Thames Road Barking Essex IG11 0JF</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01852/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 8 March 2017</td>
<td>Ms D Dabasia</td>
<td>Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and front rooflights. 117A Fanshawe Avenue Barking Essex IG11 8RF</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01940/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 8 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs A Patel</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 87 Heath Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6LH</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00031/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Mr S Rashid</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof and rear dormer window and installation of front rooflight. 108 Upney Lane Barking Essex IG11 9LR</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00041/FUL</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Mr T Ahmad</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 10 Helmore Road Barking Essex IG11 9PH</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00047/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Mr M Orton</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and two front rooflights 28 Sandown Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 8XD</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00092/LBC</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>LBBD – Mr A</td>
<td>Application for Listed Building Consent: Installation of two wall-mounted brackets to front elevation. Barking Magistrates Court 44 - 48 East Street Barking Essex</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 March 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeremy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01635/FUL</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Mr S Kumar</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 95A Stanley Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 1JL</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01853/ FUL</td>
<td>Application refused on 9 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Hussain</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side and part single/part two storey rear extension. 58 Melford Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9HT</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00051/ ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 9 March 2017</td>
<td>Insite Poster Properties Ltd</td>
<td>Replacement of 48-sheet advertising display with 48-sheet digital LED advertising display Adshell Outside Maybells Industrial Estate Ripple Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00052/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 9 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr J Badut</td>
<td>Erection of single storey front extension. 254 Woodward Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4TB</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00058/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 9 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Newman</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey rear extension. 117 Great Cullings Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0YP</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00059/ ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 9 March 2017</td>
<td>Co Op Food</td>
<td>Installation of 2 internally illuminated fascia signs, 4 non-illuminated wall mounted aluminium panels, 1 non-illuminated post mounted aluminium panel, 2 non-illuminated double sided post mounted aluminium panels and 1 double sided acrylic panel signs. Texaco Petrol Filling Station 402 - 410 Becontree Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 3UD</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00063/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 9 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr A W Chowdhury</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 37 Westrow Drive Barking Essex IG11 9BL</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00182/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 10 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr W Thomas</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 2.75 metres). 67 Wren Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5YL</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00185/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 10 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr W Mirza</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves and maximum height: 2.85 metres). 121 Victoria Road Barking Essex IG11 8PZ</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01066/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 March 2017</td>
<td>LBBD</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 32 (boundary treatment) in respect of phase 1 of planning permission 13/00229/FUL. Leys Redevelopment Site Wellington Drive Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00015/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 13 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr U Ali</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey side extension. 38 Mayesbrook Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2EB</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00070/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr B Singh</td>
<td>Erection of single storey front, side and rear extension. 57 Bastable Avenue Barking Essex IG11 0NG</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00071/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 13 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr M J U Din</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights.</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00181/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 13 March 2017</td>
<td>Mrs S Choudhry</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 2.9 metres). 853 Longbridge Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2DA</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00187/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 13 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr M K Ramay</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.83 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 116 Upney Lane Barking Essex IG11 9LR</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 March 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01665/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 14 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr K Meah</td>
<td>Erection of part single/part two storey side and rear extension. 103 Stevens Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2PU</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01998/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 14 March 2017</td>
<td>St Cedds Vicarage</td>
<td>Demolition of existing side addition and erection of single storey side extension to church. St Cedds Church Hall 185 Lodge Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 2HQ</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00074/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 14 March 2017</td>
<td>LBDD - Adults Care And Support (Operational)</td>
<td>Installation of handrails and ramp to front elevation. 38 Aldborough Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8AS</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00079/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 14 March 2017</td>
<td>Mrs A Aden</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 2 Dorrington Close Barking Essex IG11 9FD</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00080/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 14 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr L Gaxha</td>
<td>Installation of new first floor window to front elevation. 378 Heathway Dagenham Essex RM10 8NS</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**15 March 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01889/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 15 March 2017</td>
<td>Meadow Dagenham Retail Ltd and Travelodge Hotels Ltd</td>
<td>Erection of part 4/part 5 storey 77 room hotel including 269m2 of ground floor space to be used either as ancillary floorspace for hotel (Class C1) or as independent restaurant/cafe (Class A3) together with associated servicing, car parking and landscaping. Western Car Park Dagenham Leisure Park Cook Road Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00037/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 15 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr S John</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 4 Thicket Grove Dagenham Essex RM9 4NR</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00087/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 15 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Butcher</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 19 Saville Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6DS</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00312/NMA</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 15 March 2017</td>
<td>Hendrix Services</td>
<td>Application for non-material amendment following grant of planning permission 13/00303/FUL (internal alterations to flats). Beacon PH 201 Oxlow Lane Dagenham Essex RM10 7YA</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01944/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 16 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Sehmby</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and front rooflights. 64 Thatches Grove Romford Essex RM6 5LH</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/02027/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 16 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr G Bassi</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear/side extension. 462 Whalebone Lane North Romford Essex RM6 6RJ</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00019/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 16 March 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer windows. 462 Whalebone Lane North Romford Essex RM6 6RJ</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00057/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 16 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr M A Rahman</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 95 Markyate Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2LD</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00206/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 16 March 2017</td>
<td>Mrs V B Ahilan</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 51 Harrow Road Barking Essex IG11 7QZ</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00195/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 16 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Chaudhary</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.5 metres; height to eaves: 2.85 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 251 Valence Wood Road Dagenham Essex RM8 3AD</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00198/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 16 March 2017</td>
<td>Ms N Forbes</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.7 metres and maximum height: 3.7 metres). 117 Valence Circus Dagenham Essex RM8 3LS</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00241/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 16 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Albert</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.5 metres; height to eaves: 2.6 metres and maximum height: 2.75 metres). 127 Maybury Road Barking Essex IG11 0PG</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01892/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 17 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr J Uddin</td>
<td>Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window. 599 Becontree Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 3HP</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/02004/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 17 March 2017</td>
<td>Lagonda Finance Corp</td>
<td>Demolition of 5 garages on north boundary of site and creation of new vehicular access to the site from Rosemary Gardens Hassell's Garage 79 Whalebone Lane South Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Triptons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00054/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 17 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Hussain</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side and single storey rear extension. 80 Waldegrave Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2QD</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00056/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate refused on 17 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Rahman</td>
<td>Application for a Certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Use of shop as coffee shop. 7 Porters Avenue Dagenham Essex RM9 5YS</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00085/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate refused on 17 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Leigh</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of part gable end roof, rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 26 Movers Lane Barking Essex IG11 7UN</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00096/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 17 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Leigh</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 26 Movers Lane Barking Essex IG11 7UN</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00110/ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 17 March 2017</td>
<td>Coventry University London</td>
<td>Installation of 3 non-illuminated signs on the Civic Centre building (north, east and west elevations); 1 non-illuminated sign on the railings to the south of the Annexe building; 1 non-illuminated sign on the south elevation of the Annexe building; 4 flags in front of the Civic Centre; and 3 non-illuminated signs on the green in front of the Civic Centre. LB Barking And Dagenham Civic Centre Wood Lane Dagenham RM10 7BN</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00111/LBC</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 17 March 2017</td>
<td>Coventry University London</td>
<td>Application for Listed Building Consent: Installation of 3 non-illuminated signs on the Civic Centre building (north, east and west elevations); 1 non-illuminated sign on the railings to the south of the Annexe building; 1 non-illuminated sign on the south elevation of the Annexe building; 4 flags in front of the Civic Centre; and 3 non-illuminated signs on the green in front of the Civic Centre. LB Barking And Dagenham Civic Centre Wood Lane Dagenham RM10 7BN</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00236/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 17 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr H Ali</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.25 metres). 67 Stratton Drive Barking Essex IG11 9HD</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01910/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 20 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr H Kataria</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 14 (soft landscaping) in respect of planning permission 16/00368/FUL. Site Consisting Of Land To The Rear Of And Including 243 - 245 High Road Chadwell Heath Essex</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01969/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 20 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr M A Ahmed</td>
<td>Erection of single storey front and rear extension. 69 Upney Lane Barking Essex IG11 9LD</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00026/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 20 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Pandian</td>
<td>Erection of front porch and single storey side/rear extension. 131 Maybury Road Barking Essex IG11 0PG</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00081/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 20 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Schwartz</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 24 Hurstbourne Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9UX</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00093/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 20 March 2017</td>
<td>Mrs S Rashid</td>
<td>Erection of single storey side/rear extension. 59 Edgefield Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9JL</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00007/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 21 March 2017</td>
<td>Nanda Group Ltd</td>
<td>Installation of 5 first floor windows to rear and 1 first floor window to front of building. Bridge House 150 London Road Barking Essex IG11 8DA</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00231/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 21 March 2017</td>
<td>Mrs A Iliazi</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.85 metres and maximum height: 2.95 metres). 57 Standfield Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8JP</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00235/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 21 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr P Akerman</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 4.0 metres). 62 Dunkeld Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2PT</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00289/ NMA</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 21 March 2017</td>
<td>Auriga Holdings</td>
<td>Application for non-material amendment following grant of planning permission 16/00750/FUL (relocation and enclosure of plant and installation of 2 parasols over benches). KFC Unit 6 Merrielands Retail Park Merrielands Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 6SJ</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**22 March 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/00030/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 22 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Rashid</td>
<td>Demolition of rear extension and erection of part single/part two storey rear extension incorporating pitched roof to existing two storey side extension and conversion of garage to habitable accommodation. 108 Upney Lane Barking Essex IG11 9LR</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/00107/ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 22 March 2017</td>
<td>Auriga Holdings</td>
<td>Installation of 12 trough illuminated fascia panels (trekker cladding), 1 internally illuminated 8 metre high totem bucket sign, 2 non-illuminated directional ground signs, 1 LED illuminated menu board (4 door), 1 internally illuminated KFC Colonel logo sign, 6 internally illuminated white KFC letter signs with red highlights and 1 non-illuminated post mounted height restriction sign. KFC Unit 6 Merrielands Retail Park Merrielands Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 6SJ</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00113/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 22 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Jaiya</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 8 Oval Road South Dagenham Essex RM10 9DR</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00151/LBC</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 22 March 2017</td>
<td>Coventry University London</td>
<td>Application for Listed Building Consent: Change of use of building from local government offices (Class B1) to higher education institution (Class D1) involving internal alterations to building. LB Barking And Dagenham Civic Centre Wood Lane Dagenham Essex RM10 7BN</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00245/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 22 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Fernandez</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.2 metres). 17 Amesbury Road Dagenham Essex RM9 6AA</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00250/PRIOR6</td>
<td>PRIOR6</td>
<td>Mr M Saeed Baig</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 103 Whalebone Lane South Dagenham Essex RM8 1AJ</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00251/PRIOR6</td>
<td>PRIOR6</td>
<td>Mrs S R Begum</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.85 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 58 Salisbury Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9XR</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 March 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01639/FUL</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Dr M Ahmed</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side extension and single/two storey rear extensions in connection with conversion of dwelling to 1 one bedroom flat and 1 studio flat. 1 Shaw Gardens Barking Essex IG11 0UE</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01934/CDN</td>
<td>CDN</td>
<td>Mr H Kataria</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 13 (hard landscaping) in respect of planning permission 16/00368/FUL. Site Consisting Of Land To The Rear Of And Including 243 - 245 High Road Chadwell Heath Essex</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00072/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 23 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Auryla</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 82 Orchard Road Dagenham Essex RM10 9QA</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00133/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 23 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Gosz</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and installation of front rooflight. 11 Campsey Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4DS</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00141/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 23 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr S A Hoque</td>
<td>Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof and rear dormer window (retrospective) and erection of first floor side extension. 116 Blake Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9SF</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00252/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 23 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Rimkunas</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.7 metres and maximum height: 3.5 metres). 216 Billet Road Romford Essex RM6 5QR</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00351/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 23 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Joseph</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.5 metres). 63 Upney Lane Barking Essex IG11 9LD</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00271/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and Permission refused on 23 March 2017</td>
<td>Naresh Polthel</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.7 metres and maximum height: 3.2 metres). 7 South Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6YD</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING AND DAGENHAM
### REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
#### DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD
### Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/00272/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 23 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Ahmed</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.85 metres and maximum height: 3.075 metres). 267 Porters Avenue Dagenham Essex RM9 4LX</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00048/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 24 March 2017</td>
<td>LBBD</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 46 (piling/foundation designs) of 13/00229/FUL (Phase 2) Leys Redevelopment Site Wellington Drive Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00143/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 24 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Jalali</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of outbuilding in rear garden. 45 Haskard Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5XR</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01922/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 27 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr H Kataria</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 15 (lighting and crime prevention measures) in respect of planning permission 16/00368/FUL. Site Consisting Of Land To The Rear Of And Including 243 - 245 High Road Chadwell Heath Essex</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING AND DAGENHAM**  
**REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**  
**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD**  
**Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/01994/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued 27 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr I Latif</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and front rooflights. 66 Thatches Grove Romford Essex RM6 5LH</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00021/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 27 March 2017</td>
<td>Wates Construction</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 34 (community use scheme) in respect of planning permission 15/00598/FUL. Eastbrook Comprehensive School Dagenham Road Dagenham Essex RM10 7UR</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00084/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 27 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Eagleson &amp; Ms F Lamcja</td>
<td>Erection of a single storey front extension and a two storey side extension 3 Ivy Walk Dagenham Essex RM9 5RX</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00155/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 27 March 2017</td>
<td>Mrs H Awal</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 10 Ely Gardens Dagenham Essex RM10 7BE</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00161/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 27 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr G Panesaer</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of outbuilding in rear garden. 78 Stratton Drive Barking Essex IG11 9HD</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/00163/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 27 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr H Kataria</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 16 (refuse stores) in respect of planning permission 16/00368/FUL. Site Consisting Of Land To The Rear Of And Including 243 - 245 High Road Chadwell Heath Essex</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00169/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 27 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr H Kataria</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 17 (cycle stores) in respect of planning permission 16/00368/FUL. Site Consisting Of Land To The Rear Of And Including 243 - 245 High Road Chadwell Heath Essex</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00283/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required and permission refused on 27 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr K Ahmed</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 13 Bastable Avenue Barking Essex IG11 0NF</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00286/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required and permission refused on 27 March 2017</td>
<td>Mrs M Khatun</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 56 Stratton Drive Barking Essex IG11 9HH</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00488/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 27 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr J Carpio</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 75 Devon Road Barking Essex IG11 7QX</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING AND DAGENHAM
REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD
Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/00499/FAST</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 27 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr J Carpio</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 75 Devon Road Barking Essex IG11 7QX</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/02011/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 28 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr H Brar</td>
<td>Erection of two storey 1 bedroom house. 35 Bainbridge Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5UU</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00112/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 28 March 2017</td>
<td>Mrs B Kaur</td>
<td>Erection of first floor side and rear extension and installation of new window to front elevation. 6 Stanhope Gardens Dagenham Essex RM8 3DL</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00122/ FUL</td>
<td>Refused on 28 March 2017</td>
<td>Mrs A Edwin-Lamerton</td>
<td>Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a part single/part two storey side extension. 4 Dronfield Gardens Dagenham Essex RM8 2YD</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00276/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 28 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Okonkwo</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 255 Hedgemans Road Dagenham Essex RM9 6BX</td>
<td>Gorebrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00277/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 28 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Rambissoon</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.8 metres and maximum height: 2.9 metres). 25 Ivinghoe Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2NB</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/01628/FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 29 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr L Prendi</td>
<td>Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and formation of new front entrance to serve existing first floor flat. 33 Muggeridge Road Dagenham Essex RM10 7BG</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01888/FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 29 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr H Edebiri</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side extension and single storey front and rear extensions. 105 Arnold Road Dagenham Essex RM9 6AN</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01925/FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 29 March 2017</td>
<td>Gima UK Ltd</td>
<td>Erection of extension to warehouse. Unit 4 Rima House Ripple Road Barking Essex IG11 0RH</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00038/FUL</td>
<td>Refused on 29 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Iqbal</td>
<td>Erection of part single/part two storey side and rear extension. 216 Sterry Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8PT</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00130/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 29 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr J Groom</td>
<td>Erection of part single/part two storey side and rear extensions and single storey front extension. 123 Holgate Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8ND</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00131/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 29 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr B Zaman</td>
<td>Erection of front porch and front extension, conversion of garage to a habitable room and erection of single storey rear and side extension. 3 Thicket Grove Dagenham Essex RM9 4NR</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00175/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 29 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Jebeili</td>
<td>Erection of outbuilding in rear garden and erection of front railings and gates (maximum height 1.42 metres). 53 Wood Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 3ND</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00284/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 29 March 2017</td>
<td>Ms R Begum</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.75 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 6 St Giles Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 9TB</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00305/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and Permitted refused on 29 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Zeeshan</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.85 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 12 Mayswood Gardens Dagenham Essex RM10 8UU</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/00315/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and Permitted refused on 29 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr D O Oladele</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.5 metres). 8 Heathway Dagenham Essex RM10 9PP</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01992/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 30 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Ishaq</td>
<td>Erection of two storey 2 bedroom dwelling. 12 Hainault Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6BJ</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00178/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 30 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr K Kaur Khossa</td>
<td>Retention of outbuilding in rear garden. 12 Burlington Gardens Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6EL</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01755/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 31 March 2017</td>
<td>Wates Construction Limited</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 4 (soft landscaping) in respect of planning permission 15/00595/FUL. Eastbury Community School Rosslyn Road Barking Essex IG11 9UH</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01995/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 31 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr E Dunlea</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side extension. 13 Rusholme Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 7NX</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00046/REG3</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 31 March 2017</td>
<td>LBBD - Mr C Millican</td>
<td>Erection of side extension up to 3 storeys in height and alterations to rear appearance in connection with conversion of first and second floor accommodation to provide 3-bed house of multiple occupation for care leavers. 35 East Street Barking Essex IG11 8ER</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00049/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 31 March 2017</td>
<td>Mrs F B Tse</td>
<td>Erection of outbuilding in rear garden. 34 Charlton Crescent Barking Essex IG11 0NP</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00192/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 31 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Baguzis</td>
<td>Demolition of rear extension and side garage and erection of single storey side/rear extension. 321 Parsloes Avenue Dagenham Essex RM9 5QR</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00300/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 31 March 2017</td>
<td>Mrs S Kaur</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 39 Lyndhurst Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9YB</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00306/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required on 31 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Anwar</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 103 Dereham Road Barking Essex IG11 9EY</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00307/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 31 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Rahman</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 15 Arden Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 6TJ</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00308/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 31 March 2017</td>
<td>Mr J Aziz</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 4.0 metres). 10 Cavendish Gardens Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6SA</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>