Notice of Meeting

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD

Monday, 11 December 2017 - 7:00 pm
Council Chamber, Town Hall, Barking

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

Date of publication: 30 November 2017

Chris Naylor
Chief Executive

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

Please note that this meeting will be webcast, which is a transmission of audio and video over the internet. Members of the public who attend the meeting and who do not wish to appear in the webcast will be able to sit in the public gallery on the second floor of the Town Hall, which is not in camera range.

To view webcast meetings, go to https://www.lbbd.gov.uk/council/councillors-and-committees/meetings-agendas-and-minutes/overview/ and select the meeting from the list.

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 6 November 2017 (Pages 7 - 36)

New Planning Applications

4. 288 Dagenham Road, Dagenham-17/00964/FUL (Pages 37 - 61)  Eastbrook

5. Land adjacent to 95 Church Elm Lane, Dagenham-17/01626/FUL (Pages 63 - 81)  Village

Advertisement Applications

6. Town Planning Appeals (Pages 83 - 110)  Becontree; Eastbrook; Eastbury; Heath; Longbridge; Mayesbrook; River; Thames; Valence; Whalebone

7. Delegated Decisions (Pages 111 - 149)

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

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

Private Business

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

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

One borough; one community; London’s growth opportunity

Our Priorities

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

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

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

**Well run organisation**
- A digital Council, with appropriate services delivered online
- Promote equalities in the workforce and community
- Implement a smarter working programme, making best use of accommodation and IT
- Allow Members and staff to work flexibly to support the community
- Continue to manage finances efficiently, looking for ways to make savings and generate income
- Be innovative in service delivery
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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>A1</td>
<td>Shops, retail warehouses, hairdressers, undertakers, travel and ticket agencies, post offices (but not sorting offices), pet shops, sandwich bars, showrooms, domestic hire shops, dry cleaners, funeral directors and internet cafes.</td>
<td>State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. Some temporary uses – see footnote 4. A1 plus two flats above C3 residential use - see footnote 5 Bank, building society, credit union or friendly society (A2) but not for other purposes falling within A2 – see footnote 6 A2 A3 (up to 150 m2) see footnote 9 D2 (up to 200 m2) see footnote 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Financial services such as banks and building societies, professional services (other than health and medical services) including estate and employment agencies.</td>
<td>A1 (where this is a ground floor display window) plus two flats above A2 plus two flats above State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. Some temporary uses – see footnote 4. C3 residential use - see footnote 5 A3 (up to 150 m2) – see footnote 9. D2 (up to 200 m2) see footnote 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Restaurants and cafés For the sale of food and drink for consumption on the premises - restaurants, snack bars and cafes.</td>
<td>A1 or A2 State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. Some temporary uses – see footnote 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Drinking establishments Public houses, wine bars or other drinking establishments (but not night clubs).</td>
<td>A1, A2 or A3 unless listed as an Asset of Community Value State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. Some temporary uses – see footnote 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Hot food takeaway For the sale of hot food for consumption off the premises.</td>
<td>A1, A2 or A3 State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. Some temporary uses – see footnote 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>a) Offices, other than a use within Class A2 (Financial Services) b) Research and development of products or processes c) Light industry appropriate in a residential area</td>
<td>B8 (where no more than 500 sqm) B1a - C3 subject to prior approval -see footnote 1. State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. State funded school or registered nursery subject to prior approval - see footnote 3 Some temporary uses – see footnote 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>General industrial General industry: use for the carrying out of an industrial process other than one falling in class B1. (excluding incineration purposes, chemical treatment or landfill or hazardous waste).</td>
<td>B1 or B8 [B8 limited to 500 sqm] State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Storage and distribution Storage or distribution centre. This class includes open air storage.</td>
<td>B1 (where no more than 500 sqm) State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. C3 (where no more than 500 sqm) see footnote 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Hotels Hotel, boarding house or guesthouse, where no significant element of care is provided. (Excludes hostels).</td>
<td>State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. State funded school or registered nursery subject to prior approval - see footnote 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Residential institutions Hospital, nursing home or residential school, college or training centre where they provide residential accommodation or care to people in need of care (other than those within C3 dwelling houses).</td>
<td>State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. State funded school or registered nursery subject to prior approval - see footnote 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2A</td>
<td>Secure residential institution Secure residential accommodation, including use as a prison, young offenders institution, detention centre, secure training centre, custody centre, short term holding centre, secure hospital, secure local authority accommodation or use as a military barracks.</td>
<td>State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. State funded school or registered nursery subject to prior approval - see footnote 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Dwelling houses Use as a dwelling house by a single person or by people living together as a family or by not more than 6 residents living together as a single household.</td>
<td>Article 4 direction removes permitted development right to convert to C4 House in Multiple Occupation. State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Houses in multiple occupation</td>
<td>Small shared houses occupied by between three and six unrelated individuals, as their only or main residence, who share basic amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom.</td>
<td>C3 (dwelling houses) State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Assembly &amp; Leisure</td>
<td>Cinema, concert hall, bingo hall, dance hall, swimming bath, skating rink, gymnasium, or area for indoor or outdoor sports or recreations, not involving motor vehicles or firearms.</td>
<td>State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2. State funded school or registered nursery subject to prior approval - see footnote 3. Some temporary uses – see footnote 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sui – Generis</td>
<td>A use on its own, for which any change of use will require planning permission. Includes, theatres, nightclubs, retail warehouse clubs, amusement arcades, launderettes, petrol filling stations, casinos, taxi businesses, waste management facilities, motor car showrooms, betting offices and pay day loan.</td>
<td>Casino to Class D2 Amusement arcades/centres and casinos to C3 (up to 150 m2) See footnote 8 Betting offices and pay day loan to A1 and A2 plus two flats above See footnote 9. Betting offices, pay day loan and casinos to A3 (up to 150 m2) See footnote 9. Betting offices and pay day loan to D2 (up to 200m2) – see footnote 10. Betting offices and payday loan to C3 residential use - see footnote 5</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 change of use would have on existing industrial uses and or storage or distribution uses. Right only applies to buildings in B8 use on or before 19 March 2015 and development must be begun before 15 April 2018. Building must have been in B8 use for four years.

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, 6 November 2017
(6:00 - 9:55 pm)

Present: 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 Giasuddin Miah, Cllr Margaret Mullan, Cllr Adegboyega Oluwole, Cllr Bill Turner, Cllr Dominic Twomey, Cllr Jeff Wade and Cllr John White

Also Present: Cllr Sade Bright, Cllr Mick McCarthy and Cllr Tony Ramsay

Apologies: Cllr Amardeep Singh Jamu and Cllr Chris Rice

32. Declaration of Members’ Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

33. Minutes - To confirm as correct the minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2017

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2017 were confirmed as correct.

34. Farmhouse Venue, 649 Dagenham Road, Dagenham-17/00439/FUL

The Development Management Manager (DMM) introduced a report in relation to the application for the Farmhouse Venue, 649 Dagenham Road, Dagenham. This application was for the erection of permanent marquee in the grounds for use as function venue for up to 400 guests and provision of additional car parking spaces on land between the existing Farmhouse Venue and the Millennium Centre car park. The application had been previously presented to the Board meeting of 31 July where Members voted to grant planning permission subject to determination of conditions and reasons for approval being confirmed at the next meeting of the Board.

Subsequently it became apparent that the applicant had inadvertently included land within the application site boundary that was not in his ownership or control, and without serving the requisite Notice on the owner. This means that even if permission had been granted on the basis of those plans it would not have been possible for the applicant to implement the scheme. The applicant had addressed this matter by submitting an amended site location plan showing the area which coincides with his land ownership, and an amended plan within that area for the proposed overspill car parking and associated landscaping.

The amended plans did not affect the siting of the proposed marquee to the rear of the former Farmhouse Tavern, but result in a reduction in the size of the proposed overspill car parking area and the associated landscaping.
The Council had received Counsel’s Opinion to the effect that because these changes affected relevant planning considerations of ecology and the impact of the development on the Green Belt it was necessary for the Board to reconsider the application in its entirety in order to ensure a planning decision that was legally sound.

This report was for the most part the same as that presented to the Board on 31 July 2017 with some amendments where relevant to explain and analyse the impact of the amended plans.

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

The applicant had considered that the Farmhouse Venue met a specific need as there were a shortage of larger function venues in the borough however the DMM stated that there were other large function venues available. An enforcement notice had been issued against the erection of a marquee at the Farmhouse Venue in 2011 and, in a subsequent appeal, the Planning Inspector stated that this was an intrusive structure and detracted from the underdeveloped nature of the Country Park. Members needed to be satisfied that the proposed marquee, which was a little smaller and less high than the marquee the subject of the notice, would adequately overcome the inspector’s concerns.

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

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

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

The Chair invited William Dennehy, Peter Harris and Terry Justice, local residents and objectors to the application to address the Board. The main points raised against the development were:

- There were no special circumstances to allow this application as it is in the Green Belt.
• There was a build-up of urban sprawl in the borough with other major developments nearby.
• This application would be detrimental to the area.
• Noise nuisance was at the premises already from amplified music.
• This application would impact negatively on people using the Country Park.
• The application would be detrimental to the environment and wildlife.
• The peace and tranquillity of the park would be harmed if this application were agreed.
• There were other large venues available in the locality that could be used.
• The petition showed the strength of feeling against the application.

The Chair invited Councillor Mick McCarthy, Eastbrook Ward Councillor, to address the Board. He had lived in the area for over fifty years and supported the officer’s recommendation to refuse the application. He considered that the adjacent Country Park was a place of relaxation and if the application were agreed, it would allow the Farmhouse Venue to be open at any time of day. He was also concerned about the impact of noise and traffic for the cemetery, car parks and the park itself.

The Chair invited Councillor Tony Ramsay, Eastbrook Ward Councillor to address the Board. He asked the Board to reject the application on planning grounds. The Farmhouse Venue was on green belt land and the Country Park was adjacent to it. He noted that the petition had shown 1850 signatures against the application which showed a strong feeling locally against the application. If agreed, he considered it would be a threat to the environment and wildlife. Noise nuisance would also be of concern if the application were agreed and had already been reported for various events.

The Chair invited Councillor Sade Bright to address the Board. She considered that the Farmhouse Venue was a viable business and the application needed to be approved for it to survive. She understood that the Farmhouse Venue was on Green Belt land but considered that businesses needed to continue and grow. She understood what objectors were saying about the application, but businesses needed to be supported. She felt that this venue was necessary for large events as it was not too far to travel there and was used by all groups in the community. She felt that the Venue would be able to thrive if this application were allowed and monies earned from the site could be ploughed back into the Country Park.

The Chair invited Ms A. Qureshi, the applicant’s agent, to address the Board. She said that this application had been agreed at the Board meeting on 31 July 2017 and was essential to ensure the viability of the applicant’s business. The application would allow for wider benefits to the local community, for instance people attending events at the Venue would book into local hotels. There was also a lot of demand for events which the Venue catered for. The proposal for the Marquee had not changed since July 2017 and noise mitigation would be addressed by sound limiters. The Marquee would also be screened in green.
The traffic issues raised have been addressed by the applicant and there was no evidence to suggest that the Venue was a higher risk to safety and it was the Council’s job to control car parking and not the applicant. The risk of traffic and road safety in using the overspill car park was negligible and it would only be used as a last resort for bigger events. She added that the applicant’s Counsel had stated their advice on the “principle of consistency in decision making” which they felt should apply and that the application should therefore be approved by the Board.

The Legal Adviser to the Board advised that the applicant’s agent had e-mailed Members of the Board directly, with opinion from the applicant’s legal adviser, however the Board needed to reach a decision based on the Board meeting alone and Members should ignore the e-mail sent to them. The issue raised by them concerning consistency was inaccurate.

The Head of Planning confirmed that the proposed development was in the Green Belt. The essential characteristics of Green Belts were their openness and their permanence. National guidance made clear that the construction of a new building in the Green Belt was inappropriate development. Therefore, the proposed Marquee was inappropriate and by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Moreover, officers had identified further harm to the Green Belt due to the loss of amenity for users of the adjacent country park, harm to the character and open setting of the Farmhouse Tavern and harm to highway safety and ecology.

In reaching their decision, the Board needed to ensure they have given substantial weight to this harm and understood that very special circumstances only existed if this harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations which either mitigate or overcome this harm or there are public benefits which override it. These must be material planning considerations.

Whilst officers did not consider that very special circumstances existed, if members, having heard from all the parties, and having thoroughly debated the issues, were minded to approve the application, they must state the very special circumstances which clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.

Members then debated this application in detail.

Members against this application included the following points

- There were a number of strong reasons why the application should be refused relating to the application being on the green belt, the effect on the locally listed building, road safety, traffic and ecology.
- There were a number of other large venues in the area for functions.
- There was a Local Plan review next year and this was not the forum to try and change that at this stage.
- There was no material benefit to this application which would include the loss of enjoyment of the country park and this would upset more
The Marquee was a separate construction and could not be removed. It also looked out of place within the Country Park.

Road safety and traffic issues were a concern and accidents would be likely to happen.

The use of the marquee would cause noise disturbance.

Residents’ concerns about the application needed to be taken into account.

This application was not about the applicant's business but planning considerations.

Very special circumstances to allow this application had not been provided.

The Country Park is very important for residents and should not be built on. People needed green spaces and harm would be created if this application were approved. The Council were guardians of the green belt and this should be protected.

Members in favour of this application included the following points:

- It was accepted that application was on green belt land however there have sometimes been and should be occasions when exceptional circumstances are allowed for building on the green belt.
- Why has S106 money for highways improvements not been spent?
- It was accepted that there would be some harm as a result of this application but there was unlikely to be a collision of noise issues as no one is in the Country Park at night.
- This small business has been here for a long time and needs to be supported and the application approved.
- The Marquee can be removed.
- Noise can be mitigated.
- The application has not changed since it came before the Board in July 2017

The Board refused planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would be inappropriate in the Green Belt and there are no very special circumstances to justify an exception to policy; further harm to the Green Belt would be caused by the loss of openness and visual amenity resulting from the erection of the permanent marquee and the use of the overspill parking area, and a loss of tranquillity for users of the adjacent Country Park resulting from the increase in noise and activity associated with the use of the marquee that would be sited in close proximity to the boundary, contrary to policy CM3 of the Core Strategy and policy BP11 of the Borough Wide
2. The marquee would be harmful to the character and open setting of the Farmhouse Tavern, a locally listed building, contrary to policies BP2 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

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

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

(Councillor Freeborn arrived during the discussion on this item and in accordance with the Council Constitution (Part 5, Chapter 2, paragraph 7.1), was not permitted to take part in the discussion or vote on the item as she had not been present throughout the entire discussion).

(At the conclusion of this item, the Board adjourned for a break at 7.55 pm and reconvened at 8.05 pm)

35. Land between Whiting Avenue and Gurdwara Way, Barking- 17/00698/FUL

(At the commencement of this item, the Board agreed that, in accordance with Part 2, Chapter 3, paragraph 7.1 of the Council Constitution, the meeting be extended for a reasonable period beyond the two-hour threshold to enable the matter to be concluded.)

The Development Management Manager (DMM) introduced a report in relation to the application for the Land between Whiting Avenue and Gurdwara Way, Barking. The application included redevelopment of the site comprising a car park, turning head and incidental open space for the erection of two new buildings (4 storeys and part 4, part 6 storeys) to provide 78 one-bedroom flats (Use Class C3) together with associated communal and private amenity spaces, cycle parking and refuse storage; provision of substation; creation of new publicly accessible route between Whiting Avenue and Gurdwara Way; landscaping and highways alterations including works to and re-configuration of existing access road, turning head and the re-provision of 10 car parking spaces.

The DMM stated that the principle of the development was acceptable as this was not protected land and Cabinet had agreed to dispose of it. All one-bed
accommodation would be provided by the applicant, Pocket Living. These would be small affordable units and the applicants specialise in providing intermediate units with prices set 20% below the open price. Cabinet had stipulated that those eligible for buying these properties should be resident or working in the borough as key workers. The DMM stated that Pocket Living’s schemes aim to create a shared sense of community although they did not have balconies. He added that there would be no significant loss of daylight for the adjacent flats and there would be two parking spaces for wheelchair users. The development would be designed to achieve a minimum of 35% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions from the Building Regulations and, in addition, the applicant had agreed to pay a carbon off-set contribution.

The Democratic Services Officer (DSO) read a statement from Madhan Gopal, an objector to the application. Mr Gopal objected to the proposal owing to parking, health and safety of children and wellbeing of children. He considered that parking in Whiting Avenue was very bad and creating additional homes did not solve this problem. In terms of health and safety of children, he considered this would be further strained by an increase in vehicles with drivers rushing to obtain free parking spaces without consideration of speed limits. In addition, he felt that the area was already cramped for young children and constructing more flats in this area would erode green spaces further and impact on children’s creativity.

The Chair invited Paul Ronchi, an objector to the application, to address the Board. He felt that the development would have a detrimental effect on resident standard of living and quality of life and ruin the character of the area with a negative visual impact. He added that trees would be lost, and the environment would be destroyed with little space for landscaping. He felt that more flats meant more cars and traffic and that there would be a loss of privacy and light for residents in their properties.

The Chair invited Barbara Denham, an objector to the application, to address the Board. She was concerned that the site may have been subject to asbestos and that Council had not said that it wanted to build properties on this site and the current ‘buffer’ area was a protection for residents which stopped traffic and noise. She felt that the area had deteriorated with more people coming into the borough and although more housing was needed, Whiting Avenue was not an appropriate location for this development in her view.

The Chair invited Susan Parkin, an objector to the application, to address the Board. She was the Chair of the Residents and Tenants Association and disputed that there had been a full consultation held by the developer, Pocket Living. She felt the flats would be an ‘eyesore’ and were not needed. The current ‘buffer’ protected residents from the threat of flooding. She also disputed the report prepared by Pocket Living and considered that the proposed development would reduce the light into the flats.

The Chair invited Nick Williams, on behalf of the applicant, to address the Board. He stated that the development would provide 100% affordable housing with a 20% open discount. Those buying these flats must be first time buyers and key workers under the age of forty.

Members asked how the planning conditions were policed and were concerned
that the developer said no wheelchair users will want to buy these homes. They were also concerned about the plans for gardens and amenity space. Nick Williams responded that these properties could not be bought to let other than in exceptional circumstances. Pocket Living will police this, and they supported wheelchair units and would provide amenity space with allotments.

DMM added that there was a distance of 24-27 metres maximum between the proposed 4/6 storey block of flats and Harlow Mansions which would be sufficient to protect owner’s privacy. He advised that officers did not have any concerns about overlooking or light issues.

Members asked whether there was a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) active in the locality around Whiting Avenue and Gurdwara Way. The DMM stated that there is a CPZ on some local roads although others are private, and that the parking area would be upgraded to a shared surface.

Members were concerned about the issue of pollution on the vacant site, raised by one of the objectors and asked whether this may have contained asbestos. Nick Williams confirmed that the site was being cleared by the Council in liaison with the Environment Agency.

Members were concerned that properties were being made available only to those under 40 years of age however Mr Williams advised that this was a condition of the grant provided for the build.

Members considered this application was a very good initiative as there was a shortage of housing and homes were needed. They noted the concerns of residents however there was a considerable shortage of single unit properties for key workers and they were concerned to ensure that people live in the area and that properties needed to be affordable. The cost of living was very expensive, and they felt that the 20% discount was rather low.

Members asked how these properties would be marketed. Mr Williams confirmed that the applicant was working with the Council on this. He also clarified that the applicant did not employ outside estate agencies to market these properties.

Members were concerned about emergency vehicles accessibility and it was noted that this was acceptable.

Members supported the scheme although expressed concern that the visual material provided by the applicant was not as good as it should be.

The Board granted planning permission subject to:

1. A Section 106 legal agreement to secure the matters set out in section 6.9 of the report; and

2. The following conditions (with any amendments that might be necessary up to the issue of the decision).
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 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:


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

3. Prior to any part of the development hereby permitted being brought into residential use a verification report demonstrating the completion of the works set out in the approved Remediation Plan dated October 2016 (Ref: SRS/16/1283/RPT2 ISS2) and the approved Groundwater Remediation, Verification and Long Term Monitoring Plan dated March 2017 (Ref: SRS/16/1283/RPT6 ISS3), and the completion of the construction phase works identified in the Technical Note: Whiting Avenue, Barking IG11 (Ref: SRS/17/1337 RPT 1 ISS2), or any subsequent versions of the aforementioned reports that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the site does not pose any further risk to human health or the water environment by demonstrating that the requirements of the approved verification plan have been met and the remediation of the site is complete and in accordance with policies BR4 and BR5 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 5.21 of the London Plan.

4. Development shall take place in accordance with the Construction Logistics Plan prepared by SIG Building Systems and dated 26 April 2017, or in accordance with any revised Construction Logistics Plan which may be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. Minor amendments may be agreed in writing from time to time by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: 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.

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

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

The mitigation measures set out in Appendix A4 of the report ‘Air Quality Assessment, Whiting Avenue, Barking & Dagenham’ (reference J0128/1/F1 dated 20 April 2017) are to be fully implemented throughout the construction of the development.

The approved CEMP and SWMP shall be implemented for the entire period of the construction works at the site, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

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

6. No development shall commence, except any works of site clearance, until a Surface Water Drainage Scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro geological context of the development and how it affects flood risk both on and off the site, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

Reason: The Drainage Scheme is required prior to commencement of development in order to reduce the risk of flooding and in accordance with policy BR4 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.
Document and policy 5.13 of the London Plan.

7. No deliveries, external running of plant and equipment, or demolition and construction works, other than internal works not audible outside the site boundary, shall take place on the site other than between the hours of 0800 to 1800 on Monday to Friday and 0800 to 1300 on Saturday and not at all on Sundays, Public or Bank Holidays without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority. Any works which are associated with the generation of ground borne vibration are only to be carried out between the hours of 0800 and 1800 Monday to Friday.

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

8. 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 shall be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Reason: Piling has the potential to impact on local underground sewerage utility infrastructure and in order to minimise noise and disturbance in the interest of residential amenity and in accordance with policies BR13 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 7.15 of the London Plan.

9. No above ground new development shall commence until the developer has submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing, in consultation with the Local Highway Authority, a scheme of highway works associated with the development. The approved works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of the development, or as otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Local Highway Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policies BR9 and BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

10. 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 and policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan.
11. No above ground new development shall commence until full details of the hard landscaping have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The hard landscaping scheme shall include, but not be limited to, details of the following:

a) surface materials;
b) boundary treatment;
c) refuse storage; and
d) management and maintenance.

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

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

12. No above ground new development shall commence until a detailed scheme of soft landscaping for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All trees, shrubs, plants and seeds introduced to the site should generally be native (except for fruit trees) and of local provenance, unless otherwise agreed. The approved landscaping scheme shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation 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.

Reason: To secure the provision of the landscaping in the interests of the visual amenity of the area and in accordance with policy CP3 of the Core Strategy and policies BR3 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

13. No above ground new development shall commence until a scheme showing the provisions to be made for external lighting, CCTV coverage, access control and any other measures to reduce the risk of crime, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The external lighting of the development is to be designed, installed and maintained so as to fully comply with The Association of Chief Police Officers Secured by Design publication 'Lighting Against Crime - A Guide for Crime Reduction Professionals', ACPO SPD, January 2011. The design shall satisfy criteria to limit obtrusive light presented in Table 1, p25 of the guide, relating to Environmental Zone E3 - Medium district brightness areas. All external lighting shall also be designed to minimise upwards light and obtrusive light and avoid light spill onto trees, hedges and bird and bat boxes. Lighting should be designed in accordance with Bats and Lighting in the UK ([http://www.bats.org.uk/pages/bats_andlighting.html](http://www.bats.org.uk/pages/bats_andlighting.html)) or the latest advice from the Bats Conservation Trust. The development shall not be occupied until the
approved scheme has been installed. Thereafter the approved measures shall be permanently retained.

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

14. The 10 car parking spaces as indicated on drawing No. 1617(0)100 Rev A shall be constructed and marked out prior to the occupation of the development. 2 of the car parking spaces shall be marked as accessible parking bays (to be clearly marked with a British Standard disabled symbol). The car parking spaces shall thereafter be retained permanently.

Reason: To ensure and promote easier access for disabled persons and to ensure sufficient replacement off-street parking, in accordance with policies BC2, BR9 and BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 6.13 of the London Plan.

15. No occupation of the development shall occur until details of the cycle parking facilities shown on drawing No. 1617(0)100 Rev A have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submission should include details of the security, monitoring and access arrangements for the cycle parking facilities. The development shall not be occupied until the approved details have been implemented. Thereafter, the cycle parking facilities shall be permanently retained.

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

16. A scheme of acoustic protection of the mechanical heat ventilation recovery (MHVR) system is to be provided to habitable rooms where the traffic noise levels will exceed 35 dB LAeq in bedrooms (23:00 hours to 07:00 hours) or 40 dB LAeq in living rooms (07:00 hours to 23:00 hours) with windows open. The scheme shall be sufficient to secure 'windows closed' internal traffic noise levels no greater than 30 dB LAeq in bedrooms (23:00 hours to 07:00 hours) or 35 dB LAeq in living rooms (07:00 hours to 23:00 hours).

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

17. The combined rating level of the noise from any plant installed pursuant to this permission shall not exceed 45 dB 1 metre outside the window to any noise-sensitive room. Any assessment of compliance with this condition shall be made according to the methodology and procedures presented in BS4142:2014.

Reason: To ensure that noise-sensitive rooms within the proposed development and neighbouring developments are adequately protected from

18. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Energy Strategy Report (Issue 2) prepared by TUV SUD Limited and dated 24 April 2017. Details of the location and quantum of photovoltaic cells shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the photovoltaic cells shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the environment and providing sustainable development in accordance with policies BR1 and BR2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policies 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6 and 5.7 of the London Plan.

19. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until bird nesting and bat roosting bricks/boxes have been installed in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The bird and bat boxes should be incorporated into the structure of the new buildings or roof spaces where feasible. 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.

20. Before occupation 76 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 the London Plan.

21. The 2 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.

22. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until details of a communal television and satellite system have been submitted to and
approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved system shall be provided prior to occupation of the development and be made available to each residential unit. No antennae or satellite dishes may be installed on the exterior of the building, with the exception of a single antennae or satellite dish per block to support the communal television and satellite system. The proposed antennae or satellite dishes shall be designed to minimise their visual impact and shall not be mounted on any publicly visible façade.

Reason: To safeguard the external appearance of the buildings in accordance with policy CP2 of the Core Strategy and policies BP2 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

23. All retained trees on, and adjacent to, the site must be protected in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012, ‘Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction’.

Reason: In order to ensure the safety and well-being of the trees on, and adjacent to, the site that are to remain after remediation works are completed, and in accordance with policies BR3 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

24. Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted one new private fire hydrant shall be installed by the developer in consultation with London Fire Brigade Water Team. The hydrant shall be sited within the footpath – not in the carriageway, grass verge or flower bed. The hydrant shall be one metre clear of all obstructions, with the outlet no more than 300mm below the finished ground level. The hydrant shall conform to BS:750 and be indicated with a hydrant indicator plate conforming to BS:3251. The ongoing future maintenance and repairs shall be the responsibility of the site owner or management company.

Reason: To satisfy the requirements of London Fire Brigade Water Team.

25. 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.

36. BMS House, 1 Wantz Road, Dagenham- 16/00981/FUL

The Development Management Manager (DMM) introduced a report in relation to the application for BMS House, 1 Wantz Road, Dagenham. The application includes the demolition of an existing warehouse and redevelopment of site to provide part 4/part 5 storey building comprising 63 residential units comprising 9 x studio flats, 28 x one-bedroom flats, 20 x two-bedroom flats and 6 x one bedroom maisonettes and 353 square metres mixed
commercial space (A1/B1/D1/A3) together with associated car parking spaces.

The DMM was not aware of any complaints relating to the neighbouring church premises and the Environment Health Officer considered that the new flats would not be likely to be subject to excessive noise. The Transport Officer noted that there was a low level of accessibility. The site was in a locally significant employment area. The development would provide a suitable improvement to the existing site.

The DMM added that the application was for a well-designed building with 4-5 storeys and would not be overbearing at street level. The proposed car park would be accessed from Wantz Road. In terms of energy, there would be a 39% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions over the Building Regulations and the developer would pay £50K towards play space under the Section 106 agreement. The Section 106 would also include a commitment that the scheme remains within the private rented sector for 15 years, the prioritisation of local labour supply and a requirement that the applicant enters into the Section 278 Highways agreement.

The Chair invited Ade Adesina, an objector to the application, to address the Board. He was the Pastor of the Church at the adjacent premises. He advised that the Church tended to create noise during worship and, in the issue of sound proofing, enquired who was responsible if this development were to go ahead as it would have a detrimental effect on local businesses. He was concerned about noise complaints arising.

The Chair invited Simon Owen, on behalf of the applicant, to address the Board. The applicant (Neighbour) had worked hard to bring this application forward. The Ground Floor would be a commercial unit to provide more jobs and this was in accordance with the London Plan standards. The applicant had been very careful in designing good quality spaces and there would be a large communal garden to be landscaped to provide the best daylight possible. They would offer tenancies over a three, five or seven-year period and the building would help the regeneration of the area. Rents would be cheap and there was a fifteen-year obligation for the properties to be rented to be provided within the Section 106. He understood Mr Adesina’s concerns and Neighbour had worked hard with officers to help bring this scheme forward and provide a good commercial operation on the ground floor.

Members were concerned about noise insulation and relocation assistance for businesses. They also asked about the viability of the scheme. In response, Kirk Pickering (Development Director, Neighbour) advised that there were some small businesses on the first floor of the site which would need to be relocated. In terms of noise, he was only aware of these concerns being raised recently and Neighbour were willing to assist the church with sound insulation costs should complaints arise. There would be a private rental scheme (PRS) for a minimum of a fifteen-year period and marketed for local people. In addition, he noted that Neighbour was well funded and a viable organisation and considered that the site would generate income.

Members asked how the applicant would ensure that sub-letting would not take place. Kirk Pickering responded that the management of tenancies was undertaken directly by Neighbour and this would be monitored closely by them.
The Board granted planning permission subject to a S106 Agreement to secure:

- A commitment that the development is maintained as a PRS scheme for a minimum of 15 years along with a commitment to prioritise residents who live and or work in the Borough when marketing and identifying suitable tenants. The viability of the development is reviewed on occupation and a revised viability assessment is submitted;
- Following submission of the revised viability assessment, if the development results in a surplus, this shall be split 60/40 in favour of the Council and the Council shall spend their share of the surplus on sub-market housing projects in the Borough;
- A commitment to local labour/local supply so that residents and businesses in the Borough will benefit from the proposed development;
- A requirement that the developer enters into a S278 Highways Agreement to undertake any alterations to the public highway in respect of this development;
- A developer contribution of £50,000 towards play space improvements in the area.

and 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 Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).


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

3. Following the first occupation of the ground floor mixed use commercial space any further changes of use of this space specifically permitted by this permission must be carried out within a period of 10 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Class V, Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015.

4. No above ground development 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.

5. No development above ground level shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping for the site.

Reason: To safeguard and improve the appearance 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.

6. 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 any of the buildings 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.

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.

7. 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.

8. The car parking areas indicated on drawing No. 0102 Rev P4; 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.

9. No development above ground level shall take place until there has
been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the position, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. 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.

10. 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’.

11. 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 all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. 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 10 and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of condition 11 which are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

15. 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 10-15: Contamination must be identified prior to commencement of development to ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors in accordance with Policy BR5 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and Policy 5.21 of the London Plan.

16. No development above ground level shall take place until details of the combined heat and power plant (CHP) to be installed at the premises have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall be sufficient to demonstrate that products of combustion emitted from the plant will not be prejudicial to health or a nuisance having regard to;

a) The position and height of the discharge flue of the combustion plant;
b) The position and descriptions of buildings near it;
c) The levels of the neighbouring ground; and

d) Any other matters requiring consideration in the circumstances, including but not limited to, the concentration of oxides of nitrogen in the flue gas and the flue discharge velocity.

Reason: In the interests of protecting neighbouring amenity and air quality in accordance with policies BP8, BP11 and BR14 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

17. The combined heat and power plant (CHP) to be installed at the premises is to comply with the emissions standards for CHP plant for Band A locations set out in Appendix 7 of Greater London Authority Document “Sustainable Design and Construction – Supplementary


18. Habitable rooms having openings facing onto the North, West or East facing facades are to be provided with acoustic ventilators which are commensurate with the performance specification set out in Schedule 1 (paragraphs 6 and 7) of The Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 (as amended).

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of occupiers of the development in accordance with Policy BR13 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

19. The combined rating level of the noise from plant installed pursuant to this 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 safeguard the amenity of occupiers of the development in accordance with Policies BR13, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

20. The lighting of the development hereby permitted, is to be designed, installed and maintained 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 201. 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.

Reason: In order to avoid light pollution and safeguard neighbouring amenity, in accordance with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

21. The delivery / collection of goods from the commercial use hereby permitted is only permitted to take place between the hours of 07:00hrs and 21:00 hours on any day.

Reason: To ensure that the commercial use does not cause undue nuisance and disturbance to residents at unreasonable hours and in accordance with Policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

22. Demolition and construction work and associated activities are only to be carried out between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00-13:00 Saturday with no work on Sundays or public 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. 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 demolition and 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.

23. 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 hoardings(s) including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
f) Wheel washing facilities;
g) Measures to control the emission of dust, dirt and emissions to air during construction; such measures to accord with the guidance provided in the document “The Control of Dust and Emissions during Construction and Demolition”, Mayor of London, July 2014; including but not confined to, non road mobile machinery (NRMM) requirements;
h) Noise and vibration control;
i) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
j) The use of efficient construction materials;
k) Methods to minimise waste, to encourage re-use, recovery and recycling, and sourcing of materials; and
l) A nominated Development/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.

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

Reason: The CEMP and SWMP are required prior to the 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.
24. 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.

25. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Those details shall include:

a. A design that is compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, National Planning Policy Framework and Ministerial Statement on SuDS.

b. Evidence that the proposed solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 (+CC% allowance for climate change storm events), during all stages of the development (pre, post and during), with discharge rates being restricted as close to greenfield runoff rates as is reasonably practical.

c. Details of management and maintenance regimes and responsibilities.

d. A construction phase plan detailing how the drainage elements will be protected during construction.

e. Long and cross sections of each SuDS Element.

f. A finalised drainage layout plan that details pipe levels, diameters and asset locations.

The Scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

Reason: A surface water drainage scheme for the site is required prior to the commencement of development to prevent an increased risk of flooding and to prevent pollution of the water environment and in accordance with Policy BR4 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

26. Notwithstanding condition number 8, electric charging points shall be provided for 20% of the car parking spaces shown on drawing No. 0102 Rev P4 with a further 20% passive provision. The spaces shall be constructed and marked out and the charging points installed 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 encourage the use of electric cars in order to reduce carbon emissions, and in accordance with Policy BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and Policy 6.13 of the London Plan.

27. 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.

28. Details of the proposed solar photovoltaic panels generating equipment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the commencement of any work above ground level. The equipment shall be installed before the development is occupied and shall be permanently maintained so as to provide energy for the development on a day-to-day basis for as long as the development remains.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the environment, to ensure that the development provides renewable energy in accordance with Policy BR2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 5.2 of the London Plan.

29. With the exception of any roof mounted antennae or satellite dish designed for communal use by the occupiers of each flat, no antennae or satellite dishes shall be placed on any elevation of the development hereby approved 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.

30. The flats hereby approved shall not be occupied until a refuse management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved management plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reasons: To provide for the satisfactory removal of refuse in the interest of the site and locality and to protect the amenity of future occupiers and in accordance with Policies BP8, BP11 and BR15 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

31. No development above ground level shall take place until a scheme showing the provisions to be made for external lighting, CCTV coverage, access control, and any other measures to reduce the risk of crime,
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.

32. Before occupation 90% 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 the London Plan.

33. A minimum of 10% 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.

34. No permission is hereby given for any use of the ground floor commercial premises as a place of worship or as a church hall.

Reason: To avoid the introduction of uses that would be incompatible with the development and to protect the amenity of future occupiers of the development and existing neighbouring occupiers in accordance with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

37. **146-188 Church Elm Lane, Dagenham- 17/01405/FUL**

The Development Management Manager (DMM) introduced a report in relation to the application for 146-188 Church Elm Lane, Dagenham.

The application property is a two-storey building located to the south of Church Elm Lane with the main access from the north. The application property is a Council building currently incorporating 21 housing units. Part of the ground floor was previously used as two community rooms and a kitchen accessed internally on the ground floor. This related to the former use of the building as elderly persons’ accommodation. The application seeks permission for the
conversion of this space into a 2 bedroom flat with associated alterations to the
doors and window openings.

The proposal would not materially impact on the character and appearance of
the area and would not result in unacceptable levels of overlooking or loss of
privacy and therefore complies with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough
Wide Development Policies DPD.

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

The flat was indicated as having sole access to an existing courtyard (243m2)
which is not currently used but was previously accessible through the
community rooms. There were, however, concerns that the use of this space
by occupiers of the proposed flat could result in noise and nuisance and
privacy issues for occupiers of other flats within the block which have windows
directly facing this space. Accordingly, it was proposed to impose a condition
which would truncate the space available to occupiers of the proposed flat by
the erection of boundary treatment which would restrict access to the areas
closest to the neighbouring flats.

No additional off-street parking provision was 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 considered that any additional parking
generated by the flat could be adequately accommodated on neighbouring
streets and within the John Parker Close car park.

Members asked about conversion of the premises for those with special needs
and the DMM stated the conversion did not appear to require a lot of work and
as there were access ramps to the front and rear of the premises, the unit may
be suitable for such purposes, however this would be a matter for Housing
Services.

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 use hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the
   B-505 Rev A1

   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 development 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. The flat hereby approved shall not be occupied until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme showing a revised location and design of the proposed external amenity space which should seek to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

38. Town Planning Appeals

The Board noted details of the following appeals:

Appeals Lodged

The following appeals have been lodged:

a) Erection of two storey side/rear extension – 80 Gainsborough Road, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00926/FUL)

Application refused under delegated powers 1 August 2017 – Becontree Ward

b) Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres in total comprising 3.0 metres existing and 3.0 metre proposed; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres) – 150 Third Avenue, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00717/PRIOR6)

Application refused under delegated powers 8 June 2017 – River Ward

c) Erection of two storey side extension and single storey front and rear extensions – 105 Arnold Road, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00714/FUL)

Application refused under delegated powers 28 June 2017 – River Ward

Appeals Determined

The following appeals have been determined by the Planning Inspectorate:

a) Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.8 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres) – 41 Victoria Road, Barking (Ref: 17/00527/PRIOR6 – Abbey Ward)
Application refused under delegated powers 9 May 2017 for the following reason:

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

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 29 September 2017

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

Application refused under delegated powers 25 January 2017 for the following reasons:

1. The development will result in the loss of a family dwelling, further reducing the Borough’s existing stock of family housing contrary to Policy BC4 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

2. The development does not provide sufficient gross internal floor space (58m² required) or any dedicated storage provision (1.5m² required) in respect of the first floor flat and as such the development will result in a substandard unit of accommodation detrimental to the living standards and amenities enjoyed by occupiers of the development, contrary to policy 3.5 of the London Plan (March 2016).

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 5 October 2017

Costs application – allowed 5 October 2017

c) Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a part single/part two storey side extension – 4 Dronfield Gardens, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00122/FUL – Mayesbrook Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 28 March 2017 for the following reason:

1. The overall design, height, scale, bulk and massing of the proposed development would be incongruous and out of keeping with the street scene and original design of the host property and terrace in a prominent location disrupting the architectural character and rhythm of neighbouring properties, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding area, contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies
Development Plan Document (March 2011), the Supplementary Planning Document for Residential Extensions and Alterations (February 2012) and policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016.

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 27 September 2017

d) Erection of two storey 2-bedroom dwelling – 12 Hainault Road, Chadwell Heath (Ref: Whalebone Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 30 March 2017 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its rearward depth, would have an overbearing presence and have an adverse impact on outlook and loss of light to the neighbouring residents, 12 Hainault Road and would therefore be harmful to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers contrary to Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and the guidance within the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.

2. The proposed development would fail to provide any off-street parking for the existing dwelling and the proposed dwelling in an area of low public transport accessibility, which would result in an increase to the existing parking pressures harmful to highway safety and contrary to Policies BR9 and BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and Table 6.2 of the London Plan (March 2016).

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 5 October 2017

e) Demolition of bungalow and erection of 3 two storey two-bedroom dwellings – 37 Gordon Road, Chadwell Heath (Ref: 16/01503/FUL – Whalebone Ward)

Application refused at Development Control Board 6 March 2017 for the following reason:

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

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 16 October 2017

f) Retention of 3 canopy roofs and roller shutter to side of industrial unit - Emperor House, Freshwater Road, Dagenham (Ref:
17/00328/FUL – Whalebone Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 15 May 2017 for the following reason:

1. The development, by reason of its siting, design and use would result in poor levels of air quality, loss of light and outlook and general nuisance, harmful to the amenity of adjoining occupiers and contrary to Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011).

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 19 October 2017

39. Delegated Decisions

The Board noted details of delegated decisions for the period 26 June to 28 July 2017.
288 Dagenham Road, Rush Green
This page is intentionally left blank
Application No: 17/00964/FUL  
Ward: Eastbrook  

Reason for Referral to DCB as set out in Part 2, Chapter 9 of the Council Constitution: The application is recommended for approval with five or more objections from local residents.

Address: 288 Dagenham Road, Dagenham  

Development: Erection of extensions to existing shop with flat above, including two storey side, first floor rear, and roof extensions incorporating side and rear dormer windows to provide additional retail unit and a total of three 2 bedroom flats and one 1 bedroom flat.

Applicant: M A J Developments & R & NK Lal  

Contact Officer: Simon Bullock  
Title: Principal Development Management Officer  
Contact Details: Tel: 020 8227 3803  
E-mail: simon.bullock@befirst.london

Summary:

The site is at the junction of Dagenham Road and Fourth Avenue. The proposal is to substantially extend the existing shop with flat above to provide a small additional retail unit and three additional flats. The principle of such development in this location is acceptable.

The bulk of the proposed two storey side and rear extension would result in some reduction in the openness of the street scene by infilling the gap between the existing side elevation and Fourth Avenue. However, it is considered that having regard to the prevailing character of the area and the width of Dagenham Road, this would not cause harm to visual amenity.

The proposed dwellings would be of adequate size and layout, with external amenity space, in accordance with the policy standards of the London Plan, with the exception that one of the flats would not have private external amenity space. However, in view of the provision of a communal external amenity space, as described below, this is considered acceptable.

It is considered that the scheme would not harm the residential amenity of existing neighbouring occupiers, and in respect of this matter the proposed first floor roof terrace would incorporate a privacy screen to prevent direct overlooking of the adjoining residential property.

Four car parking spaces would be provided, thereby securing one parking space for each flat, in accordance with London Plan standards. The car parking spaces would be reached utilising the existing rear access road off Fourth Avenue at the rear of the site. The transport officer has no objections to the proposed parking and access arrangements.
**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 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: 3659_PL05A; 3659_PL06A; 3659_PL07B; 3659_PL08A; 3659_PL09; 3659_PL010B; 3659_PL11B; 3659_PL13.
   
   **Reason:** For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests 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 of hard and soft landscaping for the site, including seating for the shared external amenity space, and details of materials, species and a planting schedule have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved hard landscaping and seating shall be completed prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter permanently retained. The approved soft landscaping 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 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 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. 3659_PL11b 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. The refuse enclosures indicated on drawing No. 3659_PL11b 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.

7. No development above ground level shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the position, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected which shall include a boundary treatment between the pavement of Fourth Avenue and the adjacent car parking space in order to prevent vehicles over-running the pavement whilst maintaining adequate sightlines. The development shall not be occupied until the approved boundary treatment has been provided. The approved boundary treatment shall be retained unless the Local Planning Authority gives prior written approval for its removal.

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

8. Before occupation, all 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 the London Plan.

9. The privacy screen to the first floor roof terrace of Flat 2 shown on drawing No. 3659_PL10a shall be installed prior to occupation of this flat and thereafter permanently maintained.

Reason: In order to prevent a harmful loss of privacy to the rear garden and first floor rear window of No. 290 Dagenham Road and in accordance with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

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

Reason: To maintain reasonable levels of protection for the occupiers of the development from external noise and in accordance with policies BR13 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.
11. Any machinery and equipment relocated or installed pursuant to this permission shall be designed and installed to ensure that structure borne (re-radiated) noise emissions shall not exceed 35 LAeq dB (5 min) when measured in any habitable room in adjoining residential premises.

Reason: To maintain reasonable levels of protection for the occupiers of the development from external noise and in accordance with policies BR13 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

12. Habitable rooms having openings facing onto Dagenham Road or Fourth Avenue are to be provided with acoustic ventilators which are commensurate with the performance specification set out in Schedule 1 (paragraphs 6 and 7) of The Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 (as amended).

Reason: To maintain reasonable levels of protection for the occupiers of the development from external noise and in accordance with policies BR13 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

13. Demolition and construction work and associated activities are only to be carried out between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00-13:00 Saturday with no work on Sundays or public 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.

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.

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 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.

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. measures to control the emission of dust, dirt and emissions to air during construction; such measures to accord with the guidance provided in the
document “The Control of Dust and Emissions during construction and
demolition”, Mayor of London, July 2014; including but not confined to, non
road mobile machinery (NRMM) requirements.

g. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and
construction works;

h. the use of efficient construction materials;

i. methods to minimise waste, to encourage re-use, recovery and recycling,
and sourcing of materials; and 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 development above ground level shall take place until a drawing showing details
of the external appearance of the north elevation of the retained garage to the rear
of No. 290 Dagenham Road has 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.

1. **Introduction and Description of Development**

1.1 The application site, 288 Dagenham Road, is located at the junction of Dagenham
Road and Fourth Avenue. The building is a semi-detached property comprising
ground floor shop (Premier Handy Stores) (which is double width, also incorporating
the ground floor of the adjoining No. 290) and an independently accessed first floor
flat. There is also an adjacent first floor flat at No. 290 which it is understood is
occupied by the operator of the shop.

1.2 The site is surrounded by mainly two storey houses within Fourth Avenue and
Dagenham Road, with a block of three storey flats fronting Dagenham Road to the
north of the site.

1.3 Within the site, to the rear of the building is a garden/yard with one of a pair of semi-
detached garages at its end, the adjoining garage serving the neighbouring property
at No. 290. To the side of the building is a 4.5m wide hard paved forecourt up to the
back edge of the pavement of Fourth Avenue.

1.4 The proposed development is to erect a two storey side/rear extension with
additional accommodation in the roof space that would be set in from the back edge
of the pavement by 0.15m and have a total depth of 19.7m. The existing first floor
The scheme would provide a small additional retail unit of 26m², and a total of 4 flats (3 x 2 bedroom and 1 x 1 bedroom).

1.5 The existing garage would be demolished to make space for 4 proposed car parking spaces at the rear of the site, to be accessed from the existing rear access road that serves Nos. 288 and 290 and 1a and 1b Fourth Avenue, a pair of houses to the rear of Dagenham Road.

2. Background

2.1 The site has no planning history of specific relevance to the current proposal.

3. Consultations

Adjoining occupiers

3.1 Consultation letters were sent to 27 neighbouring occupiers. In response 11 objection letters were received and a petition in objection with 364 signatures. The petition and the majority of the letters were enclosed with the letter of objection from the occupier of the Premier Handy Store within the site, who it is understood is a leaseholder of the applicant.

3.2 Additionally, a copy has been provided of a ballot of those attending a Rush Green Residents Association meeting on 11 August showing that there was a unanimous vote to oppose the planning application by the 30 members present.

3.3 The majority of those signing the petition are from local addresses within Rush Green, though not all are living within close proximity of the site.

3.4 The letters are mainly from residents in the vicinity of the site including nearby houses within Dagenham Road and Fourth Avenue. One of the letters is from the Avenue Social Club located on the opposite side of Dagenham Road at No. 231. The letter states that the club committee after taking instructions from its members wishes to oppose the application.

3.5 In summary the reasons stated for objecting to the proposal within the submitted letters includes the following:

- No need for additional retail unit
- Insufficient parking for the development will result in additional on street parking in the vicinity that would be detrimental to highway safety
- Additional use of the existing vehicular access by the proposed 4 parking spaces would compromise pedestrian safety on Fourth Avenue
- Parking congestion in the area is already excessive particularly during school run hours.
- The side extension would adversely affect the sightline of motorists using the Fourth Avenue/ Dagenham Road junction
- The proposed retail use would endanger the business of the existing shop
- The construction period would cause disruption
- The proposed density of development is too great
• Proposal would compromise the privacy of the occupiers of No. 290 Dagenham Road
• Poor and unsightly design
• Side extension would create a terrace, and thereby de-value the existing semi-detached property at 290 Dagenham Road
• Side extension would be over existing right of access for occupiers of No. 290 Dagenham Road and would prevent deliveries to rear of shop
• The development may require the relocation of existing external plant for chiller units within existing shop that would be detrimental to the business

Environmental Health

3.6 No objection subject to the imposition of conditions relating to noise, hours of construction work, and a Construction and Environmental Management Plan.

Transport Development Management

3.7 The current Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating has been determined at a low level of 2, on a scale of 1 to 6 where 6 is excellent.

3.8 This proposal to construct a new commercial unit next to this property and 3 additional dwellings.

3.9 The site provides 1 existing parking space and the proposed development would provide 4 parking spaces. It is recommended that these should be allocated to provide one space per flat.

3.10 A bollard or other protection should be installed to ensure that motorists accessing the parking space adjacent to the pavement of Fourth Avenue utilise the existing access road and do not overrun the pavement. Subject to this being secured the proposed development is considered acceptable.

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 resulting in contributions of £5,335.25 and £2,332.86 respectively.

5. Equalities

5.1 The Equality Act 2010 requires the Council to advance equality of opportunity in the exercise of its functions.

5.2 In relation to this obligation all of the proposed flats would be designed to the standards set by Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations (Accessible and adaptable dwellings).
6. Analysis

Principle of the Development

6.1 The site is not designated for any specific purpose. The principle of extending the existing building in this location to provide a small additional retail unit and additional dwellings is acceptable.

Design

6.2 The proposed two storey side/ rear extension, by infilling the existing side forecourt and side garden of the site would result in a less open and spacious appearance to the street scene at the Dagenham Road/ Fourth Avenue junction. The resulting building would also sit forward of the adjacent building line in Fourth Avenue. However, in the context of the width of Dagenham Road and the set back of buildings fronting the road, it is not considered that the proposed extension would cause harm in this respect.

6.3 The proposed elevations indicate that the roof design, window proportions, and materials would be in keeping with the existing building. The proposed side elevation would incorporate two dormer windows in the sloping roof fronting Fourth Avenue. Each would have dimensions of 1.5m high and 2.4m wide, and would be set in from the roof edges. It is considered that they would not appear overly dominant.

Amenity

6.4 The proposed development has the potential to affect the amenities of the attached neighbouring flat at No. 290. In particular, the proposal incorporates a first floor terrace to serve proposed Flat 2 that would be located adjacent to the boundary with No. 290, and its first floor rear window.

6.5 In order to protect the privacy of the neighbour a side and part rear screen to this terrace has been proposed and is shown on the submitted drawing. This would prevent overlooking of the adjacent window and direct overlooking of the neighbouring garden.

6.6 The proposed flats would each meet the standards set out within the London Plan in relation to accessibility, bedroom sizes, storage space, and overall floor space, and would all be dual aspect.

6.7 In addition to the 16m2 roof terrace described above, serving Flat 2; Flat 1 a ground floor duplex unit would have a private rear garden with an area of 27m2, and Flat 2 (on the second floor within the roof space) would have a roof terrace of 5m2. These areas of private amenity space would each meet the standards set by the London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance.

6.8 The exception is proposed Flat 3 on the first floor that is within the corner of the proposed building facing Dagenham Road and Fourth Avenue which is not designed with any private external amenity space. It is understood that the architect has not proposed a balcony or terrace for this unit on the basis that due to its prominent position it would compromise the building design and be out of character.
This is accepted, and in addition to the private spaces referred to above a shared external amenity space within the existing rear garden is proposed that would have an area of 15m². It is considered that subject to this being a well designed garden space it would adequately compensate for the lack of private space for this unit. A landscaping details condition is proposed.

Transport

6.9 The site has one existing parking space within the garage that would be demolished. It is understood that this is not in use by the occupier of the shop who has the use of the adjoining garage to the rear of No. 290. Consequently there is one parking space to serve one existing flat.

6.10 The proposed development would provide 4 parking spaces, one to serve each flat, resulting in a one for one parking ratio. This would be in accordance with the standards set out within the London Plan which sets a maximum parking standard of 1 space per unit for 1 and 2 bedroom accommodation and is considered acceptable.

6.11 Whilst it is possible that there could be some overspill on street parking generated by the proposed development it is considered unlikely that this would be significant, or of a quantum that would materially affect highway safety as feared by some of those objecting to the application. Furthermore in relation to planning policy paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Frameworks states: “Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.”

6.12 The scheme does not provide any parking for the proposed small retail unit with a floor space of 26m² that could also be potentially utilised as an extension to the existing shop. This is considered acceptable as it is not considered that it would have a material impact on traffic and parking congestion and it is fairly typical for small shops not to have designated off street parking.

6.13 The applicant has submitted a diagram demonstrating the suitability of the proposed parking layout. A condition can be imposed requiring details of the boundary treatment and such details can be designed to address the Transport Officer’s comment about preventing potential over-running of the pavement by cars.

6.14 The access road off Fourth Avenue that would serve the proposed parking spaces is existing though it would be used more intensively as a result of the development. There would be adequate sightlines between motorists and pedestrians utilising the adjacent pavement on Fourth Avenue. The Transport Officer has not judged this arrangement to be harmful to highway and pedestrian safety and it is therefore considered acceptable.

6.15 It has been stated that the proposed development would prevent deliveries to the rear of the shop and affect a right of access. It is not considered that rear delivery access needs to be provided for planning or highway reasons, and the issue of rights of access is a private matter between the two parties.

6.16 In fact to the front of the shop on Dagenham Road there is a designated loading bay that has presumably been put in place especially to serve the existing shop unit
given the lack of any adjacent commercial premises. This would appear to be the best place for deliveries to take place because it avoids the need for large vehicles to utilise Fourth Avenue and the adjacent streets needed to gain access, due to Fourth Avenue being one way at its eastern end. Furthermore any parked vehicle attempting a delivery to the rear of the shop from Fourth Avenue would tend to block the counter-flow cycle lane on Fourth Avenue, creating a hazard. Photographs have been viewed showing the above existing loading bay in use.

6.17 With regard to the concern expressed about the impact of the development on the sightline between Fourth Avenue and Dagenham Road, given that the building is set back from Dagenham Road the sightline would remain more than adequate for motorists entering Dagenham Road to have a clear view of oncoming traffic.

Other matters

6.18 In relation to the density of the development (raised by an objector) this is considered acceptable on the basis that the extensions are not judged to over dominate the street scene, and an acceptable standard of residential amenity would be achieved for both future occupiers and existing neighbours.

6.19 It is accepted (as raised by an objector) that construction can sometimes cause a degree of disruption, but this is not a reason to refuse planning permission. It is, however, proposed that a Construction and Environmental Management Plan condition be imposed that would require the developer to submit details for approval demonstrating how the scheme would minimise the impact of construction on neighbours in relation to matters such as noise, dust and traffic.

6.20 With regard to the concern expressed about the external fans serving the chiller units it is not clear whether or not these would need to be relocated as a result of the development. In relation to their potential noise impact on the occupiers of the proposed adjacent first floor flat, this relationship is similar to that for the existing flat, and the Environmental Health Officer is satisfied that an acceptable standard of residential amenity can be maintained through the imposition of the proposed noise condition. If relocation is required, it would be a private matter that would need to be resolved between the leaseholder and the developer.

6.21 A number of other objections raised, including those relating to private rights of way, potential property devaluation, the lack of need for an additional retail unit, and the potential impact of the additional retail unit on the existing business at the site, are not planning considerations and therefore cannot be taken into account.

Background Papers

- Planning Application File
- Local Plan Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy CM1</td>
<td>General Principles for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy BR9</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy BR10</td>
<td>Sustainable Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy BR11</td>
<td>Walking and Cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy BR13</td>
<td>Noise Mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy BC7  Crime Prevention
Policy BP8  Protecting Residential Amenity
Policy BP11 Urban Design

- **London Plan Policy**
  
  Policy 3.3  Increasing housing supply
  Policy 3.5  Quality and design of housing developments
  Policy 3.8  Housing choice
  Policy 6.9  Cycling
  Policy 6.13 Parking
  Policy 7.3  Designing out crime
  Policy 8.3  Community infrastructure levy

- **National Policy**

  National Planning Policy Framework
  National Planning Practice Guidance
This page is intentionally left blank
This page is intentionally left blank
This page is intentionally left blank
This page is intentionally left blank
This page is intentionally left blank
Location of Site

Land Adjacent To 95 Church Elm Lane, Dagenham
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Application No: 17/01626/FUL
Ward: Village

Reason for Referral to DCB as set out in Part 2, Chapter 9 of the Council Constitution:
A letter containing 8 signatures objecting to the proposed development has been received and the application is recommended for approval.

Address: Land adjacent To 95 Church Elm Lane, Dagenham

Development:
Application for variation of condition 2 (Approved Plans) in respect of planning permission 16/00535/FUL: Erection double storey rear extension to new dwelling, front porch and alterations to front windows.

Applicant:
Mr P Mazreku

Summary:
Planning permission 16/00535/FUL was granted on 12 July 2017 for “Demolition of existing extensions and erection of two storey 2 bedroom end of terrace dwelling” as an extension to the terrace on land adjacent to 95 Church Elm Lane.

This application seeks to vary condition 2 (Approved Plans) in respect of planning permission 16/00535/FUL. This is essentially an application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for minor material amendments to the development approved under planning permission 16/00535/FUL and should be considered in the context of the approved planning permission for the site.

The application proposes to add a two storey rear extension to the approved new dwelling which is currently under construction.

The proposed changes to the previously approved plans submitted under planning ref.16/00535/FUL consist of extending the rear wall of the property by 2.2 metres at ground floor level and by 3 metres at first floor level. The proposed two storey rear extension would project in line with an existing rear extension at adjoining property No.95 Church Elm Lane. A hipped roof would be retained.

The distance between the proposed development and neighbouring properties in Crane Close would be similar to that of other end terrace configurations at nearby Huntings Road, Manning Road, Blackborne Road, Haresfield Road, Harrison Road and Church Elm Lane. The proposal would not therefore be out of character with the built form of the area and, as a minimum of 12.5 metres would be retained between the rear façade of the Crane Close houses and the new house, it is considered that the impact on neighbouring amenity would be acceptable.

The proposed extension will increase the internal floor area from 70sqm previously approved under planning ref. 16/00535/FUL to 89.4sqm, as such the new dwelling would comfortably provide sufficient space for daily living.

The private amenity space for the new dwelling would be reduced from 55.4sqm with a
depth of 11.1 metres to 50.75sqm with a depth of 9 metres. The depth of the rear garden area would not be dissimilar to those of neighbouring dwellings in Crane Close and as such the reduction in size is considered acceptable.

The proposed two storey extension does not seek to create any additional bedrooms and the proposed car parking space in the front garden is still considered to be satisfactory.

Recommendation:

That the Development Control Board grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: ZAAVIA/95CEL/801 B, ZAAVIA/95CEL/802 C, ZAAVIA/95CEL/803 B, ZAAVIA/95CEL/804 C, ZAAVIA/95CEL/805 B, ZAAVIA/95CEL/806 B

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

2. Details/samples of all materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development, shall be submitted for approval to the Local Planning Authority within one month of the date of this permission. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

   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.

3. The dwelling hereby permitted shall comply with the requirements of Building Regulation M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'. 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 the house is accessible and adaptable in accordance with policy 3.8 of the London Plan.

4. A scheme of landscaping for the front garden of the new dwelling, including details of boundary treatment, materials and any planting species, shall be submitted for approval to the Local Planning Authority within one month of the date of this permission. The scheme shall make provision for one car parking space. The approved hard landscaping shall be carried out prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter permanently retained. Any soft landscaping 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.

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

Contact Officer
Ian Drew
Title: Development Management Officer
Contact Details: Tel: 020 8227 3067 E-mail: Ian.Drew@lbbd.gov.uk
1. Introduction and Description of Development

1.1 Planning permission 16/00535/FUL was granted on 12 July 2017 for “Demolition of existing extensions and erection of two storey 2 bedroom end of terrace dwelling” as an extension to the terrace on land adjacent to 95 Church Elm Lane. Consultations were undertaken with 12 neighbouring houses and, as no replies were received, the application was determined under delegated powers.

1.2 This application seeks to vary condition 2 (Approved Plans) in respect of planning permission 16/00535/FUL. This is essentially an application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for minor material amendments to the development approved under planning permission 16/00535/FUL and should be considered in the context of the approved planning permission for the site.

1.3 The application proposes to add a two storey rear extension to the approved new dwelling which is currently under construction. The proposed development also includes the construction of a front porch and alterations to the front windows of the previously approved scheme.

2. Background

2.1 16/00001/FUL - Demolition of existing extensions and erection of two storey 2 bedroom end of terrace dwelling and formation of new front door with canopy over to existing house – Application Refused.

16/00535/FUL - Demolition of existing extensions and erection of two storey 2 bedroom end of terrace dwelling – Application Approved.

17/01625/CLU_P - 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 – Pending Consideration.

3. Consultations

3.1 Neighbouring occupiers were consulted, 2 letters were received from neighbouring occupiers one of which contains 8 signatures from the residents of Crane Close objecting to the proposal on the following grounds;

- Development is not being built in accordance with previously approved plans
- The proposed development will overlook neighbouring properties in Crane Close resulting in an undue loss of privacy to the first floor bedrooms and rear garden areas of adjoining properties
- Overbearing impact on the occupants of No.10 Crane Close

Officer Note:
Officers have instructed the applicant to cease current construction work to the rear and roof of the property pending the determination of this application. Following concerns raised by neighbouring occupiers, officers have also informed the applicant that the gable end roof that was being constructed must be removed and a hipped roof instated in accordance with the previously approved plans.
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 £2,293.13 and an LBBD CIL contribution of £1,002.68.

5. **Equalities Considerations**

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

6. **Analysis**

6.1 **Principle of Development**

6.1.1 The principle of the proposed new dwelling has already been agreed pursuant to Planning Permission 16/00535/FUL.

6.2 **Design and Amenity**

6.2.1 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.

6.2.2 The proposed changes to the previously approved plans submitted under planning ref.16/00535/FUL consist of extending the rear wall of the property by 2.2 metres at ground floor level and by 3 metres at first floor level. The proposed two storey rear extension would project in line with an existing rear extension at adjoining property No.95 Church Elm Lane. A hipped roof would be retained.

6.2.3 Whilst the application property is a new build dwelling and the proposed development is therefore not strictly an ‘alteration or extension’, the guidance set out in the Council’s Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is considered relevant on the basis of assessing the impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

6.2.4 The proposed rear extension will extend to within 1 metre of the eastern boundary at its narrowest point and to within 9 metres of the northern site boundary. The provision/reduction of private external amenity space is examined separately within this report.

6.2.5 Whilst there is no minimum set distance between properties prescribed by Council policy, a depth of 11-12 metres is generally considered acceptable. In this instance a minimum distance of 12.5 metres would be retained between the flank wall of the proposed extension and the rear wall of adjacent property No.10 Crane Close. A
distance of 18 metres would be retained between the proposed extension and the rear wall of No.15 Crane Close located to the north of the application site.

6.2.6 It is noted that in a recent appeal decision at 261 Grafton Road, Dagenham which related to a proposed two storey side and rear extension with a hipped roof, the Inspector was satisfied that the retention of a 10.5 metre distance between the flank wall of the proposed extension and the rear wall of an adjacent property was sufficient and subsequently deemed that the occupants of the adjacent dwelling would not experience a significant reduction in daylight or sunlight.

6.2.7 Furthermore it is noted that the proposed relationship between the proposed rear extension and the rear wall of No.10 Crane Close would not be dissimilar to that of other end terrace configurations at nearby Huntings Road, Manning Road, Blackborne Road, Haresfield Road, Harrison Road and Church Elm Lane.

6.2.8 At its narrowest point the proposed rear extension will extend to within 1 metre of the eastern site boundary, the same distance separates the flank wall of the new build dwelling and the eastern boundary. As such it is considered that the impact on the occupiers of No.s 9 and 10 Crane Close would be the same. It is noted that the occupier of No.9 Crane Close raised no objection to the original application ref.16/00535/FUL where a distance of 12.5 metres between properties was considered acceptable.

6.2.9 The plans submitted indicate the insertion of an additional ground floor window on the flank wall of the property serving a lounge/living area. The top of the proposed ground floor window will be positioned 2 metres above ground level and, given that the eastern boundary is marked by a 1.8 metre high close boarded timber fence, it is not considered that the additional window would result in any undue loss of privacy..

6.3 Internal Design

6.3.1 In accordance with the Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard, 4person 2 bedroom 2 storey dwellings require a minimum gross internal floor area of 79sqm, including 2.0sqm of built-in storage. The proposed extension will increase the internal floor area from 70sqm previously approved under planning ref. 16/00535/FUL to 89.4sqm, as such the new dwelling would comfortably 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 2 bed house is 50sqm. In addition, Policy BP5 seeks a minimum rear garden depth of 12 metres.

6.4.2 The private amenity space for the new dwelling would be reduced from 55.4sqm with a depth of 11.1 metres to 50.75sqm with a depth of 9 metres. The depth of the rear garden area would be the same as the adjoining house at 95 Church Elm Lane and would not be dissimilar to those of neighbouring dwellings in Crane Close (some of which have depths of 7-8 metres) and as such a garden of this depth would not be out of character with the area.
6.5 Parking

6.5.1 The application site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 3 which represents moderate 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 1-2 bedrooms, less than 1 car parking space per unit should be achieved. 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 original application ref. 16/00535/FUL provided 1 off-street parking space fronting the new dwelling with the loss of 1 existing parking space serving the donor property. Officers shared the view of the Transport Development Management Team that the use of the existing on street parking bay by the occupiers of No.95 Church Elm Lane was preferred to losing one car length in the CPZ bay outside the property (and the flexibility that this currently provides) in order to accommodate a new vehicular crossover.

6.5.3 The proposed two storey extension does not seek to create any additional bedrooms and as such would not increase existing car parking requirements which remain acceptable.

Background Papers

- Planning Application File
- Local Plan Policy
  
  Core Strategy (July 2010)
  
  Policy CP3 – High Quality Built Environment
  
  Local Development Framework (LDF) Borough Wide Development Plan Document (DPD)
  
  Policy BP5 – External Amenity Space
  Policy BP8 – Protecting Residential Amenity
  Policy BP11 – Urban Design
  Policy BR9 – Parking
  
  Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for Residential Extensions and Alterations
  
  Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard
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Title: Town Planning Appeals

Report of the Head of Planning

Open Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards Affected: Becontree, Eastbrook, Eastbury, Heath, Longbridge, Mayesbrook, River, Thames, Valence, Whalebone</th>
<th>Key Decision: No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report Author: Dave Mansfield, Development Management Manager</td>
<td>Tel: 020 8227 3999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:dave.mansfield@befirst.london">dave.mansfield@befirst.london</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:

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

Recommendation:

The Development Control Board is asked to note this report.

1. Appeals Lodged

The following appeals have been lodged:

a) Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof and rear dormer window and erection of part single/part first floor rear extension (retrospective) – 28 Castle Road, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00598/FUL)

Application refused under delegated powers 2 June 2017 – Eastbury Ward

b) Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.95 metres; height to eaves: 2.95 metres and maximum height: 3.3 metres) – 158 Valence Road, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00952/PRIOR6)

Application refused under delegated powers 17 July 2017 – Valence Ward

c) Alterations to front elevation of garage and erection of first floor side extension – 146 Marston Avenue, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00453/FUL)

Application refused under delegated powers 30 June 2017 – Heath Ward

d) Erection of two storey side and part single/part two storey rear extension – 75 Davington Road, Dagenham (Ref: 17/01072/FUL)
Application refused under delegated powers 21 August 2017 – Mayesbrook Ward

e) Erection of two storey building comprising 2 one bedroom flats – 8 Bonham Gardens, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00097/OUT)

Application refused under delegated powers 4 April 2017 – Valence Ward

f) Erection of two storey 2 bedroom end of terrace house – 33 Temple Avenue, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00858/FUL)

Application refused under delegated powers 20 July 2017 – Whalebone Ward

2. Appeals Determined

2.1.1 The following appeals have been determined by the Planning Inspectorate:

a) Erection of two storey side and part single/part two storey rear extension – 58 Melford Avenue, Barking (Ref: 17/00458/FUL – Longbridge Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 15 May 2017 for the following reason:

1. The proposed two storey side extension would partly close off an important gap, detrimental to the spatial quality of the area and harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. The proposed design and gabled roof treatment would be incongruous and out of keeping in the street scene and would fail to preserve the character of the area 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 October 2017 (see attached)

b) Erection of two storey side/rear extension – 80 Gainsborough Road, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00926/FUL – Becontree Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 1 August 2017 for the following reason:

1. The proposed development by reason of its size and siting, would constitute a prominent and unsympathetic addition, harmful to the symmetry of the pair of dwellings and character of the area and contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011) and the guidance in the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012).

Planning Inspectorate's Decision: Appeal dismissed 1 November 2017 (see attached)

c) Demolition of existing garages and erection of 8 two bedroom flats with associated car parking and landscaping - Garages to the rear of 82 - 94 High Road, Chadwell Heath (Ref: 16/01708/OUT – Whalebone Ward)
Application refused under delegated powers 29 December 2016 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would result in the loss of a large proportion of the garden areas for the existing dwellings at 82-94 High Road which would result in inadequate garden space remaining which would be harmful to the amenity of existing occupiers and contrary to policies BP5, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

2. The proximity of the proposed development to the existing dwellings at 82-94 High Road would lead to significant overlooking and loss of privacy which would be harmful to the amenity of existing and proposed residents and contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

3. The proposed development would fail to retain adequate parking provision for existing residents and thereby result in increased parking pressures, which would be harmful to highway safety and contrary to policies BR9 and BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

4. The access to the new dwellings would be via a narrow unadopted service road without a dedicated footway which would be likely to compromise pedestrian safety contrary to policy BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 7 November 2017 (see attached)

d) Erection of one bedroom bungalow – 84C Westminster Gardens, Barking (Ref: 16/01272/FUL – Thames Ward)

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

1. The principle of the provision of a bungalow in a private rear garden is inappropriate and fails to protect the character and amenity of the local area, the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers and the biodiversity of the area, contrary to policy 7.19 of the London Plan, policy CP3 of the Core Strategy and policies BR3, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

2. The proposed bungalow, by reason of its form, massing, siting and design, would be dominant and out of character in the rear garden location, detrimental to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, and susceptible to crime by reason of its siting away from the road, contrary to policy CP3 of the Core Strategy and policies BC7, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

3. The existing single width vehicular crossover from Westminster Gardens which is located at a bend in the road is not considered to be suitable as an access for multiple dwellings and this also has the potential to be detrimental to highway
and pedestrian safety; the new access road is not considered to be sufficiently wide to prevent vehicle strikes to the existing house and fence and to ensure there is no conflict between pedestrians and vehicles using the access road; and the close proximity of the new access road and car parking to the rear gardens of neighbouring occupiers has the potential to adversely affect residential amenity; contrary to policy 6.13 of the London Plan and policies BR9, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

Planning Inspectorate's Decision: Appeal dismissed 2 November 2017 (see attached)

e) Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres in total comprising 3.0 metres existing and 3.0 metre proposed; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres) – 150 Third Avenue, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00717/PRIOR6 – River Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 8 June 2017 for the following reason:

1. The proposed rear extension would project beyond a side wall of the original house and form a side extension which is more than half the width of the original dwellinghouse. Consequently, the proposal would not accord with Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A1. (j), (iii) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015

Planning Inspectorate's Decision: Appeal dismissed 2 November 2017 (see attached)

f) Erection of part single/part two storey side and rear extensions – 162 Gorseway, Rush Green (Ref: 17/00374/FUL – Eastbrook Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 28 April 2017 for the following reason:

1. The proposed two storey side extension by reason of its design, width and siting would result in the closing of the gap with the adjoining property which would not respect the established spacing pattern of development and therefore fail to reflect the open and spacious characteristic pattern of development in this part of Gorseway. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene and the locality contrary to the design objectives of policies BP8 and BP11 to the Development Plan Document and the Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions and Alterations (2012).

Planning Inspectorate's Decision: Appeal dismissed 16 November 2017 (see attached)

g) Erection of two storey side extension and single storey front and rear extensions – 105 Arnold Road, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00714/FUL – River Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 28 June 2017 for the following reason:

1. The proposed two storey side extension, by reason of its siting and excessive scale, would be disproportionately wide and erode the importance of the full
height 'bookend' architectural feature to the terrace; the proposed roof comprises irregular shaped roof slopes and would appear unsympathetic to the roof of the host house and the orderly hipped roof design of the adjacent houses. Overall, the proposal would be harmful to the character of the local area 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 22 November 2017 (see attached)
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2017

by Richard Schofield BA(Hons) MA MRTPi
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 1st November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3182914
80 Gainsborough Road, Dagenham RM8 2DP

- 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 Rafal Bednarz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 17/00926/FUL, dated 5 June 2017, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2017.
- The development proposed is described as, “erection of a two storey side and rear extension to provide a larger dining room/kitchen and dedicated utility room on ground floor and one additional bedroom with WC on the first floor. The proposed materials would match these [sic] of the existing main house. New windows will be in keeping regarding proportions and materials with existing.”

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Gainsborough Road is part of a mature residential suburb, characterised by terraced and semi-detached houses. There is a strong sense of place, with streets laid out in a clear plan form; dwellings of a coherent scale and form; the use of common building materials and building lines; and the location of feature buildings on corner plots. Side extensions do not appear to be a typical feature of the area, with semi-detached dwellings (variations in fenestration and use of render notwithstanding) typically retaining a strong sense of symmetry.

4. 80 Gainsborough Road (No 80) is one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, with 13 Mayesbrook Road (No 13), which wraps around one of the four corners of the crossroads between Gainsborough Road and Mayesbrook Road. Identically styled pairs of dwellings are located on the other three corners, set back from the road behind triangular front gardens. Overall, this gives the crossroads a very distinctive and appealing formality, and uniformity, of design.

5. The appeal proposal would extend No 80 further down Gainsborough Road, unbalancing its characteristic symmetry with No 13. The largely blank
extension would appear as a rather stark and incongruous addition to the distinctive, compact design of the semi-detached pair.

6. In addition, the proposal would extend some way into the rear garden of No 80, out beyond the rear building line. It would be clearly visible from the rear elevation and rear garden of No 13, appearing as an uncharacteristically dominant and intrusive feature, at odds with the much more low key, single storey extensions to the rear of other surrounding dwellings.

7. The appeal proposal may not be visible from all points of the crossroads, but it would still be prominent in views from various public and private vantage points.

8. Reference is made to an extension to No 13. All that was apparent from my site visit was an extremely small, single storey side extension to the dwelling, set back from the front elevation. Its impact upon the symmetry of the pair is negligible. It certainly cannot be regarded as setting any kind of precedent for the appeal proposal.

9. Vicars Walk is a later 20th century infill development on Gainsborough Road, which jars with the prevailing design of the area. It is located next to No 80 and has interrupted the rhythm of development at this point, leaving a larger than typical gap between it and No 80. Nonetheless, I do not consider that this justifies further harm to the street scene at this point. Indeed, the space between No 80 and Vicars Walk arguably helps to draw a clear distinction between the two buildings, enhancing the prominence of No 80 as a feature.

10. I conclude that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with polices BP8 and BP11 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document. These seek to ensure, among other things, that new development protects or enhances the character of the area, creating a sense of local identity and distinctiveness.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and taking all other matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal proposal conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole. I do not consider there to be any material considerations that would outweigh this conflict and, thus, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Schofield

INSPECTOR
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2017

by A J Mageean BA (Hons) BPI PhD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3179102
58 Melford Avenue, Barking IG11 9HT

- 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 Ahbab Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
- The application Ref 17/00458/FUL, dated 17 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2017.
- The development proposed is erection of two storey side and part single/part two storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the more succinct description of the development provided on the appeal form in the interests of clarity.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene within Melford Avenue.

Reasons

4. Melford Avenue is a pleasant suburban road characterised by terraces of four dwellings set behind modestly sized front garden areas. The end terrace properties, such as the appeal dwelling, have single storey side garages which typically adjoin the equivalent garages of neighbouring properties. The resulting frontage gaps at first floor level, which are further enhanced where the end properties retain their original hipped roof profile, present noticeable and welcomed visual relief, reducing the intensity of built form in this area. These gaps, which often provide glimpses of trees in rear gardens, make a positive contribution to the local street scene.

5. The appellant’s view is that as a result of previous extensions the street has a largely terraced character. On this point I accept that existing extensions have eroded the presence of some of these characteristic gaps. Where terracing between groups of properties has taken place, the loss of glimpsed views of space and gardens beyond creates a cramped and oppressive appearance. However, as the Council’s survey indicates, around half of these gaps have been retained in full, with others partially lost and some lost
altogether. Whilst I accept that the frontage treatment of these dwellings varies, as the majority of the side gaps have been retained at least in part, they remain a characteristic feature of Melford Avenue which is beneficial to the appearance local street scene.

6. The current proposal would include the demolition of the existing garage and the addition of a two storey side extension and replacement of the hipped roof form with a gable. The extension would be set down from the roof ridge, set in from the front building line by around 800mm, and set in from the side boundary by a little more than half a metre at first floor level.

7. The specific guidance on such matters set out in the Council’s SPD does not preclude side additions to end of terrace or semi-detached properties. This guidance notes that where the “gaps between buildings contribute positively to the character of the area it will be expected that the first floor of the proposed side extensions are set off the side boundary of the site”. I accept that in this case a small side gap at first floor level would be retained. However this gap, in combination with the additional bulk created by the hip to gable addition, would not be sufficient to provide the visual relief required. This concern is compounded by the fact that, should this scheme be allowed, it would be hard to resist a similar scheme from the neighbouring property to the south, No 60, in which case this gap, including the views of space and mature vegetation beyond, would to a large degree be lost.

8. I accept that the current scheme would present more of a gap in the street scene than the case relating to No 51 Melford Avenue which was dismissed at appeal. However this fact does not in itself indicate that small gap which would be present in the current case would be acceptable. It is also suggested that the appeal site occupies a less prominent position in the street than this previous case. However, given the minor nature of the bend in the road, the difference between the two sites in this respect is not in itself significant.

9. The appellant refers to the fact that the Council permitted the side extension to No 66, and other extensions in similar circumstances, subsequent to the adoption of the SPD. However I do not have the full details of these cases before me. As such I have considered the present proposal on its own merits, assessed against local policy and guidance, and found it to be unacceptable.

10. The appellant also points out that this property is not listed, nor does it form part of a conservation area, and that there were no objections to this scheme from neighbours or third parties. Nevertheless it remains that, in accordance with national and local policy, including paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework, development is expected to respond to local character. I also accept that, subject to certain limitations, permitted development rights allow the construction of hip to gable extensions. However in this case it is the combined impact of the side extension with its gable roof form which renders this scheme unacceptable.

---

1 Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2012
2 APP/Z5060/D/16/3159451
11. I note that this is a resubmission of a previous application with the same reason for refusal, though no details of the previous scheme are before me. The appellant makes the point that the Council does not object to the extension of this dwelling in principle. In this respect I note that the Council raises no objection to the proposed rear ground and first floor additions and I have no reason to take a different view. Nevertheless, the harm to the local street scene renders the proposed side additions to this property unacceptable.

12. The appellant refers to the fact that the implementation of this scheme would improve the family living conditions at this property, making the point that this would accord with the housing policies in the Framework. Whilst I accept that this may be the case, such considerations do not override the policies in the Framework seeking a high standard of design which responds to local character.

13. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the street scene within Melford Avenue. In this respect it would not accord with the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Policies DPD 2011 Policies BP8 and BP11 or the SPD which, taken together, require development to have regard to the local character of an area, protecting local views and vistas and reinforcing a sense of local identity.

**Conclusion**

14. For the reasons set out above the appeal is dismissed.

*Aj Mageean*

INSPECTOR
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Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2017

by A J Mageean  BA (Hons) BPI PhD MRTP

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

Decision date: 7th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/17/3178458

Land to the rear of 82-94 High Road, Back Lane, Romford RM6 6NX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Ashton’s Development Company Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 16/01708/OUT, dated 31 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 December 2016.
- The development proposed is demolition of existing garages and erection of 8 two bedroom flats with associated car parking and landscaping.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application was submitted in outline with all matters except access reserved for consideration at a later stage. Therefore the ‘Block Plan and Floor Plans’ and ‘Indicative Front Elevation and Street Scene’ submitted with the application are for illustrative purposes only and I have regarded them as such in my decision.

3. Whilst the site referred to in the application is 82-94 High Road, I note that the site plan and the appellant’s statement refer to 78-94 High Road. I have therefore referred to these additional properties in my decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 78-94 High Road with particular reference to the provision of private garden space, privacy and outlook; whether the future occupiers of the flats would experience acceptable living conditions with particular reference to privacy; and, the effect of the development on the safety of pedestrians and other road users in the vicinity of Back Lane.

Reasons

Living conditions – private garden space for existing occupiers

5. The appeal site comprises a large portion of the rear garden and garage areas associated with 9 semi-detached buildings which are divided into 18 ground and first floor flats. Both upper and lower floor flats appear to have separate rear back doors, and external staircases in the case of the first floor flats, providing access to long narrow gardens. Contrary to the appellant’s view that the majority of these gardens are neglected, I noted on my site visit that most of
these gardens appear to be well maintained and used, containing the usual range of garden accessories including furniture, play equipment and washing lines. I also noted that two of these garden areas had been fenced across to reduce their length. Nevertheless, it is clear from the representations received from the tenants of these properties that many of these gardens are much valued.

6. The proposed site area would reduce the rear gardens of these two bedroom properties to about a third of their current size, with the area of those relating to upper floor flats measuring around 20m², though the ground floor flats would retain an area up to around 38m². Policy BP5 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough-Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document 2011 (DPD) states that the minimum standard of amenity space for new two bedroom flats is 40m². This Policy acknowledges that there may be scope for reducing this standard in town centre locations. The Council’s transport adviser notes that the appeal site is located in an area with a ‘good’ Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 4, and I accept that the appeal site is well located in relation to a range of services and facilities. However there is no evidence that this is a town centre location before me and as such there is no justification for the reduction in garden size to the degree proposed.

7. The appellant refers to appeal decisions relating to the demolition of two existing dwellings and the construction of four replacement dwellings close to the centre of Brentwood.¹ In these cases the Inspector concluded that in town centre locations the rigid application of standards does not always make best use of land. This approach is consistent with Policy BP5. However, whilst I am not aware of the full circumstance of the decisions, I do not agree that in terms of location the current appeal is comparable.

8. I understand that the existing flats are held on short term tenancies. As such the appellant states that tenants/occupiers have the choice of deciding whether reduced garden areas would meet their needs. However it is clear from the representations received that many existing tenants have lived here for some time. Whilst these residents could also have access to the communal garden areas of the proposed dwellings, noting that Policy BP5 also refers to communal amenity space, this would not effectively address the loss of the existing private space relating to these dwellings.

9. The garages which front onto Back Lane have been neglected and appear in a state of despair. The appellant suggests that they attract anti-social behaviour, though no evidence on this point is presented. However, options for the improvement of the appearance of this area are not restricted to the development proposed in this case. This point does not therefore justify the reduction in these garden areas.

10. Finally, the appellant also refers to two appeal decisions in which flats with inadequate amenity space have been accepted by Inspectors.² I am not aware of the full circumstances of these cases, though it is clear that they both relate to the conversion of larger dwellings into flats, whereas the current case relates to the development of rear garden areas. As such these cases are not directly comparable.

¹ APP/H1515/A/04/1160828 & APP/H1515/A/05/1177278
² T/APP/P1615/A/86/51542/P4 and T/APP/F1420/A/88/86704 & 96725/P2
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11. I therefore find that the reduction in the size of private gardens would have a significant and detrimental effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of these properties. Whilst I note the appellant’s point that as the landlord of these properties their garden size could be reduced without the need for planning permission, I must determine this case on the matters before me.

Living conditions – privacy and outlook for existing and future residents

12. The rear facing windows in the new dwellings would be located around 17m from the rear elevations of the existing flats. The appellant quotes the Mayor of London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance which states that whilst 18-21m has been quoted as a minimum privacy distance between habitable rooms in the past and remains a useful yardstick, this can sometimes unnecessarily restrict density. I accept that this can be the case and also note the point that designers should consider the positions and aspects of habitable rooms, and avoid windows facing each other where privacy distances are tight.

13. In this case privacy distances are indeed tight and the proposal would involve rear facing windows located directly opposite each other, which at first floor level would lead to unobstructed two-way views. The indicative layout of the new dwellings suggests that the rear facing windows would relate to kitchens and living rooms and the obscure glazed windows of bathrooms. In quoting guidance from another London Borough the appellant suggests that whilst living rooms are regarded as habitable rooms they generally require less privacy than bedrooms and bathrooms. However, it appears that the windows on the rear elevations of the existing dwellings relate to kitchens and bedrooms. It is therefore important to protect the privacy of this aspect. As such the degree of overlooking resulting from both the narrow separation gap and the parallel positions of the rear elevations of these properties would lead to an unacceptable loss of privacy for existing occupiers.

14. Whilst not a reason for refusal, the Council’s officer report also refers to the effect of the close proximity of the existing and proposed dwellings on outlook for residents. The occupiers of the new flats as new residents may not consider this aspect of the scheme to be unacceptable. Nonetheless it is clear that the outlook for the occupiers of the existing flats would be significantly altered and that, in comparison with their current immediate outlook over rear gardens, their views of the new properties would appear intrusive and overbearing. The appellant has suggested that a condition relating to the details of internal layout could overcome such concerns. However it is not clear to me how this could be achieved.

15. The appellant states that under permitted development rights extensions of over one storey are not permitted if within 7m of any boundary. It is suggested that this would allow for two adjacent properties to extend which could result in a separation distance of 14m between two storey rear extensions. However, whilst I accept that privacy and outlook issues could arise, this would not be on the scale proposed in the present case.

16. Finally, the overlooking of private garden areas must also be considered. In higher density development in urban areas some degree of overlooking of garden areas is to be expected. This is the case with the existing properties where the occupiers of the first floor flats overlook adjacent gardens. As the amenity area associated with the new flats would be largely communal, privacy concerns would be less significant. Similarly whilst the much reduced private garden areas of the
existing flats would experience increased overlooking from the first floor windows of the new flats, this in itself would not be unacceptable.

17. Pulling all of these points on living conditions together, I have found that the future occupiers of the proposed flats would not experience unacceptable living conditions in terms of privacy. I have also accepted that the occupiers of the existing properties would not experience privacy issues in their garden areas. However, I have found significant harm in relation to the living conditions of the occupiers of 78-94 High Road with reference to the provision of private garden space, privacy within their homes and outlook. As such the proposal would not comply with the DPD Policies BP5, BP8 or BP11 which seek to protect residential amenity including the provision of external space and the protection against loss of both privacy and immediate outlook.

Highway safety

18. This section considers the effects of both the proposed point of access to the site and also the intensification of the use of Back Lane on pedestrian and highway safety. Back Lane is a narrow unadopted road which serves the garages to the rear of both the High Road properties and also Eric Road to the south. At the time of my site visit during the middle of a weekday there were cars parked along much of its length, reducing the carriageway width. It is clear that pedestrians currently use this route as a cut through from St Chads Road to other roads within the local street network. However, as there is no dedicated footpath and limited lighting, any intensification of pedestrian use must be carefully considered.

19. Back Lane would provide the main entrance to the 8 additional residential units, with the indicative plans illustrating that a dedicated parking space would be provided for each dwelling. Whilst not all of the existing garages provide parking for the residents of 78-94 High Road, it is clear that due to the parking restrictions in place on High Road between Monday and Saturday 8am-6.30pm, Back Lane provides an area for informal parking.

20. The use of Back Lane by the occupiers of the existing properties and the 8 new flats would result in an increase in the number of vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists accessing Back Lane on a regular basis. Whilst the indicative plan illustrates that a shared surface of around 1m would be provided in front of the new dwellings, the likely number of vehicles parking in this area would negate the effectiveness of this limited provision.

21. The appellant notes that the distances pedestrians would have to travel to either St Chads Road or Junction Road West would be 38m and 70m respectively, and suggests that this journey is comparable to passing along a standard pavement with crossing driveways. However, my view is that in contrast to standard pavements in which pedestrian priority is usually clear, the extent of this undefined and narrow carriageway, which could have a significantly increased number of users, would result in pedestrian safety being compromised.

22. Reference is made to the previously approved redevelopment of six garages to provide a bungalow further to the west along Back lane. In this case the appellant notes that Back Lane is even narrower at this point and that there is only a narrow strip of pavement. However, as this new dwelling is located

---
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almost opposite the junction with Eustace Road, with the occupants only having to cross the width of the carriageway to reach the pavement, these two situations are not comparable.

23. Turning to look at parking issues more specifically, few of the existing garages are used for off road parking. A number of objectors state that tenants park in Back Lane. I also understand that the garages are to be demolished whatever the outcome of this appeal. As such it does not appear that the proposal would itself result in the loss of off-road parking provision.

24. However, the demand from existing residents for informal parking along Back Lane would remain. This scheme would also result in the length of Back Lane available for parking being reduced. It is also likely that the occupiers of the new flats would seek to make use of the areas in front of their dwellings for additional parking. This area has a ‘good’ accessibility rating with public transport links close by and some parking is available outside the control times on High Road. Nevertheless, insufficient consideration has been given to the implications of this scheme for the parking available to existing residents, particularly given the likely overall increase in parking pressures on Back Lane.

25. The appellant again refers to the previously approved scheme on Back Lane in which six existing garages were demolished and a one bedroom bungalow was constructed. In this case it was found that the garages did not provide off road parking for nearby dwellings and as such their loss would not lead to an increase in pressures for on-street parking spaces. No mention is made of any existing parking pressures on Back Lane. In contrast, as the present case would impact on a greater number of existing properties, and involve the creation of 8 additional two bedroom dwellings, it is clear that pressures on parking on Back Lane would be far more pronounced than in this previous case.

26. Therefore, whilst the loss of the existing garages would not in itself lead to the loss of parking provision for existing residents, it has not been demonstrated that the implementation of this scheme would result in these residents having satisfactory parking provision. As a result the additional parking pressures and congestion in the vicinity of the appeal site would have a harmful effect on highway safety in what is a poorly lit and restricted area.

27. Whilst not referenced as a reason for refusal in this case, the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority expresses concern regarding the restricted space for access by fire appliances, particularly given the presence of parked cars in this area. This point adds to the safety concerns of this proposal.

28. Pulling these threads together, I conclude that the nature of this development and its proposed access point would have a detrimental effect on the safety of pedestrians and other road users in the vicinity of Back Lane. As such the scheme would conflict with the DPD Policies BR9 and BR10 which require the effect of development on the surrounding transport and road network to be assessed and, specifically, the impact of street parking to be managed so that the street can be easily and safely crossed at many points by pedestrians, including people using wheelchairs.

Other Matters

29. The appellant notes that the site including the existing properties has a density of 62 dwellings per hectare (dph), and suggests that the increase to 90 dph would
make efficient use of this land, introducing further small family housing characteristic in this area. The appellant also makes reference to the London Plan’s suggested densities for such a location which indicates a range of between 45-120 dph (this relates to a PTAL rating of 2 to 3; with a PTAL rating of 4 to 6 this rises to 45-185 dph). As such both the current and proposed situations are in range. However, as the London Plan notes, it is not appropriate to apply these provisions mechanistically. Of greater significance to the determination of appropriate densities is the consideration of local contextual factors. Such factors have been explored in detail in this case and it has been demonstrated that the site is not able to support the increase in density proposed.

30. The appellant submits that the Council do not have a five year housing land supply, which has not been disputed. In such circumstances the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) advises that relevant development plan policies relating to the supply of housing should not be considered up to date (paragraph 49), and planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole (paragraph 14). I therefore accept that the 8 proposed dwellings would make a modest contribution to the housing supply, and that this weighs in favour of the proposal.

31. It is also relevant to consider the presumption in favour of sustainable development as the golden thread running through the Framework. The three dimensions of sustainable development are economic, social and environmental. In terms of the contribution to housing supply in the Borough this scheme would bring moderate economic and social benefits, and in environmental terms this location has a good level of access to local services and facilities as well as public transport. These points taken together weigh moderately in favour of this scheme. However, set against these considerations I have concluded that there would be harm to the living conditions of the existing occupiers of 78-94 High Road and that road safety would be compromised. The magnitude of these harms would be considerable, such that, even if I were to conclude that there is a shortfall in 5 year housing land supply on the scale suggested by the appellant and that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date, the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Therefore the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

Conclusion

32. I am aware that the appellant has been working on proposals relating to this site for a number of years, and that the present scheme includes modifications to reflect the feedback on earlier proposals. However, I have found that the proposal would not accord with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no other material considerations to outweigh this finding. So, for the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

AJ Mageean

INSPECTOR
Appeal Decision
Site visit made on 13 September 2017
by Gwyn Clark  BSc DipTP MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government
Decision date: 2nd November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/17/3177338
84 Westminster Gardens, Barking, Essex IG11 0BL
- 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 John Avers against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 16/01272/FUL, dated 4 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 December 2016.
- The development proposed is construction of a new one bedroon bungalow on land adjacent to 84c Westminster Gardens, Barking, Essex IG11 0BL.

Decision
1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues
2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the development on i) the character and appearance of the area ii) the living conditions of residents and iii) highway safety.

Reasons

Effect on the character and appearance of the area
3. The appeal site is accessed through a narrow gap, currently gated, between Nos 86 and 84c Westminster Gardens. These two dwellings are each situated at the end of a row of terraced two story houses. The two rows are set at an oblique angle to one another where Westminster Gardens turns a corner. They also overlap one another with No 86 standing much further forward toward the road. No 84c has a side projection and No 86 has been extended to the rear. This arrangement has an enclosing effect such that the proposed bungalow would be for the most part concealed from view.

4. Policy CP3 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy 2010 (CS) requires amongst others a high quality standard in relation to design of new buildings, respecting local character and providing a sense of place. Policies BR3, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document 2011(BWDP) set out requirements for new development to preserve and enhance the natural environment, to have regard to the local character of the area, and to provide attractive, high quality architecture.
5. The character of the area is largely made up of two story terraced houses with shallow front gardens and on-street car parking. The bungalow would only be glimpsed through the narrow gap that exists between the front terraced houses and the view would be of a simply designed modest building constructed in materials that are common to the area. For these reasons I consider that the proposed development does meet the requirements of policy CP3 of the CS and those of policies BR3, BP8 and BP11 of the BWDP because there would be no harm caused to the character and appearance of the local area.

6. I have no evidence before me to suggest that the appeal site is significant to the biodiversity of the area. It has the appearance of an unkempt garden. Therefore I conclude that no harm would arise to the natural environment and that the development would meet the requirements of policy BR3 of the BWDP and policy 7.19 of the London Plan 2016.

Effect on the living conditions of residents

7. The appeal site is shallow in depth and with the exception of a narrow strip of amenity space at the rear of the proposed bungalow, which would be dominated by the high embankment that separates this site from the industrial estate beyond, the entire bungalow plot including its side amenity space, would be overlooked.

8. Policy CP3 of the CS requires new development to achieve high quality standards in relation to the layout of new buildings and spaces. Policy BP8 of the BWDP sets out to protect residential amenity, achieved by avoiding significant overlooking. Policy BP11 establishes as a principle of new development the maintenance of residential amenity. Significant harm would arise to the living conditions of the occupiers of the bungalow as a result of its close proximity to the rear of Nos 84c and 86 Westminster Gardens and the overlooking and lack of privacy that would ensue. For this reason I consider that the proposed development would be contrary to policy CP3 of the CS and policy BP8 and BP11 of the BWDP.

9. I have no evidence before me to suggest that the development would be susceptible to crime in this ‘backland’ setting. Although the gap through which access would be taken is narrow, natural surveillance is afforded by No 84c and No 86 and by houses situated in the immediate area. Therefore I consider that there is no conflict with policy BC7 of the BWDP which seeks to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour.

10. BP8 of the BWDP seeks to avoid unacceptable levels of general disturbance arising, amongst other things, from traffic movement. The access would be very lightly used and therefore I do not consider that use of the access to the proposed development would give rise to harm to the living conditions of the neighbours. Therefore I do not find that the proposed development would be contrary to this policy.

Effect on highway safety

11. The access to the bungalow is situated at a point on Westminster Gardens where the road turns a corner. Despite vehicle parking taking place on the road visibility at the junction is good. The gap between No 84c and No 86 is narrow but it is wide enough to be negotiated by a car and other larger vehicles with
care. As it would only serve the bungalow the frequency of use would be low and due to its narrowness vehicle speeds would be very low.

12. Policy BR9 of the BWDP applies parking standards to development and seeks to ensure that car parking design takes account of the local environment and accessibility of the site, access and amenity impacts. I find there is no evidence to demonstrate that harm would arise to highway or pedestrian safety and conclude that the requirements of policy BR9 of the BWDP are met.

Conclusion

13. I attach significant weight to the fact that the proposed development would offer accessible accommodation, widen the mix of houses available and contribute towards meeting the need for new houses, and in particular smaller dwellings, in the area. I also conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and I have not identified harm to highway safety.

14. However these factors do not outweigh the substantial harm that I have identified in respect of the effect of the development upon the living conditions of the occupiers of the proposed development due to being exposed to significant overlooking. Consequently I dismiss the appeal.

Gwyn Clark
INSPECTOR
Appeal Decision
Site visit made on 8 November 2017

by B Bowker  Mplan MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22nd November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3179623
105 Arnold Road, Dagenham RM9 6AN

- 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 H Edebiri against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 17/00714/FUL, dated 2 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2017.
- The development proposed is a two storey side and single storey front and rear extensions.

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 host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No 105 Arnold Road is a two storey end of terrace dwelling located adjacent the junction of Arnold Road and Combes Road. The full two storey height, width and symmetrical hipped roof design of the appeal property visually contrasts and 'bookends' the wider terrace in an attractive manner. This is a design feature evident at nearby terraces and contributes to a pleasant and ordered character in the surrounding area.

4. The height, width and overall mass of the proposed extension would obscure the bookend design of the appeal property. In addition, the irregular shape and multiple roof slopes proposed would be out of character with the symmetrical and simpler design of the roof along the host property, the wider terrace, and those in the surrounding area. Thus, as a whole, the design and scale of the proposal would appear incongruous with the host building and the wider terrace, to the detriment of the established ordered character in the surrounding area.

5. The resultant harm would be noticeable from public vantage points along Arnold Road, including the junction at Combes Road. The use of matching roof, wall and window materials would not prevent the harm identified above. The Council’s Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document states that side extensions should be particularly sympathetic in
terms of their form and roof treatment. Based on my reasoning above, the proposal would be deficient in this respect.

6. In reaching this view I understand that the Council have previously granted permission\(^1\) for a side extension at the appeal property. Full details of this permission are not before me. However, based on the Council’s description, the previous permission relates to a side extension with a reduced scale and more sympathetic design. Consequently it is materially different to the proposal before me. Moreover I must determine the appeal before me on its own individual merits.

7. Therefore the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Consequently the proposal would be contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document. Combined these policies require development to protect or enhance local character and help create a sense of local identity, distinctiveness and place.

Other Matters

8. I acknowledge that the Council concluded that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of occupants at neighbouring properties. However an absence of harm in this respect is a neutral factor, and as such would not outweigh the harm identified in relation to the main issue above.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having taken all matters raised into account, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

*B Bowker*

INSPECTOR

---

\(^1\) Council Ref 16/01888/FUL

[https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate](https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate)
Appeal Decision
Site visit made on 9 October 2017

by Richard Schofield BA(Hons) MA MRTPi
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 2nd November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3179642
150 Third Avenue, Dagenham RM10 9BB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by Mr Joel Seneca against the decision of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Council.
- The application Ref 17/00777/PRIOR6, dated 27 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2017.
- The development proposed is described as, "the existing building is a mid-terrace, single dwelling house with an existing 3m extension to the rear. An extension of a further 3m is proposed at the rear of the existing house".

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. Class A of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the GPDO) permits the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse. Within this Class, paragraph A.1 sets out when development of this type is specifically not permitted. Class A is also subject to conditions including those set out in paragraph A.4.

3. The Council contends that the proposal does not fall within the scope of works permitted under Class A of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

4. Specifically, it notes that Part 1, Class A, A.1(j) advises that development is not permitted by Class A if the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse and would (iii) have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse.

5. There is some debate between the parties as to what constitutes a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse. The appellant disputes the Council's view that the appeal dwelling had an original single storey, half width projection extending from the rear elevation, which has since been subsumed by a two storey rear extension.
6. No definitive evidence has been presented to me either way, but it was evident from my site visit that many of the unextended dwellings on Third Avenue did indeed appear to have single storey, half width projections. These were of a uniform design and appeared to be contemporary with the houses. As such, it is reasonable to consider that they were common to all of the dwellings when built and, thus, that the appeal dwelling also once had such a feature.

7. Treating the now subsumed single storey rear projection as forming part of the original dwellinghouse, rather than as an extension, the side wall of this projection is a wall forming a side elevation. The existing two storey extension that encompasses this rear projection is, therefore, an extension that extends beyond a wall that forms a side elevation (i.e. the stepped side wall created by the rear projection). If an extension was added on at the rear of this, the total enlargement would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation and is more than half the width of the dwelling house. Applying Schedule 2, Part 1 Para A.1 (ja), the appeal scheme is not permitted development.

8. In addition, given that the sum total of enlargements to the house would have more than one storey (though only in part), it is entirely probable that it would fall foul of the restrictions relating to rear extensions too. Had I found the proposal to be permitted development under Part 1, Class A, A.1(j), I would have sought the parties’ views on this additional matter.

9. This is all summed up on Page 24 of the Permitted Development Rights for Householders - Technical Guidance (DCLG April 2017), which states:

   Under paragraph (ja) ... if the proposed extension is being joined to a previous enlargement, it will not be permitted development if the size of the total enlargement (being the proposed enlargement together with any previous enlargement) exceeds these limitations. For example, if a proposed extension of 3 metres in height is added to an existing extension which exceeds 4 metres in height, or if the proposed extension creates a total enlargement which has a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse, it would not be permitted development.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal would not fall within the definition of Class A of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the GPDO) and, thus, that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Schofield
INSPECTOR
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2017

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 16th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3180186
162 Gorseway, Rush Green, Romford, Essex RM7 0SH

- 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 Colin Farr against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 17/00374/FUL, dated 1 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2017.
- The development proposed is a single storey rear, two storey rear and two storey side extensions.

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises an end of terrace house, which is substantially set off from its side boundary, with the intervening area comprising of a hardstanding and a gate. On the other side of the boundary, 160 Gorseway forms the start of the next terrace. No 160 has been extended by way of a flat roofed 2 storey extension which is set well back from the front elevation of the property and set in from the boundary with the appeal site by just under 1m.

4. The area largely comprises of short rows of terraced properties. Although a number of the end of terrace properties have been extended to the side, the arrangement of the rows remains broadly intact with the spacing in between appreciably contributing to the character and appearance of the area.

5. The two storey form of the proposal would extend near up to the boundary with No 160. The Council’s Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) states that, with regard to terraced properties, 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 are set off the side boundary. As the first floor of the proposal would not be set off the boundary with No 160 to a significant degree, the spacing, or gap, up to the boundary would be lost. This would detract from the prevailing character of the largely distinct rows of terraced properties.
6. The SPD also cautions against the closure of gaps between terraced properties because this may result in a detrimental effect on the streetscene. Although No 160’s extension is well set back, with the proposal, the space in front of the extension would, in effect, be enclosed by built development on three sides. This arrangement would not present a character of spacing in between the rows of terraced properties. Consequently, this would not address the harm that would arise by the loss of the spacing up to boundary and as a result, this would cause the detrimental effects which the SPD seeks to avoid.

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of examples of side extensions in the area. Whilst I accept that some of these have resulted in the loss of spacing between the rows of terraced properties, spacing has been maintained in others because they are separated by accesses to land to the rear, or because of the how the respective properties are sited on their plots. I consider that the prevailing character is largely intact, and it has not been substantially changed by the side extensions that are evident. As such, it is proper to maintain this character as it does appreciably contribute to the area. This equally applies both to properties at the end of terraces and on corner plots in this area, so that the character is not changed to one of a continual built up form, resulting in the loss of the short row of terraces and the associated spacing.

8. With regards to the appeal decision referred to by the appellant, this is located some distance from the site and, as I have set out, the spacing between the terraces in this area does contribute positively to its character. I am satisfied that the circumstances are sufficiently different so as not to alter my decision.

9. Although I note comments about the modest size of the properties and a need to encourage larger family housing, this is not at the expense of maintaining the qualities of the area, where they contribute positively to its character and appearance. With regards to precedent, the character of the area has not been so substantially altered that the spacing between the rows of terraces has been lost. None of these matters change my conclusions.

10. I conclude the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would not comply with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham Local Development Framework, Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011) which expects development to have regard to the local character of the area and help to create a sense of local identity, distinctiveness and place, and protect or enhance the character of the area. Similarly, I find that the proposal would not comply with the SPD, with the closure of the gap up to the boundary with No 160, and as this would result in a detrimental effect on the streetscene.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Hendley
INSPECTOR

1 APP/Z5060/D/17/3171057 45 Clare Gardens, Barking, IG11 9JH.
## BE-FIRST WORKING ON BEHALF OF LONDON BOROUGH
OF BARKING & 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>16/01564/CDN</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>LBBD</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 7 (local labour strategy), 8 (construction environmental management plan) and 9 (construction logistics plan) in respect of Phase 2 of planning permission 13/00229/FUL. Leys Redevelopment Site Wellington Drive Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00642/CDN</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Plaistow Broadway Filling Stations</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 11 (land contamination investigation) and 12 (remediation strategy) in respect of planning permission 16/01353/FUL. Boleyn Garage Limited 87 Movers Lane Barking Essex IG11 7UQ</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00916/FUL</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Mr S Dhanesar</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 14 Emerald Gardens Dagenham Essex RM8 1LH</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00920/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued</td>
<td>Mr C Gotobed</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 Rose Glen Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0SL</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 July 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>17/00922/CLU_E</td>
<td>Certificate refused on 31 July 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Razzak</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for an existing development: Erection of front porch. 3 Grosvenor Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1NP</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01047/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 31 July 2017</td>
<td>Mr W Hanif</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres in total comprising 3.53 metres existing and 2.47 metres proposed; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.2 metres). 57 Southwold Drive Barking Essex IG11 9AT</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 August 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>17/00880/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Grey</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 4 Sheringham Drive Barking Essex IG11 9AN</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00924/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 August 2017</td>
<td>Glyntex</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 3 (external materials) in respect of planning permission 14/01009/FUL. 588 Rainham Road South Dagenham Essex RM10 7XD</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00926/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 1 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Bednarz</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side/rear extension. 80 Gainsborough Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2DP</td>
<td>Becontree</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>17/00927/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 August 2017</td>
<td>GLS Properties Investment Limited</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. 58 Central Park Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 7BU</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01033/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 1 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr H R Khan</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres in total comprising 2.465 metres existing and 3.535 metres proposed; height to eaves: 2.972 metres and maximum height: 3.336 metres). 129 Upney Lane Barking Essex IG11 9LE</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00609/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate refused on 2 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Khan</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and installation of two front and one side rooflight. 31 Adelaide Gardens Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6SS</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00743/ CLU_E</td>
<td>Certificate refused on 2 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr K Kaur Khossa</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for an existing use: Use of property as two self-contained flats and erection of single storey rear extension. 12 Burlington Gardens Chadwell Heath Romford Essex</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**BE-FIRST WORKING ON BEHALF OF LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING & 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>17/00837/ADV</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC</td>
<td>Installation of 4 replacement roof mounted internally illuminated signs and replacement internally illuminated totem sign in car park. Morrisons Supermarket 402 Wood Lane Dagenham Essex RM10 7RA</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00905/OUT</td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>Mr M Barlow</td>
<td>Application for outline planning permission: Demolition of existing house and redevelopment of site to provide 2 three bedroom houses, 2 one bedroom flats and 1 two bedroom flat together with associated car parking. 808 Rainham Road South Dagenham Essex RM10 8YX</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00934/FUL</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Mr H Lewis</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof and rear dormer window. 755 Becontree Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 3HH</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00938/TPO</td>
<td>TPO</td>
<td>Sainsburys</td>
<td>Application for tree works subject to a tree preservation order: Cut back 7 poplar trees to achieve 2 metre clearance; remove robinia; 25% reduction to 4 acer platinus in service yard; 25% reduction to 9 acer platinus in car park; fell salix alba. Sainsburys 97 - 131 High Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6PB</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/01065/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 2 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr F Meraj</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). 54 Wadeville Avenue Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6EU</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00944/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 3 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Zaffar</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. 6 Ashton Gardens Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6RT</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00874/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate refused on 4 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Schwartz</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey rear extension. 24 Hurstbourne Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9UX</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00959/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 4 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Pisev</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. 250 Woodward Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4TB</td>
<td>Eastbury</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>17/01077/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 4 August 2017</td>
<td>Mrs A Way</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: 3.5 metres). 8 Valentines Way Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0YB</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01078/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 4 August 2017</td>
<td>Ms F Jamal</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: 4.0 metres). 38 Clare Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9JH</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00109/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 August 2017</td>
<td>Umad Investment Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 3 (materials), 4 (cycle parking), 5 (green roof), 6 (boundary treatment), 7 (acoustic protection), 9 (Construction Method Statement), 11 (site investigation) and 12 (remediation strategy) in respect of planning permission 15/00427/FUL. 174 - 176 Ripple Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00440/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 August 2017</td>
<td>Abbey Developments Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 6 (employment and skills strategy) in respect of planning permission 16/01025/FUL. Land South Of Cemetery Whalebone Lane North Romford 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>17/00806/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Suchak</td>
<td>Erection of single storey side and rear extension and front porch. 18 Puffin Close Barking Essex IG11 0GT</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00896/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Hussain</td>
<td>Retention of side extension and marquee for use as temporary prayer hall. 388 Ripple Road Barking Essex IG11 9RS</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00946/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 August 2017</td>
<td>LBBD - Strategic Director Service Development &amp; Integration</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 2 (external materials) in respect of Phase 1 of planning permission 16/01432/REM. Gascoigne Estate East King Edwards Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00947/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 August 2017</td>
<td>LBBD - Strategic Director Service Development &amp; Integration</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 3 (soft landscaping) and 5 (hard landscaping) in respect of in respect of Phase 1 of planning permission 16/01432/REM. Gascoigne Estate East King Edwards Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00969/ FUL</td>
<td>Application refused on 7 August 2017</td>
<td>Ms C Goodchild</td>
<td>Erection of first floor side/rear extension. 108 Maxey Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5HS</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00975/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 7 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr K Banaszek</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. 87 Alibon Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8BY</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>17/00976/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate refused on 7 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs M A Khan</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, erection of side and rear extensions, front porch and outbuilding. 10 Norton Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8BP</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00979/FUL</td>
<td>Application refused on 7 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Ur Rehman</td>
<td>Erection of two storey front extension and single storey side extension. 39 Adomar Road Dagenham Essex RM8 3LR</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01082/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 7 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Mahmoud</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.95 metres; height to eaves: 2.7 metres and maximum height: 2.8 metres). 60 Temple Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 1LP</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01083/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 7 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Allen</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres in total comprising 3.05 metres existing and 2.95 metres proposed; height to eaves: 2.3 metres and maximum height: 2.5 metres). 63 Gainsborough Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2DP</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

### 8 August 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>17/00830/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 8 August 2017</td>
<td>Mohsin Khan</td>
<td>Erection of new industrial unit. Unit 13 Riverside Industrial Estate Thames Road Barking Essex IG11 0ND</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00940/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate refused on 8 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Khanam</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. 17 Saville Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6DS</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00954/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 8 August 2017</td>
<td>ALDI Stores Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 4 (soft landscaping) in respect of planning permission 15/00619/FUL. Aldi Unit 1 Merrielands Retail Park Merrielands Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 6SJ</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00991/ TPO</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 8 August 2017</td>
<td>London &amp; Quadrant Housing Trust</td>
<td>Application for tree works subject to a tree preservation order: T20 (lime) - re-pollard. 14 Berengers Place Dagenham Essex RM9 4PT</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00980/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 8 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Haroon</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, erection of front porch and conversion of garage to habitable room. 87 Hurstbourne Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9UU</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>17/00981/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 8 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr W Hanif</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. 57 Southwold Drive Barking Essex IG11 9AT</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00982/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 8 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr Sayful-L-Islam Khan</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. 98 Baron Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1UA</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00992/TPO</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 8 August 2017</td>
<td>Crawford &amp; Company</td>
<td>Application for tree works subject to a tree preservation order: T1 (poplar) and T2 (cypress) - fell to ground level. 58 Carnation Close Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0XQ</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01092/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 8 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr S F Ahmed</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 7.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 117 Tallow Close Dagenham Essex RM9 6EU</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BE-FIRST WORKING ON BEHALF OF LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING & 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>9 August 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00576/ADV</td>
<td>Permitted on 9 August 2017</td>
<td>Outdoor Plus Ltd</td>
<td>Replacement of single-sided internally illuminated advertising panel with single-sided LED illuminated advertising panel. Kingsbridge Industrial Estate Kingsbridge Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00819/FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 9 August 2017</td>
<td>Co-Op Group</td>
<td>Installation of replacement roller shutter and replacement condensers and air conditioning units to rear of shop. Co Op 98 - 100 Dagenham Road Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0TJ</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00828/FUL</td>
<td>Refused on 9 August 2017</td>
<td>Mrs A Munnerley</td>
<td>Conversion of existing two storey side extension into a new two storey, two bedroom house. 102 Connor Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5UT</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00998/TPO</td>
<td>Permitted on 9 August 2017</td>
<td>London &amp; Quadrant Housing Trust</td>
<td>Application for tree works subject to a tree preservation order: T19 (lime) - re-pollard. 15 Berengers Place Dagenham Essex RM9 4PT</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00999/ADV</td>
<td>Permitted on 9 August 2017</td>
<td>Pizza Hut</td>
<td>Installation of internally illuminated fascia sign and projecting box sign. 339 Valence Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 3RA</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01095/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 9 August 2017</td>
<td>Miss M Sood</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.8 metres and maximum height: 2.9 metres). 167 Bennetts Castle Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 3YJ</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BE-FIRST WORKING ON BEHALF OF LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING & 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>17/01113/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required and permission refused on 9 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr F &amp; R Ahmed</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres in total comprising 3.0 metres existing and 3.0 metre proposed; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.25 metres). 133 Beccles Drive Barking Essex IG11 9HZ</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00815/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 10 August 2017</td>
<td>Mrs M K Juttla</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side/rear and single storey rear extension. 116 Lincoln Avenue Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0SJ</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00881/ FUL</td>
<td>Refused on 10 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr S M Cheung</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side extension. 326 Becontree Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 2TP</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00902/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 9 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr Canh To Vanto</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 275 Salisbury Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9XX</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00983/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 10 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr K Jepicenko</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. 10 Hunters Hall Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8JH</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>17/01000/ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 10 August 2017</td>
<td>Aldi Stores Ltd - Chelmsford</td>
<td>Installation of 8 advertisement signs (5 internally illuminated and 3 non illuminated), consisting of a mixture of fascia and other signs. Aldi Unit 1 Merrielands Retail Park Merrielands Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 6SJ</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01003/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 10 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Hussain</td>
<td>Erection of single storey side/rear extension, first floor rear extension and conversion of garage into habitable room. 58 Melford Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9HT</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01005/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 10 August 2017</td>
<td>Santander Plc</td>
<td>Installation of new shop front and automated teller machine (ATM). 247 Heathway Dagenham Essex RM9 5AN</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01006/ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 10 August 2017</td>
<td>Santander Plc</td>
<td>Installation of internally illuminated ATM display screen and relocation of fascia and projecting signs. 247 Heathway Dagenham Essex RM9 5AN</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01099/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 10 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr H Miah</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 4.0 metres). 81 Blake Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9SF</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 August 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>17/00408/CLU_E</td>
<td>Certificate refused on 11 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr T Butt</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for an existing development: Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof, rear dormer windows and front rooflights. 2 Melford Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9HT</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>17/00882/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 11 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Hegarty</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 83 Meadow Road Barking Essex IG11 9QP</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00917/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 11 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr H Imtiaz</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. 35 Farrance Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6EB</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00994/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 11 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr G Crossman</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of a rear dormer window and installation of two front rooflights. 37 Hewett Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2XT</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01010/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 11 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr S K Buttar</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of two rear dormer windows and installation of three front rooflights. 12 Rosslyn Road Barking Essex IG11 9XN</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01109/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 11 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr J Lam</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). 14 Warrington Square Dagenham Essex RM8 3JJ</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BE-FIRST WORKING ON BEHALF OF LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING & 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>17/01115/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 11 August 2017</td>
<td>Sheikh Fahima Khanom</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: 3.3 metres). 104 Stevens Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2QL</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01114/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 11 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr C Hussein</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). 100 Wilmington Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9TU</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00820/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 14 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Ahmed</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving hip to gable end the construction of rear dormer window and front rooflights. 32 Clare Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9JH</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00879/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 14 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr M K Mohammad</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window. 229 Bastable Avenue Barking Essex IG11 0QQ</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01009/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 14 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Ochenkowski</td>
<td>Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and front rooflights. 27 Ager Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 1BF</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 August 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>17/01018/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 14 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Ur Rehman</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey side extension. 39 Adomar Road Dagenham Essex RM8 3LR</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01022/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 14 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Kimani</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 108 Charlton Crescent Barking Essex IG11 0NH</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01026/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 14 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr K Banaszek</td>
<td>Erection of part single/part two storey rear extension. 87 Alibon Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8BY</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01137/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 14 August 2017</td>
<td>Barking Riverside Ltd</td>
<td>Erection of single storey building to provide temporary cycle hub. Handley Page Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01187/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 14 August 2017</td>
<td>Swan New Homes Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 37 (scheme of highway works) in respect of planning permission 16/01183/FUL. 16 - 48 Cambridge Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 August 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>17/00993/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 15 August 2017</td>
<td>Mrs Bi Yun Xu</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side/rear extension incorporating a hip roof extension and single storey rear extension. 7 Spinney Gardens Dagenham Essex RM9 5DR</td>
<td>Parsloes</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>17/01036/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 15 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Nosyrev</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving the construction of a rear dormer window, front rooflights and erection of single storey rear extension. 16 Review Road Dagenham Essex RM10 9DH</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01071/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 15 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Nita</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey rear extension. 88 Farmway Dagenham Essex RM8 2SP</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01107/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 15 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr G Mala</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.8 metres; height to eaves: 2.635 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 194 Rainham Road North Dagenham Essex RM10 7EJ</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01118/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 15 August 2017</td>
<td>LBBD</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 27 (Bird and Bat Bricks/Boxes) in respect of Phase 2 of planning permission 13/00229/FUL Leys Redevelopment Site Wellington Drive Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01125/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 15 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr C Timaru</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). 32 Shaw Avenue Barking Essex IG11 0UD</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

**BE-FIRST WORKING ON BEHALF OF LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING & DAGENHAM REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD**

<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>17/00255/ FUL</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Mr G Ubartas</td>
<td>Erection of first floor rear extensions. 17 Dawson Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9PX</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00256/ FUL</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Mr G Ubartas</td>
<td>Erection of two storey rear extension. 19 Dawson Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9PX</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00818/ CDN</td>
<td>CDN</td>
<td>East Thames Group &amp; LBBD</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 9 (external materials) in respect of Phase 1A (Sub-Phase A) and Phase 1B of planning permission 15/01084/FUL. Gascoigne Estate East King Edwards Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00935/ CDN</td>
<td>CDN</td>
<td>LBBD</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 22 (acoustic protection) and 42 (glazing) in respect of Phase 2 of planning permission 13/00229/FUL. Leys Redevelopment Site Wellington Drive Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01031/ FUL</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>LBBD</td>
<td>Erection of rear outbuilding (retrospective). 132 Lodge Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 2JP</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

16 August 2017
## BE-FIRST WORKING ON BEHALF OF LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING & 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>17/01038/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 16 August 2017</td>
<td>Mrs J Folasayo</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 26 Valence Wood Road Dagenham Essex RM8 3AT</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01041/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 16 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Hussain</td>
<td>Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 39 Hepworth Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9BA</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01045/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 16 August 2017</td>
<td>Miss Z Bokhari</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window, hip-to-gable end roof and installation of front rooflights. 19 Lynnett Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1RJ</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01134/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 16 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Ahmed</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: 3.25 metres). 7 Finnymore Road Dagenham Essex RM9 6JA</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01164/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 16 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Butt</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 3.3 metres). 26 Thorpe Road Barking Essex IG11 9XJ</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00211/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 17 August 2017</td>
<td>East Thames Group &amp; LBBD</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 17 (construction management plan), 19 (construction logistics plan) (in relation to Block A1, Sub-Phase A of Phase 1A) and 53 (vehicular and pedestrian access) (in relation to Sub-Phase A and B of Phase 1A) in respect of planning permission 15/01084/FUL. Gascoigne Estate East King Edwards Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01048/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 17 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr L Rahman</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. 72 Sheringham Drive Barking Essex IG11 9AN</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01140/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 17 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr J Downes</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). 29 Winding Way Dagenham Essex RM8 2TD</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01151/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 17 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr C Amin</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.88 metres and maximum height: 2.88 metres).</td>
<td>Valence</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><strong>18 August 2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01172/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 18 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Miah</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.25 metres). 23 Hurstbourne Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9UY</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21 August 2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01966/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 21 August 2017</td>
<td>D &amp; G Lettings Ltd</td>
<td>Formation of new door opening to shopfront in connection with self-containment of existing first floor residential accommodation. 2 The Triangle Tanner Street Barking Essex IG11 8QA</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00846/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 21 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr N Ali</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side and single storey front, side and rear extensions. 8 Albert Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1LR</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00957/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 21 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr I Kudinov</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. 31 Kennedy Road Barking Essex IG11 7XJ</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>17/00966/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 21 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr I Nadaratasundaram</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of front porch. 3 Gurney Close Barking Essex IG11 8JX</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00988/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 21 August 2017</td>
<td>Mrs B A Ilori</td>
<td>Retention of single storey rear extension. 9 Joyners Close Dagenham Essex RM9 5AL</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01053/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 21 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr G Grozev</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey rear extension. 202 Woodward Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4TA</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01061/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 21 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr Chavda</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 21 Dunkeld Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2PS</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01068/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 21 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Saud</td>
<td>Conversion and front/side/roof extension to garage to form habitable room and erection of front porch. 9 Philip Avenue Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0XB</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01072/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 21 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Mintah</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side and part single/part two storey rear extension. 75 Davington Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2LR</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</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>17/01262/PRIOR4</td>
<td>Prior approval required on 21 August 2017</td>
<td>LBBD - Mr S Loynes</td>
<td>Application for prior notification of proposed demolition of three high rise blocks of flats and one low rise block of flats. 124-159 And 221-232 St Marys, And Barnes House And Rookwood House Gascoigne Estate Barking Essex</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00889/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 22 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr S S Sangha</td>
<td>Erection of first floor side and rear extension. 10 Westrow Drive Barking Essex IG11 9BH</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01195/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 23 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Fifo</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.8 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 285 Ivyhouse Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5RT</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01197/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 23 August 2017</td>
<td>Nwe Ola Ibeawuchi</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.685 metres and maximum height: 2.685 metres). 11 Orchard Road Dagenham Essex RM10 9PT</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01196/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 23 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr F Marney</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.3 metres; height to eaves: 2.917 metres and maximum height: 3.520 metres). 843 Green Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 1DD</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>17/00745/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 24 August 2017</td>
<td>Asset Rock Ltd</td>
<td>Erection of a third floor level to the existing building to provide 5 one bedroom flats, including associated cycle and refuse storage and new staircase from second floor level. Edgefield Court Edgefield Avenue Barking Essex</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00769/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 24 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Otroshchenko</td>
<td>Conversion of existing house to form two self contained houses and conversion of part of existing annexe in rear garden into garage. 130 Western Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 8UJ</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00875/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 24 August 2017</td>
<td>Mulalley &amp; Co Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 14 (soft landscaping) in respect of planning permission 15/01778/FUL. Land At Front Of 1 -29 Webber House North Street Barking Essex</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00885/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 24 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr J Kojo</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side extension. 2 Margery Road Dagenham Essex RM8 3AX</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00890/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 24 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr S S Sukhi</td>
<td>Erection of replacement garage. 31 Bennett Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6ER</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## BE-FIRST WORKING ON BEHALF OF LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING & 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>17/00961/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 24 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr G Mishra</td>
<td>Erection of first floor side/rear extension. 19 Eric Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6JJ</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01086/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 24 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Dhruvraj</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. 45 Salisbury Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9XQ</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01088/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 24 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr J Mureithi</td>
<td>Erection of single storey side/rear extension. 28 Sovereign Road Barking Essex IG11 0XQ</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01198/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 24 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Hussain</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 4.0 metres). 14 Salisbury Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9XW</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01205/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 24 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr A 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: 3.25 metres). 40 Ventnor Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9JY</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BE-FIRST WORKING ON BEHALF OF LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING & 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>17/00835/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Rahman</td>
<td>Demolition of rear 'outrigger' projection and erection of two storey rear extension. 40 Ventnor Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9JY</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00960/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>Adnan Iqbal</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 146 Morley Road Barking Essex IG11 7DH</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01001/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>BT Payphones</td>
<td>Installation of replacement public telephone and ATM service kiosk. BT Telephone Box Outside 499 - 501 Gale Street Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01029/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs L Alex</td>
<td>Erection of part single/part two storey side and rear extension. 17 Sterry Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8PB</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01035/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Ali</td>
<td>Erection of rear outbuilding. 9 Bradfield Drive Barking Essex IG11 9AW</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01050/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>Logicor</td>
<td>Change of use from Use Class B8 to a flexible use incorporating Use Classes B1C, B2 and B8. Unit 11 Sterling Industrial Estate Rainham Road South Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 August 2017
**BE-FIRST WORKING ON BEHALF OF LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING & 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>17/01059/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>The Trustees - Masjid-E-Umar</td>
<td>Alterations to mosque involving erection of first and second floor (loft) rear extensions and hip to gable roof alteration to provide kitchen, WCs and office/library accommodation. 343 Ripple Road Barking Essex IG11 7RJ</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01084/ ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>Pizza Hut</td>
<td>Installation of internally illuminated fascia and projecting signs. 89 Longbridge Road Barking Essex IG11 8TB</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01094/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>Ms Y Trofimova</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear and front extensions. 12 Fordyke Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1PJ</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01096/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Fifo</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. 285 Ivyhouse Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5RT</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01098/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Miah</td>
<td>Installation of high level obscure glazed window on ground floor side elevation. 30 Coombewood Drive Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6AB</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01101/ ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>Co Op Food - Food Programme Delivery Orchid Group</td>
<td>Installation of 1 internally illuminated fascia sign, 1 internally illuminated double-sided sign and 1 non illuminated wall mounted sign. The Co Operative Food 34 - 36 Faircross Parade Longbridge Road Barking Essex IG11 8UW</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>17/01102/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Sarwar</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. 156 Romsey Road Dagenham Essex RM9 6BB</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01207/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Uddin</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). 165 Campden Crescent Dagenham Essex RM8 2SL</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01211/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Augustine</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.975 metres and maximum height: 3.275 metres). 6 Pettits Place Dagenham Essex RM10 8NL</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01222/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr N 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: 3.15 metres). 8 Albert Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1LR</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01224/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>Ms Evelyne</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). 42 Wren Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5YJ</td>
<td>Parsloes</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>17/01225/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 25 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr F Mahmood</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: 3.6 metres). 75 Burnham Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4RA</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00724/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 29 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Bashar</td>
<td>Erection of first floor side and rear extension. 82 Essex Road Barking Essex IG11 7QL</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00863/ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 29 August 2017</td>
<td>HSBC CRE</td>
<td>Installation of internally applied window vinyl. HSBC Bank 21 - 23 Ripple Road Barking Essex IG11 7NW</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00943/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 29 August 2017</td>
<td>AP Constructions</td>
<td>Demolition of garages in rear garden and erection of two bedroom bungalow. 100 Third Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 9BA</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01076/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 29 August 2017</td>
<td>Ms F Jamal</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. 38 Clare Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9JH</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01105/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 29 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr G A Hussain</td>
<td>Demolition of existing rear conservatory and rear projection and erection of single storey rear extension. 15 Netherfield Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9TL</td>
<td>Abbey</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>17/01111/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 29 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr G A Hussain</td>
<td>Retention of outbuilding in rear garden. 98 Park Avenue Barking Essex IG11 8QX</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01232/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 29 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Hannan</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). 131 Sandringham Road Barking Essex IG11 9AH</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01233/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 29 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Zogu</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: 3.3 metres). 26 Walfrey Gardens Dagenham Essex RM9 6JB</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00643/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 30 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr L Salmoon</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for proposed development: Erection of single storey side extension. 14 South Close Dagenham Essex RM10 9NJ</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01051/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused 30 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr G Grozev</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension in connection with change of use of dwelling to house in multiple occupation. 202 Woodward Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4TA</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 30 August 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Parent Body</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/01067/ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 30 August 2017</td>
<td>Hollywood Bowl Group</td>
<td>Installation of 4 internally illuminated fascia signs. Dagenham Bowling Dagenham Leisure Park Cook Road Dagenham Essex RM9 6UQ</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01123/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 30 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Fisher</td>
<td>Erection of outbuilding in rear garden. 50 Beccles Drive Barking Essex IG11 9HY</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01206/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 30 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr Ali</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 492 Goresbrook Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4XA</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01243/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 30 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr K Singh Kahlon</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). 58 Winterbourne Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2JT</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01247/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 30 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr K K Kola</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). 18 St Awdrys Road Barking Essex IG11 7QD</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01248/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 30 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr J Varnele</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.7 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 129 Hardie Road Dagenham Essex RM10 7BT</td>
<td>Eastbrook</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>17/01438/FAST</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 30 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr Ali</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 492 Goresbrook Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4XA</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 31 August 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/00669/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 31 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Ali</td>
<td>Loft conversion with rear dormer window and three front dormer windows. 67 Aldborough Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8AT</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00768/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 31 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Rahman</td>
<td>Erection of part single and part two storey rear extension. 15 Arden Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 6TJ</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01062/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 31 August 2017</td>
<td>LBBD</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 24 (external lighting) in respect of Phase 2 of planning permission 13/00229/FUL. Leys Redevelopment Site Wellington Drive Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01070/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 31 August 2017</td>
<td>Mr C Zirfas</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension to ground floor flat. 35 Hunters Square Dagenham Essex RM10 8AY</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/00637/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate refused on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Ms W Joseph</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Use of dwellinghouse as residential care home for no more than 6 young people living together as a single household (C3). 43 Waverley Gardens Barking Essex IG11 0BH</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00857/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr M S Baig</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension to no. 101 and first floor rear extensions to no. 101 &amp; 103 (part retrospective). 101 &amp; 103 Whalebone Lane South Dagenham Essex RM8 1AJ</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00906/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Mrs J Osbourne</td>
<td>Installation of handrails and ramp to front/side elevation. 63 Cartwright Road Dagenham Essex RM9 6JJ</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00912/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Mrs M Stevens</td>
<td>Installation of access ramp with handrails to front of house. 41 Fanshawe Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 5ER</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00913/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Mrs D Gard</td>
<td>Installation of access ramp with handrails to front/side of house. 34 Haydon Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2PA</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00914/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr C Cooper</td>
<td>Installation of handrails and ramp to front of house. 46 Chittys Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 1UP</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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>17/00915/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Mouser</td>
<td>Installation of handrails and ramp to front of property. 15 Pavet Close Dagenham Essex RM10 8SJ</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00925/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs N Bashir</td>
<td>Erection of part single/part two storey side and rear extension. 10 East Park Close Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6XX</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01056/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Khan</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction rear dormer window and three front rooflights. 15 Halsham Crescent Barking Essex IG11 9HG</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01093/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Bardhziuhov</td>
<td>Erection of single storey side and rear extensions and erection of outbuilding in rear garden. 86 Park Avenue Barking Essex IG11 8QX</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01124/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Miah</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of outbuilding in the rear garden. 141 Burdetts Road Dagenham Essex RM9 6YB</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01130/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Mrs E Hoxha</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey rear extension and conversion of existing garage to habitable room. 3 William Hope Close Barking Essex IG11 0FE</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01131/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Teresa Mason</td>
<td>Installation of access ramp with handrails to front of house. 81 Verney Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5LP</td>
<td>Parsloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01136/ TPO</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Miss S Weissbrodt</td>
<td>Application for tree works subject to a tree preservation order: Crown lift to 6 metres, thin by 20% and 3 metre reduction in spread. 24 Wykeham Green Dagenham Essex RM9 4NL</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01147/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Kucinskas</td>
<td>Erection of single storey front and side extension. 30 Cornworthy Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2DE</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01265/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Azam</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.6 metres and maximum height: 2.75 metres). 124 Lymington Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1RS</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01271/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr I Ali</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.7 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 14 Waverley Gardens Barking Essex IG11 0BQ</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01301/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required on 1 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr P Bajorinas</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: 3.15 metres). 21 Hunters Hall Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8JH</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>17/00638/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate refused on 4 September 2017</td>
<td>The Vine Residential Services</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Use of dwellinghouse as residential care home for no more than 6 young people living together as a single household (C3). 47 Waverley Gardens Barking Essex IG11 0BH</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01138/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 4 September 2017</td>
<td>Coral Racing Limited</td>
<td>Erection of 2 metre high railings and vehicle and pedestrian access gates (retrospective). Glebe House Vicarage Drive Barking Essex IG11 7NS</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01139/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 4 September 2017</td>
<td>Ms S Richardson</td>
<td>Demolition of lean to and erection of single storey rear extension. 75 Mayswood Gardens Dagenham Essex RM10 8UU</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01145/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 4 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr M M Ali</td>
<td>Retention of outbuilding in rear garden. 82 Gay Gardens Dagenham Essex RM10 7TD</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01193/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 4 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Jobanputra</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. 836 Green Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 1YR</td>
<td>Valence</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>17/01204/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 4 September 2017</td>
<td>CU London</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 14 (details of community use scheme) in respect of planning permission 16/01390/FUL. Coventry University London Civic Centre Wood Lane Dagenham Essex RM10 7BN</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01283/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required on 4 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Augustine</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.3 metres; height to eaves: 2.975 metres and maximum height: 3.275 metres). 6 Pettits Place Dagenham Essex RM10 8NL</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01340/NMA</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 4 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Odutola</td>
<td>Application for non-material amendment following grant of planning permission 14/01097/FUL (revised roof tiles and addition of smoke extract ventilation skylight). Land Adjacent To 25 - 27 Eldred Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5 September 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>17/00833/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 5 September 2017</td>
<td>Miss B Hassan</td>
<td>Demolition of outbuilding and erection of 3 storey building to provide 3 one bedroom flats. 264 Rainham Road South Dagenham Essex RM10 7UU</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01049/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 5 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr U Ali</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of outbuilding in rear garden. 38 Mayesbrook Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2EB</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
</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>17/01112/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 5 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs V Mykhaylyuk</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey rear extension. 124 Salisbury Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9XU</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01141/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 5 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr C Amin</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and two front rooflights. 830 Green Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 1YR</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01143/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 5 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr G Bansal</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of a rear dormer window and four front rooflights. 68 Essex Road Barking Essex IG11 7QL</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01221/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 5 September 2017</td>
<td>Biffa Waste Services Limited</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 3 (Hard Landscaping) in respect of planning permission 17/00210/CTY. BIFFA Waste Transfer Station Maybells Farm Ripple Road Barking Essex IG11 0TP</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01293/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 5 September 2017</td>
<td>Ms C Mackay</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). 59 Lindisfarne Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2QX</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>17/01302/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 5 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr Z Raja</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). 48 Sandown Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 8XD</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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