Present: Cllr Faraaz Shaukat (Chair), Cllr Syed Ahammad (Deputy Chair), Cllr Saima Ashraf, Cllr Faruk Choudhury, Cllr Edna Fergus, Cllr Irma Freeborn, Cllr Cameron Geddes, Cllr Syed Ghani, Cllr Adegboyega Oluwole, Cllr Chris Rice, Cllr Bill Turner and Cllr Dominic Twomey

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

46. Declaration of Members’ Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

47. Minutes - To confirm as correct the minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2017

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2017 were confirmed as correct.

48. 748-752 Green Lane, Dagenham RM8 1YT- 17/01250/FUL

The application involved the demolition of an existing two storey rear extension, the residential conversion of existing upper floor and the erection of part single/part three storey side and rear extension, to provide additional floor space to existing shop units, one additional retail unit and four one bedroom and five two-bedroom flats.

The site, formed of two shop units with ancillary accommodation above and a two-storey rear extension, would be converted and redeveloped to provide additional retail space and 9 flats within a three-storey extension at the rear. In principle such development in this location was acceptable.

The scheme would provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupiers in accordance with planning policy and would not cause harm to the amenities of existing neighbours.

The scale and siting of the development was considered appropriate to its context. The proposed extension is considered to be well proportioned, with a modern design and use of materials that would be distinctive and add visual interest to the street scene.

No car parking spaces would be provided within the site and future residents with cars would therefore need to park on the street. In accordance with the advice of the Transport Officer, based on evidence submitted of the availability of existing on street parking spaces, this is considered acceptable.

Members were concerned about certain aspects of the application, in particular
the impact on retail units, car parking, affordability, overlooking of other properties and loss of a walkway. DMM responded that it was not possible to guarantee retailers on the site. He accepted that a number of schemes had been submitted just below the threshold at which affordable housing can be sought. He understood the point about protecting neighbouring amenity but considered that the scheme would avoid any significant loss of light or privacy. He also noted that the applicant could build a small wall around the forecourt without needing planning permission therefore reducing the width of walkway.

Members requested what the amount of Community Infrastructure levy (CIL) was for this development. It was advised that the current CIL was £5386 for the Mayor and £2355 for the Council which was conceded to be not a large amount of money.

Members asked why the potential development would take two and a half years to be undertaken as regeneration in the area was needed more quickly. Daniel Harris, on behalf of the applicant, stated that it was intended to build this development if planning permission was agreed, within 2.5 years and that it could not be quicker as the lease on Superdrug retail premises did not run out till that time however it was hoped to reach agreement with them but there was always the possibility that this would not be the case. He added that the forecourt area on Waldegrave Road was currently used by pawnbrokers as a private car park with five spaces.

In answer to a question about the Superdrug site, Daniel Harris stated that it did not have to be a pharmacy in future. He added that the applicant was looking at ground floor retail storage with a back-office availability.

Members were concerned about fly-tipping and parking issues and asked in particular how the latter could be managed. The DMM confirmed that there was no car parking available with this scheme and added that there was a likelihood that occupants with cars would need to park in adjacent streets, possibly some way distant.

Members agreed that there should be an additional condition imposed on the permission in relation to not allowing residential occupiers of the proposed development to be eligible for a parking permit within any proposed adjoining CPZ. The additional condition agreed:

“The residential occupiers of the proposed development shall not be eligible for a parking permit within any proposed adjoining Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ).

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

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)


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 first floor courtyard, including 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 shall be carried out 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 refuse and cycle parking storage areas indicated on drawing No. 409-GL-L00-200 Rev. P01 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 and cycle storage provision in the interests of the appearance of the site and locality and in the interests of promoting cycling as a sustainable and non-polluting mode of transport and in accordance with policies BR11, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

6. 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.

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

Reason: In order to prevent noise nuisance to future residents of the development and to existing residential neighbours and in accordance with policies BR13 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

8. Habitable rooms having openings facing onto Green Lane or Waldegrave Road 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). The acoustic ventilators shall be installed prior to occupation of the development and thereafter maintained.

Reason: In order ensure a satisfactory noise environment for future occupiers by enabling adequate ventilation whilst windows are closed and in accordance with policies BR13 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

9. No deliveries, external running of plant and equipment or construction works, other than internal works not audible outside the site boundary, shall take place on the site other than between the hours of 0800 to 1800 on Monday to Friday and 0800 to 1300 on Saturday and not at all on Sundays, Public or Bank Holidays without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

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

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

Reason: To ensure that the proposed construction work does not cause undue nuisance and disturbance to neighbouring residents and in accordance with policies BR13 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.
11. 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. methods to minimise waste, to encourage re-use, recovery and recycling, and sourcing of materials;
i. 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 details are required prior to commencement of development in order to minimise the environmental impact of the construction and the impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents, and in accordance with policies BR10, BR13, BR15 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

12. The development shall not be occupied until the installation of a privacy screen to prevent overlooking from the external staircase within the courtyard towards the private terrace of the 79m2 2B4P flat in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved by in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The screen shall thereafter be maintained.

Reason: In order to secure a good standard of residential amenity for future occupiers in accordance with policies BP8 and BP11 BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

13. The residential occupiers of the proposed development shall not be eligible for a parking permit within any proposed adjoining Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ).

Reason: To prevent residential occupiers of the proposed development from taking up parking spaces in any proposed adjoining CPZ which are already in high demand by existing local residents in accordance with Policies BR9 and
The application property is a two-storey building located on the south-eastern side of Longbridge Road. The building contains a dental and medical centre on the ground floor and a 2 bedroom flat at first floor. The application seeks permission for the erection of a part single/part two storey rear extension and a first floor rear extension to provide additional floor space to serve the existing health clinic and a 2 bedroom self-contained flat including the provision of first floor roof terraces to serve the existing and proposed flats and the creation of new window and door openings to the existing flat.

The proposed new dwelling accords with the Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standards (March 2015). The proposed flat has sole access to private and useable external amenity space measuring 12.23m² and the proposal also creates an external amenity space for the existing flat measuring 38.95m².

No off-street parking provision was proposed for this development. The site has a PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) of 6a on a scale of 1-6 where 6 is excellent. It is therefore considered that due to the site’s location approximately 320 metres from Barking Station and with access to a number of bus routes, there is no requirement for car parking. It is noted that most of the commercial premises and flats on this side of Longbridge Road do not have access to car parking.

Members asked whether the premises might remain as a medical health centre and this was confirmed by the applicant. The DMM stated that this could change to any other Class D1 use in the future.

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 following approved plans: LOCATION-101, BLOCK-101, EX-101, EX-200, PRO-101, PRO-201, PRO-203
   
   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. A scheme specifying the provisions to be made for the control of noise emanating from the ground floor dental surgery shall submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme which, may include physical and/or administrative measures, shall be designed to ensure that noise emissions from the surgery do not exceed 35 LAeq dB (5 min) in any habitable room in adjoining residential premises and shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the flat hereby approved.

Reason: The noise control scheme is required prior to the commencement of development in order to minimise the transmission of noise and thereby safeguard the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and in accordance with policies BR13 and BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

5. Before occupation, the dwelling 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.

6. The 1.8 metre high boundary fence facing No. 96 Longbridge Road as indicated on drawing PRO-201 shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans prior to the use of the proposed terrace for the existing flat and thereafter permanently retained.

Reason: To provide satisfactory privacy for the occupants of the adjoining residential property in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

50. 445-447 Becontree Avenue, Dagenham RM8 3UL- 17/01594/FUL

The application was for a change of use from a shop to a car showroom.

The application property is a ground floor commercial unit which is currently vacant and was previously used as a community centre (without planning permission). Prior to this it was used as a Blockbuster video store (Class A1). The property is a prominent corner unit on the junction of Becontree Avenue and Valence Avenue and is located within the Andrew’s Corner Neighbourhood Centre. The application seeks permission for the change of use of the shop to a car showroom.

At present, 35.6% of the neighbourhood centre frontage is in use or has planning permission for non-A1 use. Should the proposed use be granted, this would increase to 47% which would significantly exceed the 35% limit sought
by Policy BE1. It is however noted that the application site is currently vacant and has not been in use for retail purposes for approximately 4 years.

In support of the proposed change of use, the applicant had provided marketing evidence stating that the property has been marketed for approximately 8 months at a reasonable rent. The owner has received offers solely from places of worship which have been refused as the owner is concerned about the impact of such uses on car parking availability and the high visitor volumes that may be generated. The owner’s estate agents state that the only credible offer which has been received is that of the applicants.

Vehicular access would be from the rear of the premises and a condition is proposed requiring the installation of bollards around the shop forecourt to prevent vehicles from entering/exiting the site from the front which would be dangerous to pedestrians and vehicles alike.

Members were concerned about a number of issues with the application and in particular parking, accessibility, lack of visual presentation contained in the report as they felt it was unclear. They also sought an analysis of the impact on the food store next door to the site, security and any removal of street furniture. Members were also concerned about the need for fencing and the applicant stated he would erect this if required.

The applicant, in answer to questions, stated that safety was a very important consideration and a maximum of five cars would be parked outside the premises.

Members agreed to defer this application to the next meeting of the Board on 12 February in order to provide them with greater detail in a number of areas. They requested that the following areas are included the next report to the Board:

- The exact area that the application covered,
- erection of bollards
- erection of fencing
- security lighting
- The exact number of vehicles that would be parked at the premises
- avoidance of encroachment and square footage
- an analysis of the impact of the potential change of use on neighbouring businesses

The Legal Adviser advised that the Board may also wish to consider whether it could consider setting a limit on the number of vehicles, vehicle repairs, power washing of vehicles, hours of activity and the type of vehicles at the premises, whether commercial or passenger based.

51. Town Planning Appeals

The Board noted details of the following appeals:

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 Baron Road, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00952/PRIOR6)

Application refused under delegated powers 17 July 2017 – Valence Ward

c) **Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.5 metres and maximum height: 2.9 metres)** – 23 Mill Lane, Chadwell Heath (Ref: 17/01472/PRIOR6)

Application refused under delegated powers 6 October 2017 – Chadwell Heath Ward

d) **Erection of single storey rear extension and loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and hip to gable roof extension and external insulation and rendering** – 10 Herbert Gardens, Chadwell Heath (Ref: 17/01473/FUL)

Application refused under delegated powers 20 November 2017 – Whalebone Ward

**Appeals Determined**

The following appeals have been determined by the Planning Inspectorate:

a) **Demolition of side extension and erection of two storey 2 bedroom end of terrace house** – 40 Cornwallis Road, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00291/FUL - Parsloes Ward)

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

1. The development, by reason of its siting and excessive scale, would result in a dominant and intrusive addition in the side garden of this corner plot. The proposed roof ridge is set below the ridge of the main building and would appear incongruous with the form of the terrace building and detrimental to the character of the street scene and Becontree Estate. Overall the development would be harmful to
the character and appearance of the area and contrary to policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document, policy CP2 of the Core Strategy and the guidance contained in the Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Extensions and Alterations'.

2. The external amenity space for the existing house at 40 Cornwallis Road would be reduced to 41m² which would not be of sufficient size to meet the needs of the occupants of a two bedroom house contrary to Policy BP5 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

3. The proposed development would result in the loss of a family dwelling house to the detriment of the stock of family housing in the borough, contrary to Policy BC4 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

**Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 30 November 2017**

b) **Change of use of a single family dwelling (Use Class C3) to a House in Multiple Occupation (Class C4) – 7 Cecil Avenue, Barking (Ref: 17/00631/FUL – Abbey Ward)**

Application refused under delegated powers 13 June 2017 for the following reason:

1. The proposed development would result in the loss of a 7 bedroom family house to the detriment of the stock of family housing in the borough, contrary to policy BC4 of the Borough wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

**Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal allowed 5 December 2017**

c) **Erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear and front extensions – 12 Fordyke Road, Dagenham (Ref: 17/01094/FUL – Whalebone Ward)**

Application refused under delegated powers 25 August 2017 for the following reason:

1. The proposed two storey side extension would compromise an important gap between the application site and No. 14 Fordyke Road, to the detriment of the spatial character of the streetscene contrary to BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD and the Supplementary Planning Document for Residential Extensions and Alterations.

**Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 8 December 2017**

d) **Erection of two storey one bedroom detached house – 141**
**Woodward Road, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00523/FUL – Eastbury Ward)**

Application refused under delegated powers 4 July 2017 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by virtue of its siting and scale would constitute an unacceptable form of back garden development which would materially reduce the open and spacious character of the application site’s garden and would be harmful to the character of the area and out of keeping with the prevailing built form. Overall, the proposal would fail to maintain the character of the Becontree Estate and is contrary to Policies CP2 and CP3 of the Core Strategy (July 2010) and Policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011).

2. The proposed house, by reason of its siting and scale, would result in a dominant addition in the private garden environment resulting in loss of outlook and light to the occupiers of 84 Ellerton Road, and loss of outlook and privacy to the occupiers of 139 Woodward Road. The amenity of the neighbouring properties would be significantly reduced, and the proposal is contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

**Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal allowed 8 December 2017**

e) **Erection of two storey side and part single/part two storey rear extension – 75 Davington Road, Dagenham (Ref: 17/01072/FUL – Mayesbrook Ward)**

Application refused under delegated powers 21 August 2017 for the following reason:

1. The proposed side extension would partially close off an important gap within the street scene and would fail to maintain the spacious character of the Becontree Estate and be harmful to the street scene. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011), policy CP2 of the Core Strategy and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012).

**Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 12 December 2017**

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

Application refused under delegated powers 30 June 2017 for the following reason:
1. The siting and design of the proposed development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the streetscene and the surrounding area contrary to Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy (July 2010) and Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011) and the guidance within the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (February 2012).

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 8 December 2017

g) 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 Baron Road, Dagenham (Ref: 17/00952/PRIOR6 – Valence Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 17 July 2017 for the following reason:

1. The proposed extension would have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers at 156 and 160 Baron Road by virtue of its excessive depth and height which would result in a loss of light and outlook at Numbers 156 and 160 and would be detrimental to the amenities of and living standards enjoyed contrary to Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Polices DPD and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 12 December 2017

h) Enforcement appeal – The erection without planning permission of a single storey rear extension – 53 Winding Way (Becontree Ward)

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 27 December 2017

52. Delegated Decisions

The Board noted details of delegated decisions for the period 6 September to 2 October 2017.